

---

**Report of the Director of Social Services**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18 January 2006**

**Subject: Annual Review of Adult Social Care Services Performance and Star Rating**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

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

---

**Executive Summary**

This report is presented to the Executive Board to meet a national requirement for the annual assessment of Adult Social Care Services Performance to be reported and put in the public domain. Performance assessment is shaped by the overall policy framework of the Department of Health in the case of Adult services.

As part of the overall response to the requirements of the Children Act the performance assessment regime changed in 2005 and, for the first time, assessments have been conducted separately, by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) in the case of Adult services and by OFSTED and CSCI in the case of Children's services, this report deals with adult services performance.

A copy of the Performance Review Report relating to Adult services is attached as Appendix 1 and in the report by the Director of Social Services attention is drawn to the key performance improvement recommendations. Future performance will be measured by achievements against these recommendations.

The annual performance assessment feeds into the annual star rating for social care services which was published on the 1<sup>st</sup> December last year. Leeds has retained its 2 star status with the prospects for adult care services remaining 'promising' and showing improvement on the overall judgment for social care services to children, where prospects for improvement have been upgraded to 'promising'. The letter from the Commission for Social Care Inspection on the Annual Review of Performance for Adult Social Care is attached as Appendix 2.

Members are asked to note the contents of the report.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 On an annual basis each Council with social care responsibilities receives an assessment of their performance, under the Department of Health Performance Assessment Framework. Following receipt of the performance review report in relation to adult social care services , Directors of Social Services are asked to ensure that the report is drawn to the attention of the Executive Board and to the wider public. Following the annual review, in November of each year star ratings are published for each social services authority, this happened on the 1<sup>st</sup> December last year.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 From April 2004, responsibility for the performance review of social services passed to the new Commission for Social Care Inspection, which is an arms length body, reporting directly to Parliament. The format for the performance review round covering 2004/05 was different to that of previous years specifically in the way the assessment of Children's social care services has been undertaken, this report deals with adult social care services reflecting the national change in performance assessment requirements.
- 2.2 The performance report follows on from the Annual Review Meeting which took place in September last year in relation to adult social care services with the Commission for Social Care Inspection. A range of other stakeholders attended this meeting, including representatives from Health services, auditors, and the Executive Board Member, Councillor Harrand.
- 2.3 The annual performance review letter in relation to Adult social care services is attached at appendix 1. The letter describes the methodology, outcome and confirmation that the assessment feeds into the overall corporate performance assessment.

## **3.0 Summary of Improvement Recommendations**

- 3.1 The performance report highlights strengths and areas for improvement using the national priorities and strategic objectives for social care services set by the Department of Health, in relation to Adult social care services the priorities are:
- Commissioning services based on a sound analysis of local population needs, including those of minority groups.
  - Balancing cost and quality requirements successfully
  - Focussing more on care planning and review
  - Increasing support for carers
  - Promoting fair, equal and timely access to services for people from all backgrounds.

## **4.0 Services for Adults and Older people**

- 4.1 Good progress has been made in a number of key areas. In particular the report notes the following:
- the progress that continues to be made in the promotion of independence for older people and people with physical and learning disabilities. This is supported by evidence that levels of intensive home care, intermediate care and extra care housing reflect very good performance and are above comparators.

- the improved reports on reducing the number of delayed discharges, which continued the successful partnership working with healthcare partners to agree protocols and manage processes for discharge.
- the continuing progress made in Leeds in relation to the National Service Framework for older people, in particular, standard 8, the promotion of healthy and active aging and standard 2 in relation to the progress which continues to be made in the adoption of the single assessment process across health and social care.
- the approach to commissioning cost efficient services in relation to home care and residential and nursing care is noted as a key improvement. Improvements are also noted in relation to the speed of delivery of equipment and adaptations.

## 5.0 Areas Identified for Improvement.

5.1 For adult services the summary recommendations from the performance report are:

- More effective use should be made of intermediate care .
- Quality and choice need to be more evident as objectives within commissioning processes.
- The numbers of people receiving service through direct payments continues to remain low.
- Improvements on the timeliness of assessment and care management processes is required.
- Plans agreed with health partners regarding stroke and falls services need to be more rigorously implemented.

5.2 These recommendations reflect specific areas of activity already identified by the department, details of the approach adopted to address the required service improvements are evidenced in the departmental business plan 2005 – 2008 presented to the Executive Board in May last year.

## 6.0 Star Rating

6.1 The overall star rating for each authority with social services responsibilities is reviewed on an annual basis followed by a formal announcement in November. Leeds has retained its **2 star** status, however there has been a change in the overall judgment for services for children. This is shown in the following table.

<b>Services for children</b>			
Serving people well	Most	↔	
Capacity for improvement	Promising	↑	Previously uncertain
<b>Services for Adults</b>			
Serving people well	Most	↔	
Capacity for improvement.	Promising	↔	

6.2 The judgement in relation to adult services acknowledges the progress made against the recommendations of previous performance assessment and continues to assess the prospects for further improvement to be promising. .

## **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 The Executive Board is asked to note the contents of this report and the attached Performance Review Report from the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) for adult social care services.

## PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Name of Adult Services Authority                      **Leeds**  
Business Relationship Manager:                      **Rod Hamilton**

Date:    **23 September 2005**

### Performance Review Report

#### Summary of Improvements

- Promotion of independence for older people, people with physical and learning disabilities
- Delivery of equipment and adaptations
- Extended provision of extra care housing
- Improved reports on the management of delayed transfers
- Cost efficient services commissioned
- Promotion of healthy and active ageing
- Implementation of the single assessment process

#### Summary of Areas for Improvement

- Care management processes and assessments within prescribed timescales
- Direct payments take up
- More effective use of intermediate care
- More effective commissioning that is cost efficient and ensures both quality and choice
- Implementation of plans with health partners regarding 'strokes and falls' services

#### STANDARD 1: National Priorities And Strategic Objectives

The council is working corporately and with partners to deliver national priorities and objectives for social care, relevant National Service Frameworks and local strategic objectives to serve the needs of diverse local communities

#### Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review:

- Council Strategy promotes 'fairness, independence and affordability' through redesign of teams, improved process on screening, signposting and assessments.
- B11. Percentage of Intensive Homecare retains very good band performance.
- Extra care housing tenancies provided and supported places are above comparators.

- Intermediate figures for the number of people funded remain well above comparators.
- NSF Falls milestone at 4.
- Specialist community mental health team in place for NSF Mental Health milestone.
- Good strategy for LD, PD/SI and MH services based on a range of initiatives.
- LD, OP, PD/SI and MH service areas have good service user involvement mechanisms.
- Good examples of responsiveness to users.
- Leeds Emergency Care framework developed with Leeds NHS Trust, to improve joint services with health partners.
- Well-targeted 3-year strategy for carers.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Assessment figures remain low across all timescales, with only services provided within 4 weeks better than comparators.
- NSF Strokes milestone at 2.
- Mental health protocols for Older People still in development, needs to be progressed.
- LD person centred planning project needs to be developed.
- Delayed transfers of care figures running higher than comparators for the last 3 quarters of 04-05.

### **STANDARD 2: Cost and efficiency**

Social services commission and deliver services to clear standards of both quality and cost,  
by the most effective, economic and efficient means available

### **Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review**

- Social enterprise initiatives designed to support users to signposted to those services.
- C32. OP helped to live at home retains very good band performance over previous 4 years.
- C28. Intensive homecare improved to very good band.
- C26. Admissions of 65+ to res care improved to very good band.
- S.31 agreement and governance arrangements for learning disability pooled budgets are being revised and improved.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Council identified need for strengthening commissioning arrangements with health partners.
- C27. Admissions of 18-64 to res care remains in average band.

### **STANDARD 3: Effectiveness of service delivery and outcomes**

Services promote independence, protect from harm, and support people to make the most

of their capacity and potential and achieve the best possible outcomes

### **Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review**

- C30. LD helped to live at home improved to very good band.
- Proportion of expenditure on day and domiciliary for LD to residential provision is 2, against 0.7 for IPF.
- Number of LD in work remains above IPF.
- D54. Items of equipment and adaptations within 7 days, performance retains very good band.
- C31. MH helped to live at home retains very good band, over previous 4 years.
- LDDF reported as contributing to numerous improvements in services for LD.
- Re-design of MH team within Leeds MH Trust reducing number of admissions on acute MH wards with crisis resolution service to be extended to incorporate assessment element of 136(MH Act) provision.
- Carers Emergency Card launched with 10,000 distributed.

### **Areas for improvement**

- MH early intervention team with only limited service in place.
- C51. Direct payments have improved from lowest band to below average band, though actual numbers in receipt of DP are above IPF and council report £1M investment to improve.

### **STANDARD 4: Quality of services for users and carers**

Services users, their families and other supporters, benefit from convenient and good quality services, which are responsive to individual needs and preferences

### **Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review**

- D56. Waiting times for care packages improved to best band.

### **Areas for improvement**

- D40. Clients receiving a review remain in below average band.
- D55. Waiting times for assessments fallen from below average to lowest band.
- D39. percentage receiving a statement of needs has fallen to average from good band.
- Standards of recording of EASYcare to support the single assessment process needs to be improved.

### **STANDARD 5: Fair access**

Social services act fairly and consistently in allocating services and applying charges

## **Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review**

- Advocacy spend on LD well above IPF.

### **Areas for improvement**

- Access to services through assessment process needs to be improved.
- Work needs to be done to improve reporting of ethnicity on RAP returns and SSD staffing.
- Access to approved SW's not available at night during weekends.
- Work to assess impact of policy on BME communities' needs to progress.

### **STANDARD 6: Capacity for improvement**

The council has corporate arrangements and capacity to achieve consistent, sustainable and effective improvement in social services

## **Improvements achieved/achievements consolidated since the previous annual review**

- Developing partnership initiatives with the 5 PCT's across a range of service areas.
- Development of further Neighbourhood Schemes to increase capacity in preventative/early intervention services.
- 3 year contracts in private sector to support long term planning.
- Executive Board approved draft consultation for new commissioning strategy for homecare.
- Care Communication Centre to provide brokerage through citywide recording of demand and capacity.
- The increase in Extra Care Housing gives older people more choice. One new scheme, providing flats for older people with dementia, was introduced this year and three further schemes have been commissioned over the next two years. One of these schemes is also planned to provide Intermediate Care flats.
- Departmental involvement in the Care Pathways as part of the Strategic Services Programme – to reduce admissions, expedite discharges and develop community services.
- Business plan for 2005-2008 launched with which links the council's corporate plan with service area business plans.
- Staff vacancy rates are lower than comparators at 6.4 (IPF 9.9)

### **Areas for improvement**

- MH PCT not yet fully signed up to joint mental health strategy; this has resulted in different levels of investment and service provision across the city.
- DIS reports that PAF data is used only as annual appraisal of practitioners and first line managers, more frequent use of updated information has informed many



authorities of trends developing and allowed the authorities to take action to identify shortcomings in service provision.

- Staff turnover rates are higher than comparator councils at 12.4 (IPF 10.9), exit interviews are have been introduced to identify any issues.



*Making Social Care  
Better for People*

**CSCI**  
Aire House  
Town Street  
Rodley  
Leeds  
LS13 1HP

Tel: 0113 201 1075  
Fax: 0113 201 1096  
E: Rod.Hamilton@csci.gsi.gov.uk

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Rosemary Archer  
Director of Social Services  
Selectapost 9  
Merrion House  
110 Merrion Centre  
Leeds  
LS2 8QB

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**ANNUAL REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

Dear Rosemary

Thank you for our recent annual review meeting. This letter and the attached Record of Performance Assessment provide a record and an evaluation of currently available evidence of the council's performance on Adult social care. It was informed by discussion at the meeting.

The attached Record of Performance Assessment (ROPA) includes:

- The Performance Review Report (PRR) which sets out the Commission for Social Care Inspection's (CSCI) view of the performance of adult social care services in your area during the last year, and comments on improvements for the year ahead; and
- The Record of Evidence, which sets out, the admissible evidence accumulated from the range of admissible sources and CSCI's evaluation of that evidence.

In assessing performance in adult social care, CSCI reaches judgements about performance against a set of standards and criteria, drawing on evidence from a number of standard sources. These include:

- The published PAF performance indicators and other statistical data up to 2004-05, plus data supporting planned targets for 2005-06;
- Evidence agreed in the course of our monitoring meetings that have been formally recorded; and
- Monitoring information from the Delivery and Improvement Statements completed in October 2004 and May 2005.

Details of the standards and criteria have been published, and are available from CSCI, or may be seen on the CSCI's performance website.

The contents of this letter and the attached Record of Performance Assessment represent our **provisional** assessment at this stage in the Performance Assessment cycle. They are provided **in confidence and should not be shared publicly**. The judgements and assessments indicated are subject to later moderation including following consideration of CSCI data for 2004-2005, including Key Thresholds, and findings and judgements from any recent service inspections. The judgements form the basis of later ratings, namely the CPA Adult social care rating and the Social care star rating. The final report published to the authority in late October will update these ratings, where necessary. Councils will have an opportunity to make representations about these judgements at that stage. Details of the representations process are available separately.

When you receive the final report in October, you will be asked to:

- Present this letter to an open meeting of the relevant executive committee of the council by 31 January 2006 and to inform us of the date on which this will take place.
- Make the report available to members of the public at the same time.
- Copy this letter and report to the council's appointed auditor, and to relevant partners.

The finalised Record of Performance Assessment will be published on the CSCI website on 1 December.

At this stage in the process, it is our provisional assessment that social care services in your area are serving **most** adults well and the council's capacity to improve these services is **promising**.

Any factual inaccuracies in the Record of Performance Assessment should be brought to my attention by 7 October 2005.

Progress will continue to be monitored during the year through our usual processes.

Yours sincerely



Rod Hamilton  
Business Relationship Manager

23 September 2005

---

**Report of the Director of Corporate Services**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: Outcomes of the Investors in People Review**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

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

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. This covering report introduces the attached "Investors in People Review Executive Summary of Final Report, November 2005" provided to the council by the external Managing Assessor following completion of the year-long review.
2. This covering report explains the background and approach to the review process and asks Executive Board members to note the findings and outcomes of the review contained in the Executive Summary.
3. The Executive Summary confirms that the council has been successful in maintaining its liP accreditation status and provides overall feedback on areas of strength and areas for development and improvement against this quality standard. The external Managing Assessor concludes her report with the following positive statement,

"the overwhelming finding of the review is that Leeds City Council is an organization fully committed to the development of its staff as part of its commitment to continuous improvement."

## **1.0 Purpose Of This Report**

- 1.1 To bring to the attention of the Executive Board the process and outcomes of the cross-council review against the Investors in People (IiP) standard which began in Autumn 2004 and was completed in November 2005.
- 1.2 To present the executive summary of the external Managing Assessor's final report.

## **2.0 Background Information**

- 2.1 IiP is a national quality standard that provides a framework and good practice for ensuring that an organization is making the most of its people resources. By embedding these principles, processes and practices people are able to work more effectively, achieve objectives and so contribute to improved service and organizational performance.
- 2.2 The council initially achieved cross-council IiP accreditation in July 2001 and had a "light touch" review in 2003. To retain IiP accreditation a full review had to be completed by 2006.

## **3.0 Main Issues**

- 3.1 As a cross-council review was a major logistical exercise it was broken down into manageable sections with each of the 7 departments and Education Leeds being reviewed in turn. Corporate Services Department was the first to be reviewed in December 2004 and the review programme was completed in Social Services in November 2005. This extended approach allowed most departments to identify areas for improvement and to take action so that by the end of the review tangible evidence of improvement could be demonstrated to the external Managing Assessor.
- 3.2 The approach to review was to use small teams of trained internal reviewers to go into each department and gather evidence against the benchmarks of the IiP standard, assess the effectiveness of key processes and identify areas for improvement. These findings were fed back to the departmental management team which then took ownership for improvement action.
- 3.3 At the end of the review, the external Managing Assessor confirmed that the council had maintained its IiP accreditation status and concludes her report with the following positive statement, "the overwhelming finding of the review is that Leeds City Council is an organization fully committed to the development of its staff as part of its commitment to continuous improvement." The accreditation status is valid for another 3 years.
- 3.4 The attached executive summary is the external Managing Assessor's perspective and feedback on the review. In particular Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of her report identify "Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice" and "Areas for Continued Development" respectively.

## **4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance**

- 4.1 The external Managing Assessor provided feedback on the findings and outcomes of the IiP review to Corporate Management Team on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005. Her detailed report has recently been circulated to internal stakeholders including: Corporate Management Team, Chief Support Services Officers, Heads of HR,

Departmental liP Coordinators, the liP Internal Review Team and Corporate HR Service.

4.2 The contents of the report will be discussed in appropriate forums and improvements plans will be drawn up at both corporate and departmental levels to tackle the areas identified as development areas. The liP standard has itself been reviewed and changed as part of a national process and the implications of this needs to be incorporated into our improvement plans. There is a need to ensure that the priorities within the liP improvement plans are compatible with the priorities within the council's People Strategy 2005 – 2008 "Valuing Colleagues".

4.3 The next cross-council liP external review will have to be completed by December 2008. In setting up the building blocks in preparation for this there is a need to discuss, agree and implement the council's strategy for liP maintenance and particularly the ongoing role and work focus of the Internal Review Team.

## **5.0 Legal And Resource Implications**

5.1 By using trained internal reviewers to carry out the bulk of the on site evidence gathering for the liP review the council has saved considerably on external assessment fees (£550 per day). By having this internal expertise the council has also benefited through better management of the review process and in having local experts in departments who understand external assessor feedback and are able to implement identified improvements.

5.2 To maintain the capacity and capability of the Internal Review Team there is a need to reaffirm the council's commitment to this approach and support the ongoing development of the team. This will mean continual updating of the team skills and knowledge, recruitment and training of new reviewers and the release of reviewers by their employing departments for training and on site work.

## **6.0 Conclusions**

6.1 The liP review was carried out using project management methodology and was completed within the planned timescale using the resources of the 20 internal reviewers comprising the Internal Review Team.

6.2 The review resulted in successful maintenance of the council's liP accreditation status and provided valuable external feedback on future areas for improved organisational performance.

## **7.0 Recommendations**

7.1 The Executive Board is asked to welcome the findings and outcomes of the review.

**Leeds City Council**

**Investors in People Review**

**Executive Summary of Final Report**

**November 2005**

**Managing Assessor: Liz Sherwin**

**On behalf of Yorkshire and Humberside Assessment Ltd**

# **Contents**

- 1.0 Overview of the Review**
- 2.0 Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice**
- 3.0 Areas for Continued Development**
- 4.0 Conclusion**



## 1.0 Overview of the Review

This Investors in People Review has taken place over the period July 2004 to October 2005. It has been carried out using the Internal Review model for the first time within the Council, and has involved a team of twenty trained Internal Reviewers from all the different Leeds City Council departments.

The training for Internal Reviewers consisted of a two-day workshop provided by Yorkshire and Humberside Assessment Ltd, a practical exercise to put learnt skills into practice, and a capability interview with the Managing Assessor (Liz Sherwin).

A consistent approach was used to review each department which was decided upon at the initial planning meetings with Leeds City Council representatives, Colin Morrell and Shamim Chaudhry, and the Learning Skills Council representative, Lynne Wharton.

This consisted of:

- Training for twenty Internal Reviewers
- Capability Discussions
- Initial IR scoping meeting, at which departments made presentations to inform the team of issues and activities
- Leadership and Management interviews with senior members of the departments
- Notes on key issues to Internal Reviewers
- Internal Reviewers carried out their interviews
- Internal Reviewers completed an evidence matrix and a written report
- Internal Reviewers meeting with the Managing Assessor to discuss findings and recommendations
- Verbal feedback meeting with the departmental senior management team
- Interim notes sent by the Managing Assessor to the departments
- Updates on progress from the departmental IIP co-ordinators to the Managing Assessor
- Managing Assessor final overview verbal feedback to the Corporate Management Team.

All those interviewed were given assurances that the discussions would be confidential and that comments were non-attributable. This report supports those statements and therefore does not quote individuals.

The scope of the IIP Review covered approximately 20,000 staff which included Education Leeds, though not teaching staff and it did not cover Arms Length Organisations.

Care was taken when identifying staff for interview to maintain a representative sample that included part-time and full-time staff, male and female, different ethnicity, those with disabilities, new starters and those with many years service, line managers and members of their teams, staff from remote sites as well as those based in central Leeds, shift staff and Trade Union Representatives.

In total 758 (3.8%) interviews were held through either formal individual or group interviews and many more contributed informally through casual conversations or the preparation of information for the team.

The Internal Review team found staff to be open and forthcoming in their comments, enabling the Internal Reviewers to gather a mix of evidence and ensuring a balanced view of current practices within Leeds City Council.

The breakdown of staff is as listed below, and interviews took place between December 2004 and October 2005.

<b>Department</b>	<b>Leaders &amp; Senior Managers</b>	<b>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Departmental Total</b>
<b>Corporate Services</b>	20	12	23	55
<b>Chief Executives</b>	9	6	20	35
<b>Neighbourhoods &amp; Housing</b>	10	13	26	49
<b>Education Leeds</b>	11	11	23	45
<b>City Services</b>	12	28	128	168
<b>Learning &amp; Leisure</b>	14	48	102	164
<b>Development</b>	13	10	18	41
<b>Social Services</b>	13	79	105	197
<b>Political Leaders</b>	2			2
<b>TU Reps</b>	2			2
<b>Total</b>	106	207	445	758

The objectives of the Review were discussed at the original planning meetings and were discussed again with senior personnel within the Council at every stage of the Review.

Objectives included:

- providing feedback on key areas such as effective corporate communications
- the impact of the investment in management development
- the effectiveness and visibility of the leadership team
- the effectiveness of specific communications linked to restructures and reorganisations
- the development of particular cultures in departments where there have been changes
- the impact of specific changes on certain groups of staff
- the impact of a change in Director on the culture of the department

- the effectiveness of recruitment and retention strategies
- the impact of career paths for scarce professionals
- the opportunity in different departments for administrative staff to develop and for those from an ethnic minority group to develop into managers.

Feedback at a departmental level has been given to these, and many other departmentally specific objectives, and I would refer you to the Internal Reviewers reports and the interim reports produced by the Managing Assessor for the departments concerned.

However, there are some key areas of good practice, and areas for continued improvement that have wider cross Council implications, and these are contained within this report.

Leeds City Council has been judged by the CPA as an 'excellent' Council during the period of this review, and there were many examples of excellence found throughout the Review both at team and at individual level. Therefore, areas identified for improvement need to be placed within this overall context of general good practice.

This has been a rigorous IIP Review, where the decision taken to look at each department sequentially has provided an opportunity for Internal Reviewers and their own departments to learn from what they have seen in other areas. The positive attitude with which departments have listened to their IIP feedback and then their demonstration of action resulting from those comments has been heartening.

At the same time as this Review, the Council was being assessed against and has since attained Recognition against the Leadership and Management model. Comments made within that report support the evidence of managerial effectiveness outlined in this report.

## **2.0 Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice**

Although the numerical and geographical size of Leeds City Council makes consistency in the many aspects reviewed an extremely difficult achievement, nevertheless the areas outlined below were seen to do this for the most part.

- Effective Leadership and Management from the top, where there is effective strategic thinking and follow through to implementation.
- A commitment throughout the organisation to the development of all staff, to meet the needs of the organisation and therefore the needs of the Leeds community.
- A positive sense of enthusiasm for the future, with managers and staff optimistic about forthcoming changes and positive in general about the restructures that have taken place to reduce the numbers of departments.
- A commitment, from the vast majority to implementing processes and procedures that support the identification of training and development needs.
- A growing recognition over the period of the Review, that training and development is more than just training courses, and the identification of innovative ways to develop teams and individuals.

- A significant number of staff involved through Away Days etc in the development of the planning process.
- The unequivocal commitment of staff to the delivery of their service. In many instances internal reviewers commented on this depth of commitment and in some areas on the strength of the vocation of individuals to help those within the Community.
- The robust evaluation that has taken place of LLP2 and the changes implemented as a result.
- The recognition from the top of the organisation that the development of all staff and in particular managers at every level is essential to the continued success of the Council.
- The outward looking approach of departments to understand innovations taking place in other areas, and their willingness to share ideas and good practice with other public sectors organisations and private sector partners.
- Recognition in many areas of the calibre of staff employed and the willingness of managers to let individuals develop and use those skills.

### **3.0 Areas for Continued Development**

Although there are a number of development areas identified in the main body of this report, they link specifically to areas that have already been fed back to individual departments. To summarise the issues for the Council as a whole I have listed below areas that seem to cover many departments and are already areas for internal activity within some departments. There is a real danger within such a large organisation that some of the best practices captured by this review are not transferred between departments. However, it is hoped that this listing of key improvement areas will help departments to share the good practices they have already developed with those departments where work still needs to take place.

- Consider the future development of the first line supervisors, to ensure they have the knowledge and skills to manage others in a way that reflects the identified managerial competencies for other more senior staff.
- Ensure that staff at all locations, however remote, are aware of the development opportunities available to them and how they can be accessed.
- Maintain and build upon the current visibility of many senior managers, to ensure that this is maintained and consistent across the Council.
- Ensure that the robust evaluation of investment in training and development continues, to ensure that best value is received for this investment.
- Consider how more effectively communication of council wide issues might be communicated to all staff in a manner that is relevant to them.
- Use the internal skills that exist to share good practices, provide facilitators, and develop joint training in a more consistent manner.

- Ensure that opportunities for ethnic minority staff are developed in all departments with a clear understanding of the benefits to individuals as well as the organisation.
- Endeavour to further develop, where feasible, appropriate recognition and reward for effective leadership.
- Consider innovative approaches to the recruitment and retention of skilled personnel, ensuring that some of the excellent ideas and practices seen by the Internal Review team are shared across the council.
- Review how all staff input into the planning process and how aware they are that they are doing so.
- Given the competition for effective staff, within the buoyant labour market in Leeds, consider how best the Council can identify and develop potential throughout the Council, whilst at the same time maintaining the equality of opportunity for all staff to develop.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

The Review has been developmental, and actions have already been seen as a result of some of the earlier development recommendations. This once again reiterates the overwhelming finding of the Review that Leeds City Council is an organisation fully committed to the development of its staff as part of its commitment to continuous improvement.

Following a consistent and final review of all the Internal Reviewers' findings, and those of the Managing Assessor, I am pleased to recommend that Leeds City Council continue to be recognised as an Investors in People organisation.

This Investors in People Review was carried out with the assistance of a professional and flexible Internal Review team, efficient organisation within departments, and the willing participation of many very busy people. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved with this Review.

---

**Report of the Director of Corporate Services**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: Outcomes of the liP Leadership and Management Model Assessment**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

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

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. This covering report introduces the attached "Investors in People Leadership and Management Model Assessment Executive Summary of Final Report, November 2005" provided to the council by the external Managing Assessor following completion of the year-long review.
2. This covering report explains the background and approach to the assessment process and asks Executive Board members to note the findings and outcomes of the assessment contained in the Executive Summary.
3. The Executive Summary confirms that the council has been successful in achieving liP Leadership and Management Model accreditation status and provides overall feedback on areas of strength and areas for development and improvement against this quality standard. The external Managing Assessor concludes her report with the following positive statement,

"in light of the evidence gathered during the assessment Leeds City Council meets all the requirements of the Investors in People Leadership and Management Model."

## **1.0 Purpose Of This Report**

- 1.1 To bring to the attention of the Executive Board the process and outcomes of the cross-council review against the Investors in People Leadership and Management Model which began in Autumn 2004 and was completed in November 2005.
- 1.2 To present the executive summary of the external Managing Assessor's final report.

## **2.0 Background Information**

- 2.1 The liP Leadership and Management Model is an additional module developed and offered by liP(UK) to organizations aiming to improve their processes for selecting, developing and performance managing their leaders and managers. The Model was launched about 3 years ago and to date few large organizations have achieved accreditation against this standard. It has a similar structure to the main liP quality standard.
- 2.2 The council had not been assessed against the Leadership and Management Model prior to this assessment. The decision to undertake assessment was made because it was considered that the process would provide valuable external feedback against a recognized national benchmark on the council's approach to leadership and management. Leadership capacity and capability are seen within the Corporate Plan and in central government's modernization agenda as critical to improved service and organisational performance.

## **3.0 Main Issues**

- 3.1 The Leadership and Management assessment was carried out at the same time as the main liP review beginning with Corporate Services Department in December 2004 and concluding the departmental aspect with Social Services in November 2005. A final corporate element was undertaken which involved the Chief Executive, The Leader of Council and the Members Development Officer.
- 3.2 As the council had not been assessed against the Leadership and Management Model previously, liP(UK) guidelines dictated that the external Managing Assessor carried out the main workload in this assessment.
- 3.3 Senior managers and middle managers were identified as in scope of the assessment and this amounted to approximately 1700 people. The Managing Assessor interviewed 104 (6.1%) of these leaders and managers forming a representative sample to gather evidence. The Managing Assessor also examined key corporate and departmental documents that underpin the council's approach to its leaders and managers e.g. Corporate Plan, leadership strategy, manager appraisal. She also attended the launch of LLP2 (cohort 3) change management programme and the major Leadership Conference for middle and senior managers held in November 2005.
- 3.4 At the end of the assessment, the external Managing Assessor confirmed that the council had achieved accreditation status against the liP Leadership and Management Model. She concluded her report with the following positive statement, "in light of the evidence gathered during the assessment Leeds City Council meets all the requirements of the Investors in People Leadership and Management Model." The council is the largest local authority to achieve this accreditation status.

- 3.5 The attached executive summary is the external Managing Assessor's perspective and feedback on the review. In particular Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of her report identify "Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice" and "Areas for Continued Development" respectively.

#### **4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance**

- 4.1 The external Managing Assessor provided feedback on the findings and outcomes of the liP Leadership and Management assessment to Corporate Management Team on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005. Her detailed report has recently been circulated to internal stakeholders including: Corporate Management Team, Chief Support Services Officers, Heads of HR, Departmental liP Coordinators, the liP Internal Review Team and Corporate HR Service.
- 4.2 The contents of the report will be discussed in appropriate forums and improvements plans will be drawn up at both corporate and departmental levels to tackle the areas identified as development areas.
- 4.3 To keep accreditation status an external review will have to be completed by December 2008. In setting up the building blocks in preparation for this there is a need to complete current discussions on the council's leadership strategy and draw up, resource and action an implementation plan.

#### **5.0 Legal And Resource Implications**

- 5.1 Resources for implementing the council's leadership strategy need to be identified both at departmental and corporate levels as part of workforce and organisational development planning.

#### **6.0 Conclusions**

- 6.1 Project management methodology was used to ensure that the liP Leadership and Management assessment was completed within the planned timescale and concurrent to the main liP review.
- 6.2 The assessment resulted in successful achievement of the accreditation status against the liP Leadership and Management Model and provided valuable external feedback on the council's current approach.

#### **7.0 Recommendations**

- 7.1 The Executive Board is asked to welcome the findings and outcomes of the assessment.



**Leeds City Council**

**Investors in People**

**Leadership and Management Model Assessment**

**Executive Summary of Final Report**

**November 2005**

**Managing Assessor: Liz Sherwin**

**On behalf of Yorkshire and Humberside Assessment Ltd**

# **Contents**

**1.0 Background to the Organisation**

**2.0 Overview of the Assessment**

**3.0 Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice**

**4.0 Areas for Continued Development**

**5.0 Conclusion**

## 1.0 Background to the Organisation

Leeds City Council is organised into seven major departments. The Chief Executive is Paul Rogerson and the Deputy Chief Executive is David Page. Political leadership is provided by a joint administration arrangement through the Executive Board.

The seven major departments and Education Leeds with approximate number of staff are:

Chief Executives Department	550
City Services Department	5770
Corporate Services	1170
Development Department	840
Learning & Leisure Department	5160
Neighbourhoods, and Housing Department	1110
Social Services Department	5820
Education Leeds	1400

The Council has established 'Arms Length' organisations that manage their housing stock and are not part of the Assessment.

All departments have undergone significant restructuring in the past two to four years as the Council reduced from fifteen departments to seven. As part of the restructure, there has also been a clear strategy to put in place senior personnel, who can lead the organisation rather than manage the status quo. To this effect significant care and investment has been made in finding those with the skills, and most importantly the capacity and attitude, to lead the Council forward.

The Vision of the Council is, "to bring the benefits of a prosperous, vibrant and attractive city to all the people of Leeds".

The Corporate Values as set out in the 2005-2008 Corporate Plan are:

- Looking After Leeds,
- Putting Customers First,
- Treating People Fairly,
- Valuing Colleagues

There have been two key Leadership Programmes - Leeds Leadership Programme 1 (LLP1) and Leeds Leadership Programme 2 (LLP2), which have included all leaders and managers. LLP1 for senior managers has been completed and there is now a working group considering the way forward for further corporate wide development of this group. LLP2 has recently launched Cohort 3 (approximately three hundred participants) following external evaluation of cohort one and two programmes and incorporation of improvements ensuring that the workshops and projects involved meet the needs of individuals as well as the Council.

In addition to the corporate support for LLP2, departments have developed bespoke training that meets the specific needs of leaders in their sphere of work e.g. Social Services in

conjunction with Leeds Metropolitan University has developed a management programme for its departmental managers.

This Assessment is also aware of the 'political' nature of leadership that influences the strategies, and their implementation, when the organisation is a City Council. Therefore, care has been taken to speak with Council Members and to review their training and development as part of the Assessment process.

Leeds is a city where there has been significant growth in the private sectors of most industries, and the Council is aware of the competitive nature of the labour market for skilled leaders. It is also aware that they are in the vicinity of other smaller councils as well as other metropolitan councils. Recruitment and retention of effective leaders at all levels is therefore critical to taking the Council forward.

## **2.0 Overview of the Assessment**

The Council first achieved corporate recognition that it met the Investors in People standard in July 2001 and had a post recognition review in February 2003. This assessment against the Leadership and Management model has been carried out in parallel with an Investors in People Review of the whole Council using the internal review process.

At two planning meetings with Colin Morrell and Shamim Chaudhry - the Investors in People Co-ordinators, and Lynne Wharton of the LSC, the objectives of the Assessment were agreed as follows:

- Review whether the Council meets all aspects of the Leadership and Management model.
- Feedback to the Corporate Management Team on the impact of the investment in Leadership and Management development.
- Feedback to the Corporate Management Team on the impact of the development of transformational managers within the Council.

The Council identified a Leadership and Management population of approximately 300 senior leaders and managers, and 1400 who would be eligible to attend LLP2 and who are therefore leaders and potential leaders. Individuals from the central graduate training scheme were also included in the assessment as the most junior potential managers and leaders.

In addition to the interviews with the sample from the identified (1700) leaders and managers and those identified as 'potential' leaders, I have spoken at length with Council Members and the two Leaders who have been in place during this period (Conservative and Liberal/Democrat).

In addition, there have been interviews and updates with those responsible for the development of the Leeds Leadership Programme, and I attended the launch of Cohort 3 of the programme.

Twenty trained Internal Reviewers have worked in small teams over the past year carrying out departmental interviews and gathering evidence for the assessment. Prior to each departmental Investors in People Review, I as the Managing Assessor, and in my role as Assessor for the Leadership and Management model, have carried out a number of senior level confidential interviews. The table below indicates the timings and number of people who have been interviewed. In addition, I have been able to use the information from the Internal Reviewers, to inform my understanding of how Leadership and Management strategies have been implemented and disseminated throughout the organisation.

All interviews were one to one confidential discussions.

Department	Date of Interviews	Number of Interviews for L&M Assessment
Corporate Services	7/8 December 2004	19
Chief Executives	20 January 2005	10
Neighbourhoods and Housing	22 February 2005	10
Education Leeds	5/6 April 2005	11
City Services	9 May 2005	12
Learning & Leisure	28th June 2005	14
Development	15 September 2005	13
Social Services	4 October 2005	13
Political Leaders	15 September 2005 11 November 2005	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>104 (6.1% of 1700)</b>

As the Assessor I have been concerned with the group identified as 'Leaders and Managers', however, there are many hundreds of staff who are leading from within the organisation and who are managing teams of staff. It has therefore been of great assistance in this Assessment to review the findings of the internal reviewers who have interviewed over 150 other individuals with people management responsibilities at a more junior level. Their feedback has enabled me to track from strategies through to implementation, over a wide geographical, and over a large employee population.

As part of the agreed process of Assessment against the Leadership and Management model, I have provided interim feedback to each department as it has undergone assessment and its internal review. This has taken the form of a verbal presentation to the Departmental Management Team, and subsequent interim notes against the indicators. Copies of these notes are all accessible via YHAL.

### **3.0 Areas of Particular Strength and Good Practice**

- The understanding of effective leadership is at the core of thinking for those deciding strategy for the Council, to ensure it delivers its services appropriately. This includes council members in equal part to those senior managers with whom this was discussed.
- The leadership development programmes have at their heart the concept of the 'transformational leader', someone who can make a difference to the culture of the organisation, as well as to the effectiveness and efficiencies of its processes.
- Significant investment has taken place, to ensure that all Leeds City Council leaders and managers, have the skills, knowledge, and behaviours described by the Council in its managerial competency framework.
- The strategic plan for the success of the Council has at its core, the development of its management and leadership. There has been a long-term recognition and commitment from the Corporate Management Team and Council Members to the investment in this group.
- The continued development of a culture, where leaders and managers are responsible and accountable, and in turn are recognised for their effectiveness. In the case of Directors this is through the achievement against KPIs linked to remuneration.
- The recruitment of the best people for the roles, regardless of whether they are internal or external candidates.
- The development of a culture, where leaders and managers are encouraged to share their experiences and learn from each other. This may be through LLP workshops, learning sets, working groups, and through cross-corporate project working.

- There is an outward looking approach to the development of leaders and managers, which is reflected in the extent of partnering that occurs with other agencies and organisations, as well as the external recognition of achievement that Leeds has through such things as 'Beacon' status.
- There is recognition amongst managers, that there is a leadership style from the top that has clarity of vision and strength of purpose. It is also seen that this is combined with a style that is open and visible, and eager to maintain communications with staff at every level.
- There are inspirational leaders who have acted as role models for other managers in their departments, and it is interesting to note that in many cases they were quoted for their leadership qualities, rather than for their knowledge of the job. It was aspects such as decision-making capabilities, and communication skills that were most frequently cited as positive models.

#### **4.0 Areas for Continued Development**

- In the early stages of the Assessment there was a concern that LLP1, though successful, had not been followed through and had not brought together new members of the senior management team with those who has completed the programme. However, this has been addressed through the introduction of senior managers' forums and discussions, to develop and implement the next stages in the leadership strategy. This has enabled senior personnel to meet to discuss the key questions facing the organisation and challenge the thinking on issues. Evaluation needs to take place to ensure the senior manager's development meets both individual and the Council's objectives.
- There was also concern that the participants on LLP2 came with such a variety of experiences, that there were a number who felt the programme was missing their needs. However, during the year extensive evaluation has taken place and the programme has been remodelled to ensure that individuals can pick and mix development sessions and training workshops to meet their needs. Again there is a need to maintain the robust evaluation processes.
- There have been strides forward in departments to achieve a higher visibility of the senior team, and this has led to an increase in awareness of them as role models. However, the size of the organisation inevitably poses issues around both maintaining this visibility and increasing it, so that staff really know who is leading them rather than acknowledging them as a name and title.
- In departments such as Social Services, the assessment recognises the extent of future changes that are facing them (split of Adult and Children's Services) and the need to support managers through such periods. Capacity was an issue that did arise throughout the year, and there is a recognition that leaders and managers are performing at the highest level both locally and often nationally. There may be scope to further develop mentoring in areas to ensure support at critical times.

- Although the Council has invested in the development of BME individuals there are still areas where the diversity of the Leeds population does not appear to be effectively reflected. These areas were discussed with departments during the process of the Assessment, and activities and actions have been seen to be in place. However, some industry sectors, such as construction, will take time to provide appropriate pathways.
- The identification of potential leaders does take place through appraisal and reflection on individual performance as well as the graduate-training scheme. However, given the competition for effective leadership throughout all industry sectors there is a need to ensure that the Council has a talent spotting process that encourages those with potential to develop their career with the council.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

Throughout this review, I have been struck by the professionalism and openness of the leaders and managers whom I interviewed. In all cases, individuals shared their departmental practices, setting them within the complex framework of the Council. It was also apparent that individuals were dedicated to their roles and the service of the wider community, with many areas revealing a vocational aspect to the work involved.

My recommendation, in the light of the evidence gathered during the assessment, is that Leeds City Council meets all the requirements of the Investors in People Leadership and Management Model.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who took part in the Assessment process, finding appropriate time in very busy diaries and providing supporting written evidence as requested.



---

**Report of the Chief Democratic Services Officer**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: Inquiry into the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract – Final Report and Recommendations**

---

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p>	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Ethnic minorities <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Women <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disabled people <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Eligible for Call In <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Not Eligible for Call In (Details contained in the report) <input type="checkbox"/></p>

---

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety) has recently undertaken an inquiry into the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract following adverse impact on the service and complaints from Councillors and members of the public.
- 1.2 The Board held discussions with the Executive Board Member with responsibility for City Services and agreed to undertake an inquiry into the reasons why the service was disrupted and the issues raised by the procurement process.
- 1.3 A number of recommendations have been made by the Scrutiny Board and Members will note that these are aimed at officers. Whilst there are no recommendations for consideration by the Executive Board, members of Scrutiny Board (Environmental and Community Safety) requested that the Executive Board receive the final report for information.

**2.0 REPORT SUBMITTED TO EXECUTIVE BOARD**

- 2.1 Attached to this report is the final report and recommendations of Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety) following the inquiry into the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract. An executive summary is included. The summary of evidence received is available from Corporate Governance.

### **3.0 RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 At its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005, Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety) received the responses to the recommendations, in accordance with Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules. This was a corporate response and outlined the actions being taken to address the issues raised by the inquiry. These responses are appended to this report.

### **4.0 RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 Executive Board members are requested to note the report and recommendations.

**SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY)**

**INQUIRY INTO STREETSCENE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT**

**RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 1</b></p> <p><b>That the senior project officer, the project manager and project boards do not disband until the project board is satisfied that the contract or new service arrangements are established and running satisfactorily, in order to provide a co-ordinating body dealing with issues, risks and contingencies up to, and beyond, the start of the contract or the establishment of new service delivery arrangements.</b></p>	<p>In future the Project Brief and Terms of Reference for the Senior Responsible Officer, Project Board and Project Manager will require a commitment for the board and Project Manager to remain in control until satisfactory implementation has been reached.</p> <p>The inclusion in the Procurement Gateway Review process of an additional gateway at the end of implementation. The Senior Responsible Officer and the Project Board need to be satisfied that satisfactory impletion has been achieved and that control can be handed to the senior officer responsible for contract management before they sign off this final gateway review.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 2</b></p> <p><b>That CMT discuss the monitoring arrangements for this contract to ensure that there is agreement on where this function should lie.</b></p>	<p>The original decision to locate the grounds maintenance client, and therefore the monitoring arrangements, with City Services was largely based on the desire to see Streetscene activities more closely coordinated to ensure an improved service to the public. Whilst this inevitably resulted in a transitional learning period for City Services staff, CMT are of the opinion that the decision remains appropriate and will provide benefits in the medium and longer term. In order to achieve this, a communication mechanism will be established so that Parks and Countryside can continue to provide technical advice.</p> <p>It is important for the companies and organisations bidding for Council work to have a</p>

	<p>clear understanding of how service delivery is to be monitored, especially any requirement for the provider to undertake self monitoring or to participate in joint monitoring. Bidders need to be aware of these arrangements at the time of preparing their bids as the arrangements are likely to have an impact on cost. The client needs to, as part the preparing the Specification, clearly define the proposed contract management arrangements. During the Specification preparation, the Project Board must agree where the contract management function is to lie. Any dispute/concern arising out of the boards decision should referred to CMT.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 3</b></p> <p><b>That projects involved in procuring services ensure that specifications and any proposed variations are costed simultaneously to prevent the need for the re-submission of tenders.</b></p>	<p>CPU agree with this recommendation. The Specification must be capable of identifying any additional requirement (or reduction in requirement) separately within the document. Subsequently, the Pricing Schedule should allow bidders to price a number of options regarding service levels so as to provide the client with a choice that best matches the available budget.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 4</b></p> <p><b>That any future Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contracts are awarded well ahead of the growing season, so as to ensure the Contractor has sufficient time to mobilise.</b></p>	<p>City Services support this recommendation. It will allow any new contractor time to mobilise their operations for the growing season. The department will ensure that this approach is adopted in all its future contracts.</p> <p>For future Grounds Maintenance contracts the project timetable should allow for a contract award in October/November, with transition taking place between November and February and implementation taking place at the beginning of March.</p> <p>Other procurement processes that are likely to have similar seasonal implications affecting implementation need to adopt the same timetabling arrangements.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 5</b></p> <p><b>That risk assessments for seasonal</b></p>	<p>City Services Department accept this recommendation and will ensure that from now</p>

<p><b>contracts should identify a cut off point by which time the contract should be awarded for the effective delivery of the service. Where this is unachievable, the award should be deferred.</b></p>	<p>on such an evaluation of the timeliness of the award process is included in the risk management matrix for such contracts.</p> <p>The Project Brief and Timetable must include a date by which the board can abort the process. This is particularly important with contracts that are affected by seasonal demands. If timetable slippage occurs then this arrangement will allow the board to abort the process if it feels further progress will adversely affect implementation.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 6</b></p> <p><b>That a mechanism is established to identify high and low risk projects and to formalise the necessary reporting of issues to CMT.</b></p>	<p>The existing Strategic Risk Assessment has been amended to allow both types of project to be identified. This has been achieved by giving a higher weighting for criteria such as strategic importance to the Council, significant workforce implications and high level customer/user impact. The score allocated to a particular to a particular procurement project will determine whether it is high or very high risk. For very high risk procurement projects, the Senior Responsible Officer should ensure that a robust business case is presented to CMT and this must happen at the earliest opportunity in the project lifecycle. The Senior Responsible Officer must arrange for a standing item “items to be referred to CMT” on Project board agendas.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 7</b></p> <p><b>We recommend that training takes place or information is disseminated to ensure that the term ‘letter of intent’ and other specialist procurement terminology is used correctly</b></p>	<p>“Letters of Intent” should only be used in very limited circumstances. They introduce a level of uncertainty as to whether a contract actually exists between the parties and under what terms and conditions the parties are bound. Where there is a clarity on these issues, the parties should be signing the contract rather than seeking a “Letter of Intent”. Legal advice should always be sought before signing a “Letter of Intent”.</p> <p>Generally, the use of “Letters of Intent” seems to be increasing and CPU are currently reviewing why this should be the case. Detailed advice and guidance to departments on the use of “Letters of Intent” will follow the review and will address this recommendation.</p>

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 8</b></p> <p><b>That the Corporate Procurement Unit develop and establish the improvement measures identified as part of the review of the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance project, particularly regarding the roles and responsibilities and project management tools in place, the reporting process, the remit of the project board, costing the specification and the time allocated to the stages of procurement. We also recommend procedures are introduced to ensure all meetings throughout the process are minuted.</b></p>	<p>Future high and very high level procurement projects will have the roles and responsibilities for the Senior Responsible Officer, Project Board and Project Manager clearly defined and accepted by the board. The Project Brief will include the recognised project management tools needed to provide effective management and control of the project. Timetables should be realistic and must not be time driven, a successful outcome is more important than a rushed procurement process.</p> <p>The client needs to ensure that its Specification fully describes the service to be provided as well as describing any conditions that might affect service delivery. The client must arrange for the Specification to be properly costed prior to it being finalised.</p> <p>The new Procurement Project Strategy details the need for the project's organisation to be clearly defined. The project organisation should include a Project Support function and an officer from this function should be responsible for providing administrative support to the Project Board, Project Team and evaluation panels, this includes the taking of minutes. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to arrange for this support to be made available.</p> <p>The results of a review of the procurement processes used for this particular procurement and similar procurements are currently being incorporated into a revised Procurement Project Strategy document that being developed by CPU. Check lists to be signed off by the Senior Responsible Officer at the end of each Procurement Gateway Review will be a main feature of the revised strategy.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 9</b></p> <p><b>That as part of the project management process for high profile or high risk contracts or new service delivery arrangements adequate contingency plans are put in place.</b></p>	<p>The need for the Project Board to develop a Contingency Plan is just one of the project management tools to be incorporated into the revised Procurement Project Strategy.</p>

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 10</b></p> <p><b>That where a high profile project is experiencing any difficulties or risks that might influence the awarding of a contract or the delivery of new service arrangements, the relevant Executive Board Member is briefed by the chair of the project board at the earliest possible stage. To complement this we recommend that guidelines are drawn up outlining the appropriate stages at which Members should be briefed.</b></p>	<p>In the future it will be the responsibility of the Senior Responsible Officer to act as an interface between the Project Board and the relevant Executive Board Member (and relevant Lead Member) and CMT.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 11</b></p> <p><b>That the current risk assessment methodology is reviewed to ensure that issues identified in this inquiry are incorporated and to ensure that a rolling risk register is always adopted for projects.</b></p>	<p>A mechanism has already been established to identify high and low risk projects. The Council's Risk Management Policy (including a Risk Management Strategy) was approved by Executive Board on 11th February 2005. Briefly, the mechanism recognises a number of stages of risk management; establish objectives, identify the risks, analyse the risks, evaluate the risks (in terms of probability and impact), prioritise the risks, treat the risks, agree actions to mitigate risks, take action, and monitor and report on the status of the risks.</p> <p>The Strategy also includes formal reporting arrangements. CMT are responsible for reviewing the corporate risk register and escalating to Executive Board any risks that remain very high. The Strategy also requires an annual report on the Council's risk management arrangements to be submitted to Executive Board. The Corporate Governance and Audit Committee is responsible for 'reviewing the adequacy of the Council's corporate governance arrangements (including matters such as internal control and risk management)' Quarterly reports are submitted to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.</p>

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 12</b></p> <p><b>That the risk assessment process ensures that the option of a phased approach to a contract is considered.</b></p>	<p>Phased implementation should be considered when the contract involves multi site service delivery. The Senior Responsible Officer and Project Board must assess the need for phased implementation when the Risk Register highlights implementation as a high or very high risk. This will be incorporated into the procurement advice given out by the CPU.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 13</b></p> <p><b>That work continues on the database held by Parks and Countryside to ensure that data is up to date and correctly attributed. We also recommend that where a similar contract is let in the future issues around data are resolved and checked before the specification is agreed and is given to the Contractor / service deliverer in a usable form.</b></p>	<p>Work is continuing to complete this work by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2005. The responsibility for managing the database will transfer to City Services Contracts Team from week commencing 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005. This transfer will ensure that future queries are more speedily resolved and communicated to Elected Members or the customer who raised the query.</p> <p>City Services Department accept the need for future contract databases to be resolved before the specification is agreed and will check as part of risk assessing such future contracts that this is the case.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that this is an important principle that has been highlighted by the Board, it has been noted that the data was 99% accurate and work will be undertaken to ensure any residual problems are resolved.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 14</b></p> <p><b>We recommend that City Services and Parks and Countryside work alongside Ward Members in identifying whether any privately owned land has been erroneously included on previous cutting</b></p>	<p>This recommendation is accepted. The transfer of the database management from the middle of December to the Contracts Team should speed up this process in the future.</p>



<p><b>schedules and that in such instances the owners are contacted to take over maintenance. We also recommend that this exercise also identifies land which should be on the schedule and is currently not being cut.</b></p>	
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 15</b></p> <p><b>We recommend that City Services establishes what is required for the 'In Bloom' routes and ensures that appropriate arrangements are made for next year.</b></p>	<p>City Services Department support this recommendation. Work has already commenced with Britain in Bloom colleagues to identify all those communities involved in the various levels of 'In Bloom' competitions. A forum made up of representatives of all such communities is being set up which will also be attended by the Grounds Maintenance Contractor. The forum will improve communications between all the interested parties and ensure that the contractor works with the communities to deliver their aspirations.</p> <p>Learning and Leisure state that if the contract is maintained according to specification then there should not be a requirement for 'in bloom' routes to be given any additional operations.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 16</b></p> <p><b>That City Services, as the monitoring department, continues to closely monitor the performance of the Contractor particularly with regard to shrub maintenance and verge maintenance and any contingencies being developed by both the Council and the Contractor for the start of the next cutting season.</b></p>	<p>City Services accept this recommendation. Regular meetings are already taking place with the contractor to monitor and manage the 2005/06 arrangements and to prepare for the 2006 season.</p>

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 17</b></p> <p><b>That City Services (in consultation with the Executive Board Member) consider the possibility of a winter cut this year and an earlier Spring cut next year and that where appropriate this is included within the budget discussions, whilst ensuring that the specification has been fully met.</b></p>	<p>City Services accept this recommendation. In view of the particular difficulties experienced this year, the Director has arranged for the grass cutting to continue until 27<sup>th</sup> November 2005. This is an extension of the cutting time from the start of October. In addition, currently it is planned to start cutting the grass in February 2006, a month ahead of the contract specifications. This extra work is a balance of work resulting from the failure of the contractor to complete the early grass cuts in 2005/06 year.</p> <p>For the future, the Director of City Services will submit a report for CMT and Members to consider whether additional resources should be made available from 2006/07 onwards to enable additional winter cuts to be made.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 18</b></p> <p><b>That induction arrangements are regarded as a priority when handing over a service to a new delivering body, internally or externally to the Council.</b></p>	<p>This recommendation is accepted. As part of letting such contracts in the future a suitable induction period will be arranged.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 19</b></p> <p><b>That City Services review the arrangements around weed control to ensure that any issues are resolved for next year.</b></p>	<p><b>City Services</b> The contract for Weed Spraying has been extended until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007. The Director of City Services has asked the Streetscene Contract officers to ensure that they are fully briefed on the contract arrangements and therefore competent to deal with any related issues which might arise next year. The Director has also asked that officers review the arrangements for future management of the contract with Parks and Countryside and the other client departments so as to improve future communications around this matter.</p> <p><b>Learning and Leisure</b> The weed spraying contract includes obstacle spraying as part of a winter spray in February/March. The specification for the grounds maintenance contract makes it</p>

	<p>clear it is the grounds maintenance contractor's responsibility to 'maintain the grass around the trees and obstacles to the same standard as the surrounding grass'. It should be noted that no pesticides can be used to control weeds around trees. A further point to note with regard to weed control is that the weedspraying contractor has highlighted that the difficulties experienced in grass cutting during 2005 season will incur subsequent weed growth issues over the following years due to the resulting seedbank. This may well result in additional costs incurred in controlling weed growth.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 20</b></p> <p><b>That City Services develop and arrangement with the Contractor to allow direct access for Ward Members to the service provider, whilst continuing the appropriate performance monitoring.</b></p>	<p>City Services Department accept this recommendation. The department is drafting a protocol which will ensure that Elected Members have such access without compromising the contract management arrangements.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION 21</b></p> <p><b>That the Chief Executive looks further into the issues raised in the inquiry</b></p>	<p>The Corporate Plan continues to highlight the importance and need for the continuous development of effective leadership at all levels. Over the last few years much has been done to develop the ethos of 'Closer Working: Better Services'. The Leeds Leadership Programme senior officers led to greater cross-council understanding and culminated in the restructure to streamline the number of departments and management arrangements.</p> <p>Subsequently the Leeds Leadership Programme 2 (LLP2) for 1300 middle management officers commenced in 2003. The third cohort of this programme has just commenced and recent evaluation from the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) puts the programme as one of the best in class nationally specifically noting that it is clearly linked to organisational goals and priorities to develop unanimity of purpose across the council.</p> <p>Learning from the feedback from new appointees and building on the legacy of the</p>

original Leeds Leadership programme this year has also seen the introduction of a Chief Officers Leadership Forum. Corporate Management Team and the top 50 senior officers across the council meet quarterly specifically to discuss and plan common approaches to cross cutting issues such as project and risk management, the Gershon agenda and other leadership challenges.

Corporate Management Team have also commissioned three development sessions for them to review and develop their effectiveness as the top strategic team in the officer structure. These sessions between December '05 and April '06 will provide the opportunity to consider the issues raised by this inquiry regarding corporateness and culture.

To pull together a coherent plan for ongoing leadership and cultural development the People Strategy commits to develop an over arching high level Leadership Strategy for the council by April 2006. This will clearly identify the need to further develop Closer Working Better Services ethos; the recommendations of the inquiry will be incorporated into this plan. It will link together many of the existing initiatives such as the roll out of project management , 'Delivering Successful Change', and risk management how these all contribute to the development of ever more effective leadership.

The lessons identified by the inquiry are also being incorporated into the ongoing work and future plans. This will be monitored by the newly established Corporate Priority Board for People and Culture led by the Deputy Chief Executive and including the Director of Corporate Services and Chief Officer – HR.



Report of Scrutiny Board  
(Environment and Community Safety)

Inquiry into Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract

**Date of Publication: October 2005**

# **Report of Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety)**

## **Inquiry into Streetscene Grounds Maintenance**

### **SESSIONAL EVIDENCE**

#### Reports and Publications Submitted

- Report from Chief Recreation Officer
  - Report from Director of City Services
  - Report from Director of Legal and Democratic Services
  - Report from Chief Officer Leeds North West Homes
  - Report from Managing Director Glendale
  - Briefing notes from Chief Recreation Officer
  - Reports submitted to CMT and corresponding minutes
  - Minutes of Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract Project Board meetings
  - Tender Evaluation report
  - Risk Assessment Register
  - Contract Specification
- (copies of the written submission is available on request to the Scrutiny Support Unit)

#### Witnesses Heard

- Chief Executive
- Director of City Services
- Head of Environmental Services, City Services
- Director of Learning and Leisure
- Chief Recreation Officer, Learning and Leisure
- Principal Area Managers, Parks and Countryside
- Recreation Projects Manager, Learning and Leisure
- Project Officer, Parks and Countryside
- Director Legal and Democratic Services
- Procurement Manager, Legal and Democratic Services
- Acting Chief Procurement Officer, Legal and Democratic Services
- Principal Legal Officer Contracts, Legal and Democratic Services
- Chief Officer Leeds North West Homes
- Strategic Landlord Manager
- Managing Director Glendale
- Regional Manager Glendale
- Assistant Regional Director Glendale

#### Dates of Scrutiny

- 5<sup>th</sup> July 2005 working group
- 15<sup>th</sup> July 2005 working group
- 21<sup>st</sup> July 2005 working group

- 19<sup>th</sup> September 2005 Scrutiny Board meeting
- 17<sup>th</sup> October 2005 Scrutiny Board meeting

## **Report of Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety)**

### **Inquiry into Streetscene Grounds Maintenance**

#### Executive Summary

Following an extensive inquiry into the process of handing over the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance service to an external contractor, the Board has concluded that the combination of number of factors contributed to the problems in delivering the service this year; the late award of the contract (and the various contributory factors to the late award), procurement issues, (including roles and responsibilities) and levels of communication across the departments and with the Contractor.

Our general conclusion is that this was a corporate failure and we have emphasised the shared responsibility of departments and those involved in the decision making process. There is no single factor that can be identified as the cause of the problems with this contract, similarly no one individual is seen as responsible, but rather it was the cumulative effect of a number of factors and decisions that created the circumstances which prevented a smooth transition of the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance service.

Our recommendations have focused on the measures we feel are required to improve the procurement process and to ensure that similar projects benefit from a more robust approach to risk management. A number of these recommendations have been suggested to us in the course of the inquiry, resulting from officer reviews of the process and these have concurred with our own findings.

We have also commented on the role of Corporate Management Team and recommended that further work is done on the reporting mechanisms for high risk projects to ensure that should issues arise, these are communicated at the appropriate level, including Executive Board Members and appropriate Lead Members, and in doing so we have emphasised the need to ensure there is corporate ownership of problems and their solutions.

## **Report of Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety)**

### **Inquiry into Streetscene Grounds Maintenance**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 It may be the opinion of some that grass cutting is not a priority nor a strategic enough issue for the Scrutiny Board to deal with. However, one only has to examine the press coverage on this issue in the spring and early summer this year to understand that a failure to adequately deliver this service impacts significantly on our customers. It has therefore been a priority for the Scrutiny Board. Not only this, it has become clear that the key questions were not just about how the grass is cut. Our inquiry has covered fundamental issues about procurement, decision making, managing risk, contingency planning and ownership of problems. Following a period of public and Member concern and after discussion with the Executive Board Member responsible for City Services, we agreed to undertake an immediate inquiry into the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance arrangements.
- 1.2 For reasons of urgency, the Board agreed to undertake some of the information- gathering in working groups. Three working groups met to receive accounts from Learning and Leisure and City Services departments, the Arms Length Management Organisations (ALMOs) and the Contractor. Our aim was to understand each party's point of view, their stake in the process and their responsibilities, and identify those factors which have caused the service to suffer. It is also our intention that the recommendations in this report contribute to the improvement of similar processes, but also mindful of when this Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract is re-let, some recommendations are specific to this project.
- 1.3 The evidence we received included the recovery strategy and the progress towards an improvement in quality. It has been acknowledged that it will take some time for the grass to recover and for the service to find its equilibrium. Our hope is that this will indeed be the case by the time our recommendations are issued and acted on. Whilst departments have noted the lessons to be learnt, during the inquiry we observed that there were still ongoing problems with some aspects of the grass cutting service. It is not our intention to comment on the minutiae of monitoring the Contractor's work, that is a matter for the Contractor and City Services department. Our intention is to highlight what has gone wrong in the process before, during and after the award of the contract and what changes should occur in order to prevent the same circumstances reoccurring.



- 1.4 We have not commented on the original decision to outsource the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract, though we did discuss the issues around ALMO inspections and the drive to achieve a 2 star rating which included market testing of the grounds maintenance service. We recognise that a positive impact of outsourcing has also been that the parks and green spaces around the city being maintained by Parks and Countryside are benefiting from the department's ability to focus on this core business.
- 1.5 We would like to thank all the contributors for their attendance at various meetings. Discussions at times highlighted diverse opinions between witnesses and we appreciate the efforts made to ensure that all the information required was brought to the Board. Having received all the information available and asked many questions of officers and the Contractor, it is our intention to present our conclusions in this report with balance and objectivity.

*(A summary of the evidence considered in arriving at our conclusions is presented at Appendix 1).*

## **2.0 THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY**

2.1 The Board agreed to make comments and recommendations, where appropriate, on the following areas:

- Background and decision to tender
- Decision not to submit an in-house tender
- Specification and schedule preparation
- Management of tendering process
- Delay in contract award
- Transitional service arrangements
- The measures in place to ensure the future smooth running of the service, including quality control mechanisms
- Contractor mobilisation issues
- Lessons learned from the different stages of the process
- Any health and safety impact resulting from the delay in service

## **3.0 THE BOARD'S CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 We are proud of the performance of Leeds City Council, its 'excellent' status and its reputation. We know that officers too share this pride. We are, however, realistic and know that an organisation of this size will not be 100% right all the time. It has become obvious in our discussions, though, that we all share in the disappointment that the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract project has caused damage to the reputation of the Council by virtue of the high profile nature of the service. When such a service goes wrong, everyone notices.

- 3.2 Our discussions over the course of this inquiry have revealed a catalogue of issues which culminated in a grass cutting service attracting adverse publicity for the Council and the Contractor and which has left members of the public, our customers, asking why the service could have gone so awry. Whilst we recognise that much has been done to solve difficult problems and turn the service around, our job as a Scrutiny Board is to highlight what has gone wrong and why, and identify lessons to be learnt.
- 3.3 The Board received a large amount of information and discussed issues with a large number of contributors. In order to express the comments and recommendations of the Board in a straightforward manner, each of the key issues raised in the inquiry are dealt with below one by one, followed by the relevant recommendation.

#### Slippage in the timetable

- 3.4 Our view is that slippage in the project timetable is the most important factor from which many other problems have stemmed. We understand from discussions with the Contractor that it was made clear at the evaluation stage in December that, in their view, there was no room for further delay in the awarding of the contract. Indeed, it was the Contractor's opinion that such contracts are better awarded in December or January at the latest and not February as was the case. The seasonal nature of the service has made the timing of crucial importance.
- 3.5 We received information on the risk assessment that was undertaken in May 2004 for the project board, facilitated by the Risk Management Unit and involving the project board and project team (we discuss the risk assessment in more detail later). The project board was set up to manage the tendering process and choose the successful bidder and was led by Learning and Leisure department. The risk assessment is a key piece of information as it describes where the project was at its most vulnerable. We have noted that timetable slippages were identified as one of the highest risks and the most likely to occur. The risk assessment document also indicates that in the early planning stages of the project August was considered as the time to award the contract; "due to the seasonal nature of the work, if the contract is not out this August, it then may have to be August 2005". We acknowledge that the timetable was formally reported giving November as the award date (as agreed by the project board). In either case, the award date of February 17<sup>th</sup> 2005 does not reflect the risk assessment, nor the agreed timetable. We have discussed this in great detail with officers but we will sum up our conclusion simply; the contract was awarded late and the risk assessment proved to be of little value in this regard.
- 3.6 Our understanding of the chronology of events is that the project board met for the final time in January 2005, before the contract was formally awarded in February. This final meeting did not appear to acknowledge any continuing risk of delay, though by this time there clearly was a delay and that the 'go live' date of the contract had been pushed back to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005. We

acknowledge that the Corporate Procurement Unit offered to facilitate a contract management and monitoring meeting in January and that City Services were meeting with the Contractor in February. However, we feel that the project board should have continued to meet and deal with the looming crisis until, at the very least, the contract had started. Had this been the case, the project board would have provided a forum for dealing with issues as they arose. A better scenario would have been for the project board to have supported the handover to City Services as the client department and pursued issues until the major problems had been resolved and the contract was running smoothly.

- 3.7 During the discussions, we noted that the brief of the project board was to award the contract and once this task was completed this appeared to end its responsibility. With hindsight, we feel that the project board should have had an extended remit, to include ensuring that the handover and start of the contract ran as smoothly as possible. A number of contributors have concurred with this view and we hope that in future project boards will see themselves as responsible until a contract is handed over with all arrangements satisfactorily in place. (We noted in this particular instance the unavoidable absence of the Director of City Services for a time may have been a factor in the management of the handover arrangements). We acknowledge that monitoring being placed in a department other than the lead procuring department, as in this case, is not a common situation and probably exacerbated the hiatus in January and February 2005 (we have noted that Parks and Countryside originally recommended that they should take on the monitoring role). We cannot comment on whether the monitoring role is situated in the correct department and therefore suggest that CMT discuss the monitoring arrangements to ensure that there is agreement on where this function should lie. We feel that CMT is best placed to take a corporate approach with a view to what is best for the Council as a whole and the service in question.
- 3.8 We recommend that all project boards steering procurement and contract awards should be fully involved and responsible for the risks and contingencies until the arrangements are fully bedded in, regardless of where monitoring responsibilities are placed. We also consider it an important issue for in-house projects which affect service delivery arrangements. In addition, as a general point and acknowledging that the project board for this contract included senior officers, we recommend that the seniority of officers on the project board reflect the priority given to the project. The Procurement Review, submitted to the Board as part of the inquiry, also indicated that for very high risk projects, relevant Directors should chair the project boards.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 1**

**That the senior project officer, the project manager and project boards do not disband until the project board is satisfied that the contract or new service arrangements are established and running satisfactorily, in order to provide a co-ordinating body dealing with issues, risks and**

**contingencies up to, and beyond, the start of the contract or the establishment of new service delivery arrangements.**

## **RECOMMENDATION 2**

**That CMT discuss the monitoring arrangements for this contract to ensure that there is agreement on where this function should lie.**

- 3.9 It is clear that the process was in part held up by the request for tenderers to resubmit bids after the initial specification to include collection of grass cuttings, at the request of the ALMOs, proved to be too expensive. Whilst we understand the reasoning behind this initial specification, the advice from Parks and Countryside at the time was clear; that the collection of grass cuttings would be too costly. We are in sympathy with the need to take into account the level of service being requested by tenants, however, we see it as the responsibility of the ALMOs to manage the expectations of tenants where a level of service is outside the budgetary constraints. We also understand the logic of undertaking an exercise to provide a benchmark price and to illustrate why a seemingly simple request to collect grass cuttings (which is a perennial complaint to Ward Members) can only be provided at significant cost. It is unfortunate however that this caused some delay in the tendering process and with hindsight, advice from Parks and Countryside should perhaps have been heeded. During the discussions we have learnt that 'dual pricing' at the tender stage is an option. In this case it would have allowed the exploration of the cost of collecting grass cuttings whilst receiving an alternative price for a service omitting this. Our understanding is that this would have avoided this specific slippage in the timetable. We are surprised that this was not considered at the time, given the definite nature of the advice from Parks and Countryside. We have noted that the Procurement review has included this point.

## **RECOMMENDATION 3**

**That projects involved in procuring services ensure that specifications and any proposed variations are costed simultaneously to prevent the need for the re-submission of tenders.**

- 3.10 This is not the whole story however and we do not believe that the need to ask for re-submission of prices alone caused the late award of the contract. Our inquiries have shown that the cumulative effect of this delay and the delay in reporting further to Corporate Management Team (CMT) probably put the aim of a smooth transition of the service to the Contractor out of reach. The delay in the submission of the information regarding the award of the contract to CMT has perplexed us. Not only have we questioned why this was allowed to happen, but we have also discussed the role of CMT in the decision making process. We accept that reports had been to CMT at various points and within those reports were descriptions of the status of the project, including the timetabling of the project. We have noted that discussions regarding land transfer and other important issues had been conducted within CMT. However, at the time when approval was requested to let the contract, it

appears that the urgency was not sufficiently communicated to CMT, whose meeting schedule caused a further delay. No doubt CMT would have been flexible in their meeting arrangements had it been highlighted as necessary. We feel that the project board should have pressed the issue with CMT in order to achieve an earlier award date. We have questions regarding the perception that CMT approval was required and its role within the decision making process, which we discuss further.

- 3.11 We feel it was the responsibility of the project board to ensure that everything possible was done to prevent slippage happening, and to have in place contingencies should slippage occur. It is our view that this did not take place. We accept that there are some risks that cannot be controlled. However, we believe the delays in the process could have been prevented through foresight, planning and more attention to the risk management process.
- 3.12 The basic question we have asked ourselves is, would the same problems in service delivery have arisen had the contract been awarded in December? Based on the evidence we have received, our understanding is that the majority of the problems would not have occurred to the extent they did. This is not to say that there would have been no problems at all. The Contractor may still have had difficulties in recruiting and securing a depot, for instance, but this would not have been at the time when the cutting should have been taking place. What has been consistently reported to us is that a contract of this nature will have some problems; it was a new contract for the Council and the client department (City Services) was unfamiliar with the service. The original data gathering exercise took place in preparation for CCT contracts during 1980s. This data along with a considerable amount of further more detailed data capture commenced in 1998 and culminated in a concentrated effort to present data in the streetscene grounds maintenance contract as well as identify land transfer and other parks sites during the procurement process. This meant that a large amount of data was processed and it is to be expected that some adjustments would need to be made – another factor to be taken into account. Added to this, no doubt the Contractor will have lessons to learn from this experience also, such as the challenge of mobilising where there are no TUPE transfers of staff. It would have been unrealistic to expect no problems at all under these circumstances. However, by awarding this contract as late as February, with an official start date of 1<sup>st</sup> March, a ‘go live’ date of 1<sup>st</sup> April, a debilitating set of circumstances was created and the contract was ‘fatally delayed’, in the words of one contributor.
- 3.13 We can trace three major problems relating to the delay in the process: the lack of time for a thorough induction process for the Contractor (itself the cause of problems), the reduced time available for the Contractor to mobilise effectively (including the acquisition of depots, recruitment and training of staff and familiarisation with the routes, all taking place at the time when the service needed to be delivered) and the length of the grass by April, having missed the March cut. Given that the start of the contract was likely to be delayed, we feel that Parks and Countryside should have undertaken an earlier cut before the end of the financial year (February or March) in order to ensure that the ‘go live’ date of April did not mean the grass was longer than it

should have been. The Contractor has indicated that climatic conditions meant that a missed March cut was significant, though we acknowledge that Parks and Countryside officers have a differing view. The key point is that it is likely that City Services and the Contractor were handed a task that had already become impossible to achieve without experiencing major problems.

- 3.14 Looking ahead, we have discussed the timing for awarding a seasonal contract such as this. We would like to emphasise that any contract with a cyclical aspect should be awarded in a timely fashion. Specifically, it should be highlighted that any future Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract should be awarded well ahead of the growing season, for example in the preceding August as was originally suggested in the risk assessment.
- 3.15 In addition, we would like to recommend that for a seasonal contract the risk assessment should identify any appropriate cut off date by which time the contract should be awarded for the effective delivery of the service. Where this is unachievable the award should be deferred. We understand that deferring the award of this contract may have caused uncertainty within the department, however, the consequences of awarding the contract late have been hugely disruptive.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4**

**That any future Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contracts are awarded well ahead of the growing season, so as to ensure the Contractor has sufficient time to mobilise.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION 5**

**That risk assessments for seasonal contracts should identify a cut off point by which time the contract should be awarded for the effective delivery of the service. Where this is unachievable, the award should be deferred.**

#### The Role of Corporate Management Team

- 3.16 We have identified a delay in the process involving CMT, however this needs to be put into context. Firstly we should say that whilst CMT represents the corporate responsibility for the Council's performance in any of its services, it is our understanding that it is not the decision making body – certainly the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract was an officer delegated decision made by the Director of City Services. We appreciate that CMT informs decisions, co-ordinates where appropriate and ensures issues are aired and challenged and the project board clearly felt the need to bring information to CMT before awarding the contract. Indeed, we understand that information was requested by CMT. We also appreciate the sheer volume of items which appear on any CMT agenda and that in an organisation which spends £5m per day a £2m per annum contract does not stand out in a crowd of projects

and contracts. (We are assured however, that it is now fully understood by all concerned that, regardless of cost, the impact of service failure in grass cutting is enormous. We have made it clear that as Ward Members the issue has brought us into contact with enraged residents who normally have little contact with the Council.)

- 3.17 Within this context it is easy to understand the response to our question about why alarm bells were not ringing at the CMT meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> January 2005; that either CMT were “a little deaf or the alarm bells were not sounded loud enough”.
- 3.18 The issue of how CMT is regarded by project boards (as a decision making body or offering approval for decisions) is something the Chief Executive may wish to explore. Certainly we feel there is scope for clarifying the relationship between such project boards and CMT and the level of communication required. In our inquiry we felt that the project board and CMT may have had a different understanding of the relationship. Clearly the project board felt that CMT should be consulted (and indeed make decisions) on certain stages of the inquiry, particularly problematic at the end of the process. We are not saying that this is incorrect and there may be good reason for taking this approach. However, CMT had no deep understanding of the various issues involved in a grass cutting contract (which is entirely understandable) and was reliant on the project board being explicit about the urgency of the situation at the right time. To be clear, the appropriate representative on CMT during the life of the project board was the Director of Learning and Leisure who had no knowledge of the problems with the contract until April 2005, long after it had been awarded. Once the delegated decision had been made, the Director of City Services became the link to CMT. If the project board saw CMT as the decision making body which needed to receive certain information before the process could be progressed, there was undoubtedly a failure on the part of the project board in briefing CMT adequately for this purpose. In other words, they did not sound the alarm bells loud enough.
- 3.19 Alternatively, had the project board executed full responsibility for the process and handed over the delegated decision to award the contract to the Director of City Services without waiting for CMT to meet, this would have taken another delay out of the process. However, though it would have been understandable had the project board felt the need to flag up explicitly to CMT what were now perceived to be the risks of a late contract award, this was not what the January 20<sup>th</sup> report did. CMT were told that should there be any *further* delay, there would be operational difficulty. Accordingly, our issue is not with the decision of the project board to report further to CMT, but with the nature of the report and the failure to spell out to CMT the high risks of serious operational difficulties likely with the delay that had already occurred.
- 3.20 Our suggestion would be that it might be appropriate for low risk projects to report only exceptionally to CMT. However, for high risk projects (and we would include the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract in this category) the relationship with CMT needs to be formalised so that all parties understand where responsibility lies and how a decision is to be made. A

suggestion has been made to us that such identified project boards should routinely consider at their meetings what needs to be reported to CMT and that this reporting should be done in a timely and informative manner. We would stress that the responsibility for alerting CMT to any possible issue remains with the project board and the Director(s) responsible. It has been suggested to us by the Corporate Procurement Unit that for very high risk projects, the chair of the project board should be a Director with a natural link to CMT.

## **RECOMMENDATION 6**

**That a mechanism is established to identify high and low risk projects and to formalise the necessary reporting of issues to CMT.**

### Letter of intent and letter of award

- 3.21 We have received evidence relating to the issue of mobilisation of the Contractor, the assurances made during the evaluation process and the reported length of time given for mobilisation. There have been conflicting views on these. One issue which has become clear in this part of the discussion is the importance of the status of the 'letter of intent'. Representatives of the project board have stated that during the evaluation, the Contractor indicated mobilisation could begin with the receipt of a letter of intent and that eight weeks, though challenging, would be enough time to mobilise sufficiently to start the contract. We were also informed that the Contractor was given over nine weeks to mobilise from the receipt of the letter of intent to the (revised) start of the contract on 1st April 2005. But this is not as straightforward as it may appear.
- 3.22 We accept that during the evaluation stage, the Contractor had indicated that they would begin mobilising on the strength of a letter of intent. However, on examining this issue, we learned that the Contractor did not consider the letter received as a formal 'letter of intent' that gave any commitment from the Council which would allow the Contractor to begin to release significant resources. The Director of Legal and Democratic Services has confirmed that the Contractor's legal advice regarding this letter seems reasonable. Moreover, officers from Procurement have confirmed that a letter of intent was *not* sent, though a subject to contract letter was, prior to the letter of award. This issue must surely be the responsibility of the project board and Procurement and we have asked why Procurement officers did not pick up on the misleading use of the term. Given the difficulties caused by the delay in awarding the contract, this is a serious point and it seems to us that such a misunderstanding over the 'letter of intent' reveals a lack of communication within the project board and with Procurement and a lack of ownership over this part of the process. Given the confusing nature of this issue, we recommend that training takes place or information is disseminated to ensure that the term 'letter of intent' and other specialist procurement terminology is used correctly.



## RECOMMENDATION 7

**We recommend that training takes place or information is disseminated to ensure that the term 'letter of intent' and other specialist procurement terminology is used correctly**

- 3.23 During the inquiry we have been told that the Contractor's mobilisation period was over nine weeks. It appears that this mobilisation time in reality for the Contractor was nearer to six weeks (from the receipt of the award letter to 1st April). We cannot say whether or not the Contractor would have been in a better position if a letter of intent with legal status had been sent. What, however, we do question is whether the Council gave a reasonable amount of time for the Contractor to adequately mobilise before the 1<sup>st</sup> April, a date which had already been pushed back from 1<sup>st</sup> March.
- 3.24 In addition to this, we have been informed by the Contractor that, a period of eight weeks from 3<sup>rd</sup> January to 1<sup>st</sup> March was a 'tall order' and that there was no room whatsoever for further slippage in the award date. This links into the issue of the seasonal nature of the contract and the fact that any delay in mobilisation was exacerbated by the length of the grass in some areas by the time it received its first cut.
- 3.25 Be this as it may, our question remains, if there were continuing concerns over the delay in the process (identified as a major risk) and whether the Contractor had enough time to fully mobilise, with the knowledge within the project board of the consequences of such a delay, coupled with the claims of the Contractor that they contacted the Council on numerous occasions chasing confirmation of the award, why was this issue not picked up at the time?

### Procurement issues

- 3.26 Our remit does not allow us to investigate procurement issues in too much detail, but we have received information on a review of the procurement issues arising from this project, which has already taken place. A number of improvements have been suggested to us, which concur with our understanding and judgement of events as related to us. A number of our recommendations dovetail with the improvements suggested by the Procurement review. We would like to suggest that the appropriate Scrutiny Board considers whether there is further Scrutiny work to be done in this area.
- 3.27 We will discuss in more detail the risk assessment process, however, we are pleased to note that officers have already begun to address this with the adoption of a more rigorous process of managing risks. The Procurement review has identified the need for a project board to continue in its responsibility until operations are up and running, which we have discussed earlier. We were interested to note that it is also suggested that a project board's remit for high risk projects be extended at the early stages, to include preparing the market stage. We have noted that this includes reporting at major stages to CMT (linking in to our previous recommendation). The

Procurement review has also taken on board the issues around the specification and suggestions have been made to improve how enhancements are identified on the specification and that the specification is fully costed, variations included.

- 3.28 We have discussed the decision not to provide an in-house bid for this contract. Whilst we understand the reasons why an in-house bid was not made, we were concerned that there was no benchmarking information available. We have noted that the Procurement review has identified the need to have a shadow bid where no in-house bid has been made.
- 3.29 The Procurement Review has suggested a number of improvements to the process and we support these and recommend that they are implemented as soon as possible. One addition we wish to make to the identified improvements is that accurate minutes are taken throughout the procurement process and particularly at the evaluation meetings. We have discussed the importance of the evaluation meetings and the dialogue with the potential contractors. We feel that where such conversations inform the contractual arrangements, it is important to record these with accuracy.
- 3.30 We would like to refer the issues raised in relation to the procurement process to the relevant Scrutiny Board to ensure that the Procurement review is considered in its own right and to follow up the debate regarding the 'letter of intent'.

## **RECOMMENDATION 8**

**That the Corporate Procurement Unit develop and establish the improvement measures identified as part of the review of the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance project, particularly regarding the roles and responsibilities and project management tools in place, the reporting process, the remit of the project board, costing the specification and the time allocated to the stages of procurement. We also recommend procedures are introduced to ensure all meetings throughout the process are minuted.**

### Contingency Plan

- 3.31 Some of our inquiry has focused on the critical period between December and April 2005, when it became clear that the contract would be awarded far later than originally anticipated and that the start date of the contract would need to be pushed back. What became clear to us early in discussions was that there was no adequate contingency plan in place. The downsizing of Parks and Countryside left the Council in a vulnerable position such that had the contract not been awarded we would have faced even more serious difficulties. We acknowledge that the project board would not have awarded the contract had the Contractor indicated they were unable to meet the requirements of the contract. The Contractor has also pointed out to us that though the delay in the award of the contract caused major difficulties, Glendale agreed to proceed (knowing that the Council would be left with no service at all if they

did not proceed), with the understanding amongst all parties that some catching up would need to be done. To be frank, the fact that the Council awarded the contract late and without adequate contingency plans should be of more concern than the speed at which the Contractor was able to mobilise.

- 3.32 Our discussions around contingencies have also revealed a major difference of approach between departments. We discussed in detail the downsizing activities of Parks and Countryside and the fact that budget arrangements required this. We have also discussed the fact that City Services as the monitoring department was left with no additional assistance in the Spring, though it was made clear to us that such assistance was requested of Parks and Countryside. We were informed of meetings which took place where contingency needs were raised (this was discussed between City Services and Parks and Countryside on 20th January 2005 as well as being raised at the Streetscene Project Board in January 2005). We have been informed that Parks and Countryside were not in a position to provide a full cut once the downsizing was well underway, as reported to CMT in January. We have had conflicting reports regarding when leased machinery could have been available from Parks and Countryside and what type of assistance was requested. We also feel that as part of the contingency planning discussions should have taken place regarding the arrangements for downsizing within Parks and Countryside. Whilst we understand there are budgetary considerations involved, it may have been an option to retain some or all of this resource as part of the contingency.
- 3.33 Whilst we have tried to understand the detailed accounts, it is probably sufficient to say that we have been left with the impression that at best contingency planning was non-existent and at worst departments, in this instance, were very far removed from the 'closer working, better services' ethos this Council subscribes to. Members have commented on the inability of Parks and Countryside to provide assistance in the early Spring (even a modest amount of assistance would have helped and we recognise that downsizing activities made a full cut impossible), and yet In Bloom routes in the Summer received emergency attention from Parks and Countryside. Whilst we understand that such resources cannot be organised overnight, we find it confusing that assistance that Parks and Countryside were ready to organise in the Summer (for In Bloom) was assistance that they were not even prepared to contemplate providing during the critical early Spring period when City Services were requesting it.
- 3.34 The high risk, high impact and seasonal nature of this contract demanded good contingency planning. In our view this should have been developed out of the risk assessment undertaken by the project board. Such contingency plans might have included a skeleton service provided by Parks and Countryside until the Contractor had mobilised, or a strict deadline in place after which the contract award would have been deferred to the following year with Parks and Countryside continuing with the service. Those with experience in these matters will no doubt be able to suggest other contingency plans. Our recommendation is not concerned with the detail, but rather the lesson to be learnt that with a service that has a high public impact,

contingencies are a necessity and that these should be included as part of the project brief at the beginning of the process.

## **RECOMMENDATION 9**

**That as part of the project management process for high profile or high risk contracts or new service delivery arrangements adequate contingency plans are put in place.**

### Communication with Elected Members

- 3.35 The role of Elected Members during this process has been minimal and there does not appear to have been a great deal of communication with Executive Board Members in particular. We accept that the normal briefing process was taking place, for example Lead Members for Learning and Leisure were aware of the project from an early stage in 2004, (though we have no evidence that Lead Members were briefed in the latter stages of the project when issues were arising). Also, we would not suggest that Elected Members be briefed on every aspect of a project. However, as issues were beginning to emerge and with the likely prospect of a visible impact around the city, an early briefing of the relevant Members would have been beneficial. In the words of the Procurement review, we suggest that project boards 'inform the appropriate Executive Board Member of any deviations or risks that might influence the ability to award a contract'. We have also asked about the details of how and when Leader Management Team (LMT) were informed of issues as they became apparent and why more information was not presented to LMT and to CMT after January 2005.
- 3.36 We feel that better dialogue could have taken place between officers and Members, particularly the Executive Board Members with the relevant responsibility. Whilst this was an officer process, it would have been beneficial for Members and senior officers to be more informed of the stages of the process and the issues as they occurred - and to have requested briefings.

## **RECOMMENDATION 10**

**That where a high profile project is experiencing any difficulties or risks that might influence the awarding of a contract or the delivery of new service arrangements, the relevant Executive Board Member is briefed by the chair of the project board at the earliest possible stage. To complement this we recommend that guidelines are drawn up outlining the appropriate stages at which Members should be briefed.**

### Project Board and Risk Management

- 3.37 We have touched on the role of the project board and risk management and this needs further elaboration. It is clear that the risk assessment undertaken in 2004 identified a number of risks, some of which subsequently occurred. Ownership had been applied to some of these identified risks. In our view, in

some cases, this did not result in the issues being addressed. We feel that there was a lack of leadership in this project which allowed 'sides' to develop, prevented adequate contingency planning and did not deal effectively with the weaknesses in the process as they developed.

- 3.38 We understand that the project board meetings did regularly review timetable issues, budget issues and other elements of risk (such as TUPE transfers). As some of these risks manifested themselves, we find it difficult to believe that the project board meetings did in fact adequately address them.
- 3.39 In reviewing the minutes of the project board meetings, there appears to be little sense of urgency regarding the slippage in timetable, indeed there is mention of some of the high risks on the risk register having disappeared in August 2004 and in October 2004. The remaining project board meetings of November 2004 and January 2005 do not mention the risk register at all. Evidence submitted by Procurement seems to indicate that the major problems manifested themselves late in the process, which has been described as 'hectic'. This suggests to us that the risk assessment process in this case did not work and that the problems that arose in the latter stages seemed to take everyone by surprise.
- 3.40 The risk assessment itself, undertaken in May 2004, shows those identified risks according to impact and probability. Most significantly, the impact and the probability of there being slippages in the timetable scored the highest possible. The project board therefore knew that there was a likelihood of there being slippage and that if it were to occur it would cause grave problems to the project. As we have stated previously, in our view the late award of the contract is the main cause of the subsequent problems.
- 3.41 We understand that a new approach to risk assessment has been agreed and is in fact being practised in current projects. A rolling risk register should be established for all major projects, which would require regular reviewing and updating right up until the conclusion of the project (in this case, the successful handover and first few months of the contract). We noted that the Procurement review has identified the need to ensure that the risk register is regularly reviewed with emerging risks identified and incorporated. It is also suggested that the risk assessment be extended to include preparation for the market, transition issues and implementation of the contract or service arrangements. We would also recommend that high priority within the risk assessment is given to assessing the resources available (or required) to put into place contingency plans and any identified transitional arrangements.
- 3.42 A further suggestion we would like to support is the inclusion of a transitional arrangements risk assessment, linking into our comments on contingency planning as part of the risk assessment process. In the case of the Streetscene Grounds Maintenance contract, had careful thought been given to how the service would be transferred to an external Contractor in a way that would minimise disruption, a number of actions would no doubt have been taken to support the transfer.

- 3.43 We suggest that in the light of this project and the lessons we have discussed here, that the agreed current approach to risk management is checked to ensure it incorporates all the issues raised.
- 3.44 In addition, given the fact that this contract was to transfer without any existing employees and that the Contractor had no prior knowledge of the geographic detail, it should have been let on a phased basis (which we understand was the initial suggestion from Parks and Countryside). It has also been suggested that where a service will have a city wide impact and a high user base, a phased approach should be considered for the *implementation* of the arrangements (though this may not be possible with grass cutting as the service needs to be implemented city wide at the same time). This may of course have led to less economy in the short term but more surety of service delivery and allowing resolution of issues without exposing the entire city to a service below par. This might be an option best considered in the very early stages of a project and could be a route discussed as part of the risk assessment process.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 11**

**That the current risk assessment methodology is reviewed to ensure that issues identified in this inquiry are incorporated and to ensure that a rolling risk register is always adopted for projects.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION 12**

**That the risk assessment process ensures that the option of a phased approach to a contract is considered.**

#### Data issues

- 3.45 We have received information on how the data on land included in the contract has been identified and supplied to the Contractor. During the inquiry it was reported to us that 99.02% of the data was correct. We understand that a number of queries were sent to Parks and Countryside, where the data is kept, during the inquiry. Some of these queries were identified as private land, new land created after the contract was drawn up, land managed by Parks and Countryside and therefore correctly not in the contract, for example. It was stressed to us a number of times that the volume of land that had been omitted from the original specification was insignificant and we have accepted that the data included in the contract was accurate to within one percent. However, reiterating our introductory point, we have recognised that the impact of the slightest errors is substantial. Members of the public and parish and town councils cannot help but notice small tracts of land growing wild, giving the *perception* of large swathes of grass remaining uncut (not withstanding that some complaints about uncut grass were regarding areas that were on the schedule). The Contractor has also acknowledged that such discrepancies are to be expected in any contract of this nature. The issue is that time should have been allowed for the data to be tested and for good

communication with the Contractor before the start of operations, which goes back to the lateness of the award of the contract and the squeezing of the time available for mobilisation.

- 3.46 During the inquiry, there has been the suggestion that some areas of privately owned land have been traditionally maintained by the Council and it has been reported to us that work is being done to trace owners of such land where it is now not being maintained. It has been refuted by Parks and Countryside that any non-Council land was knowingly cut and it may be that over the years land has found its way onto the Council's own cutting schedule, there are certainly examples that can be provided by Ward Members. If it is the case that the Council has, over the years, maintained grass not owned by the Council, these areas should have been clearly identified before the start of the contract and private arrangements made. Whilst not the responsibility of the Council, the fact that areas have suddenly been left uncut has reflected poorly on the service. We are not suggesting that the Council should maintain land it has no responsibility for but we appreciate the undertaking of City Services officers to ensure that *all* grassed areas are cut until other arrangements are made. However, we believe that this source of public frustration should have been removed before the contract went live. We recommend that as soon as possible, owners of private land that has been identified as being erroneously on the cutting schedule be contacted and informed that the Council will not continue maintaining this land (it may be that contractual arrangements with the Council are requested).
- 3.47 Whilst we acknowledge that there will always be adjustments required to such a large and complicated amount of data, we must also take into account that this has contributed to the apparent levels of dissatisfaction amongst Ward Members and members of the public.
- 3.48 A further aspect of the data issue is the Contractor's point regarding how that data was presented to them. The Contractor has explained that ordinarily they would not expect the data to be presented with streets already in route order – they would manipulate the data themselves prior to beginning cutting. However, we understand that the first weeks and months of the contract were pressurised and difficult, for various reasons. Undoubtedly, receiving the data organised in street order would have helped the Contractor organise the schedule execution when time was extremely tight. Whilst we acknowledge that Parks and Countryside officers did meet with the Contractor in January and that data was discussed, this did not seem to solve the Contractor's issue with the usability of the data. We are keen to highlight our need, as a Council, to maintain a co-operative approach and we feel liaison with the Contractor regarding the data, with hindsight, could have been better organised.
- 3.49 All this said, our priority is how to ensure that the data is now kept up to date and that City Services continue to feed queries back to Parks and Countryside for verification. We also suggest that periodic checks take place to ensure that the data is accurate and we particularly see this as necessary before a schedule is drawn up for a future contract of this kind. We understand that identifying land to be added to the schedule will need to be taken into account

in future budget allocations and in future contract specifications and we suggest that these discussions take place as soon as the data is considered complete. Officers should also seek to discuss local areas with Ward Members as part of this exercise.

- 3.50 We have discussed the arrangements which needed to be made to ensure that the Britain in Bloom areas received the required attention. We also understand that those involved in 'In Bloom' need to know that the relevant areas will be attended to at the optimum time. We suggest that City Services establish what is required for Britain in Bloom and ensure that arrangements are made for next year.

### **RECOMMENDATION 13**

**That work continues on the database held by Parks and Countryside to ensure that data is up to date and correctly attributed. We also recommend that where a similar contract is let in the future issues around data are resolved and checked before the specification is agreed and is given to the Contractor / service deliverer in a usable form.**

### **RECOMMENDATION 14**

**We recommend that City Services and Parks and Countryside work alongside Ward Members in identifying whether any privately owned land has been erroneously included on previous cutting schedules and that in such instances the owners are contacted to take over maintenance. We also recommend that this exercise also identifies land which should be on the schedule and is currently not being cut**

### **RECOMMENDATION 15**

**We recommend that City Services establishes what is required for the 'In Bloom' routes and ensures that appropriate arrangements are made for next year.**

### Monitoring Arrangements

- 3.51 There has been discussion regarding the monitoring arrangements for this contract. Certainly we feel that the client department being different from the department leading on the procurement process may have contributed to the gap in ownership, though arrangements could have been improved to avoid this. We understand the reasons for establishing the monitoring within City Services and that such arrangements are being integrated within existing structures. We have also noted the efforts to ensure that the problems are dealt with and we have acknowledged City Services' view that the Contractor has worked hard to overcome the initial difficulties.
- 3.52 Effectively, the position the Authority found itself in on the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2005 on this contract was that we had a brand new Contractor with brand new employees being monitored by Monitoring Officers who did not have intimate



service knowledge. In future such changes should be implemented at a point of time either well before or after such a contract starts. The Contractor has also expressed that City Services could not have been expected to understand the enormity of the consequences of the delay. We understand that initial proposals to transfer some expertise from Parks and Countryside to the monitoring team in City Services did not come to fruition. This would have been extremely useful to City Services, particularly in the very early stages of transferring the service to the Contractor. (We have already noted that Parks and Countryside originally recommended that they should monitor the contract). In future, under these circumstances, we would suggest that such arrangements are given a priority.

- 3.53 Whilst we understand that a recovery plan has been put into action, we are aware that given the impact of the initial difficulties care should be taken to ensure that the service regains the ground lost. We acknowledge that a full recovery of the quality of the grass is probably not possible until next year, though we now expect the Contractor to be fully in control of the cutting. We have not commented on the Contractor's technical performance as this remains the responsibility of City Services as the monitoring department and it is more appropriate that City Services report on this. We therefore request that a further report, towards the end of the growing season, is submitted to this Scrutiny Board detailing the performance of the Contractor, to include shrub and verge maintenance and any contingencies to be developed for the start of the next cutting season. We suggest that City Services also ensures that the Contractor's monitoring arrangements are effective in maintaining the standard of work required.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 16**

**That City Services, as the monitoring department, continues to closely monitor the performance of the Contractor particularly with regard to shrub maintenance and verge maintenance and any contingencies being developed by both the Council and the Contractor for the start of the next cutting season.**

- 3.54 During the inquiry we briefly discussed whether there was a need for a winter cut. We have noted that there are differing views on this. We feel that further discussions on this would be beneficial and therefore request City Services to investigate this possibility.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 17**

**That City Services (in consultation with the Executive Board Member) consider the possibility of a winter cut this year and an earlier Spring cut next year and that where appropriate this is included within the budget discussions, whilst ensuring that the specification has been fully met.**

The Contractor

- 3.55 It is clear that the Contractor's reputation has also been at stake during the start up period for the contract. We have already stated that City Services are responsible for ensuring the performance of the Contractor and we look forward to further reporting on this. The inquiry has highlighted the dissatisfaction of Members and the public with the service delivery and whilst at this stage we have focused on the Council's management of the process, the Board expect performance to have improved for the start of next season. We have covered some elements of the Contractor's involvement in the inquiry, such as the data issues. There remain a number of issues raised by the Contractor which we feel need some airing.
- 3.56 The Contractor has indicated that whilst there are no issues with working with the City Services as the monitoring department, it was pointed out to us that "it is extremely unusual for the contract to be procured by a different department from that which will be required to execute it. Glendale did not meet anyone who we knew to be from City Services until after the contract was let." This may well have been due to a lack of emphasis on communication. With hindsight we feel that it would have been beneficial to have had more discussions with the Contractor. We would also wish to point out that had the Contractor notified the Council of ongoing problems by letter this would have provided clearer documentation of the course of events.
- 3.57 This brings us to the issue of induction, which would normally have taken place with the Contractor to ensure a smooth handover. However, City Services did not have the luxury of time to undertake this and it became imperative that the Contractor simply begin cutting grass as soon as possible. We acknowledge that some meetings did take place, but these did not help the Contractor get to grips with the geography of the routes or the individual arrangements with ALMOs (such as access). Whilst it might be argued that the Contractor could have spent time getting to know the city and establishing its own routes, it is surely in the Council's interests to ensure that a Contractor has every chance of succeeding. City Services have agreed that in an ideal situation a thorough induction would have helped the situation a great deal. We would like to recommend that this is always regarded as a priority when handing over a service to a new delivering body, internally or externally and should be considered part of the whole procurement process.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 18**

**That induction arrangements are regarded as a priority when handing over a service to a new delivering body, internally or externally to the Council.**

- 3.58 The Contractor discussed with us the issue of weed control. We understand that, in the view of the Contractor, the weed growth had not been curtailed sufficiently in the previous year, resulting in the need to deal with weeds around obstacles. Whilst we were informed that the weed control contract was in place and that work had been done, this is clearly an issue. We suggest, therefore, that City Services look at the arrangements around weed control to ensure that any issues are resolved for next year.

## **RECOMMENDATION 19**

**That City Services review the arrangements around weed control to ensure that any issues are resolved for next year.**

- 3.59 As Elected Members, we feel that on occasions it would be beneficial to have direct contact with the service provider, as would be the case for in-house services. We feel that, whilst City Services need to maintain control over the performance information, Members should have access to the Contractor to discuss local delivery issues.

## **RECOMMENDATION 20**

**That City Services develop and arrangement with the Contractor to allow direct access for Ward Members to the service provider, whilst continuing the appropriate performance monitoring.**

## **4.0 CLOSING COMMENTS**

- 4.1 Throughout this inquiry we have been disappointed with the level of communication and co-operation between parties, particularly within the Council. We have not focused on the detail of this as our recommendations are aimed at improvements to the process. However, we feel that in summary we should underline the 'closer working, better services' ethos to which we as an Authority subscribe. The Contractor felt the effects of this 'separateness' of departments and has suggested that we should "ensure that there is, so far as is possible, unanimity of purpose amongst different council departments."
- 4.2 There are probably details of the project management process which we have not been able to cover. Our recommendations cover the major issues. We also feel that the apparent disunity between departments is a serious issue which needs addressing at the highest level. We would suggest that, for completeness, the Chief Executive looks further into these issues and other aspects of this inquiry which may need further work. Whilst we understand that the Chief Executive will be interested in those areas of corporate significance (such as how departments relate to each other) we would also suggest the following detailed issues need further inquiry; how the risk assessment influences decision making, the process of choosing the Contractor, the level of communication with the Contractor particularly with regard to the length of time allowed for mobilisation.

## **RECOMMENDATION 21**

**That the Chief Executive looks further into the issues raised in the inquiry**

- 4.3 What has been encouraging is that the inquiry has allowed contributors to understand their role in the process and whilst acknowledging where the

process went wrong, a number have provided the Board with positive suggestions for improvement for the future.

- 4.4 Having discussed many of the 'technicalities' of the project we feel that much of the argument boils down to the inadequate communication between departments, the lack of a shared approach to responsibility and leadership during this sensitive period. Although we can pinpoint errors and omissions in various quarters, this must be regarded as a corporate failure.
- 4.5 However, this experience must be put into context and once the service fully recovers the Council and its customers will benefit from this arrangement. We hope that good relationships and co-operation between departments and with the Contractor will be considered an important aspect of service improvement.
- 4.6 Finally, this has been an unusually detailed inquiry involving a number of voices and views. We have also attempted to undertake the work as quickly and efficiently as possible. We would like to thank all those who have taken part for their time and the information they have provided and for answering with clarity the numerous questions asked by the Board.

**Report Agreed by the Board on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2005**

**Chair of Scrutiny Board: Cllr Anderson**

---

**Report of the Director of Development**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: A6120 RING ROAD ROUTE STRATEGY**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

All wards adjacent to the A6120

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

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

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A study of the A6120 Ring Road has been completed by Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick consultants.

The consultant's final recommendations are for a Highway Investment Scenario aimed at an eventual upgrading of the Ring Road to dual carriageway throughout, including a bypass of Seacroft and Cross Gates and a potential road link to Leeds Bradford Airport. This would be accompanied by investment in public transport priorities at radial junctions and the provision of park and ride and interchanges along the route together with enhancements to the provision made for pedestrians and cyclists.

The estimated cost of the recommended scenario is £165 million and has an economic benefit cost ratio (BCR) of 2.82 to 1. This option received the highest level of consultation support, 45% of respondents. Alternative lower cost "Best Use" and "Balanced" scenarios for the route were also developed, however these options did not yield a positive BCR.

Issues of project phasing and timing which reflect the likely need and urgency for implementation of the various elements of the strategy, along with community views, will need to be considered if a scheme meeting regional and national policy and funding criteria is to be achieved.

Further work is now necessary to examine and develop these proposals to a greater level of detail. This will review the value for money, affordability and priorities for future works, prior

to the development of the comprehensive business case that will ultimately be required as the basis for seeking Government funding.

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 This report informs the Executive Board as to the consultant's final recommendations from the study of the A6120 Ring Road route which was completed in October 2005. It outlines proposals for the further development of the work towards the preparation of appropriate submissions to the Regional Transport Board and the Department for Transport.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2.1 The Local Transport Plan 2001-06 identified in July 2001 the need for a comprehensive study of the A6120 route. At that time the eastern section of the route (from the A660 to M1) was a Trunk Road controlled by the Department for Transport's Highways Agency. However, the de-trunking of this route and transfer to the City Council in April 2003 made it possible for a study of the whole route from the M1 at Austhorpe to the A647 at Pudsey to be undertaken. A contract was awarded to Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick consultants (SWK) in February 2003 to undertake this work.

2.2 The study has comprised three stages:-

- Stage 1, baseline assessment (Completed October 2003)
- Stage 2, strategy development (Completed June 2004)
- Stage 3, final strategy selection (Completed October 2005)

2.3 A multi-modal approach to the review has been followed in line with the Government's guidance and technical advice, taking account of the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan. The study has analysed traffic and transport issues, including the development and expansion of the Council's SATURN highways model and Metro's TRIPS public transport model to allow the testing and identification of appropriate strategies and measures for the route.

2.4 In view of the increasing importance of Leeds Bradford International Airport to the City and Region it was also agreed that the study should examine the potential for a road link between the A6120/A65 and the airport. This proposal has been identified in the Vision for Leeds and has subsequently been included within the draft Airport Masterplan which is currently out to public consultation.

2.5 Stage 1 reviewed the background data sources, including the analysis of traffic surveys to provide a greater understanding of journey patterns. Some key findings were as follows:-

- Relatively short length of journeys on the ring road, 6km on average as part of longer journeys with less than 5% of traffic travelling 15km or more on the route.
- Clear peaks and daily variations in traffic flow which emphasise the role of the route in peak periods for commuting.
- Daily traffic flows vary between just under 20,000 vehicles per day up to 38,000 vehicles per day on the busier sections of the route.
- Lorries account for between 2.5% and 6% of the total traffic flows on the route.
- Traffic analysis shows that most congestion problems relate to junctions rather than any capacity issues with the road links in between.
- Analysis of road injury rates indicates that only one of the 5 sections of route exceeds the national average.

- Details of from the Council's "sites for concern" show 14 junctions along the route with 11 or more accidents recorded over the last four years
- At various locations there are local nature and ecological sites where more detailed consideration will be needed before finalising schemes.

2.6 From the baseline assessment which included the results of the initial public consultation, it was concluded that the main functions of the route were, in order of importance, accommodating: local distribution and access traffic; commuting; access to the airport; and strategic long distance journeys. The analysis also provided confirmation and quantification of the key problems and issues associated with the route as follows:-

- Congestion at main radial junctions.
- Safer road crossings (for vulnerable road users i.e. pedestrians etc).
- Transport and environmental impacts on communities.
- Public transport routes and timings.
- Link stress factors (i.e. the propensity for congestion to be caused by inadequate road capacity between junctions).
- Accommodating growth (in terms of new development and the economy).
- Airport access.
- Provision of cycling facilities.
- Accident hotspots at junctions.

2.7 Using the detailed baseline information assembled from Stage 1, Stage 2 of the study reviewed a wide range of possible strategy to assemble a "long list" of possible options. A sift through this list to test the measures' "fit" with local and national transport objectives was then used to identify the most promising options. During this process a number of high level interventions were considered and discarded, these included:-

- New highway route off-line – considered to be both too expensive with potentially very major impacts on property and the environment without a corresponding justification in strategic terms.
- Grade separated route – a highly expensive option with intrusive construction which was neither justifiable in terms of the function of the route or in keeping with the suburban setting.
- Dedicated bus priorities along the route – the modelling did not shown any substantive case for such measures along the orbital route.

2.8 The outcome of Stage 2 was that three contrasting strategy and investment scenarios were identified for detailed testing and analysis in the final Stage 3 process. These are summarised below:-

Scenario 1 – Best Use (Low investment). Maximises use of the existing highway with targeted improvements to major junctions, improvements for other users and a public transport package comprising interchanges and park and ride. Cost £41m.

Scenario 2 – Balanced package (Medium investment). Similar to (1) but includes a single carriageway bypass to Seacroft and Cross Gates and a link road to the airport Cost £94m.

Scenario 3 – Highway investment (High investment). Upgrading of the full A6120 route to dual carriageway with associated junction improvements, dual carriageway bypass to Seacroft and Cross Gates and airport link. Cost £165 m.

2.9 The proposed public transport interventions, which assume the provision of radial bus priority measures at all the key junctions but not on the main line of the Ring Road,

are common to all three scenarios. Similarly the provision for park and ride sites has been included within all the scenarios. The consultants also evaluated the case for augmenting the level of orbital bus services along the Ring Road. Sensitivity tests on different service levels showed that whilst increasing service frequency improved bus use (a doubling of service frequency increases ridership by 50%), this is against a very low user base and had an insignificant impact on overall travel mode share and journey making in any of the scenarios.

2.10 Each Scenario has been tested using the transport models and appraised in detail in terms of the economic benefits for travellers and road injuries. An appraisal of the non-transport related impacts such as noise; ecology, heritage and community implications formed part of this process. This was then drawn together in an evaluation which weighed all the impacts of each scenario to identify the most advantageous solution.

### **3.0 PROPOSALS**

3.1 On the basis of the study the consultants have recommended Scenario 3 – Highway Investment (see figure LTP1 appended). This recommendation is made on the following basis:-

- The only option with a positive economic case.
- Closest fit with the study and strategy objectives.
- Best fit in terms of addressing the key issues and problems.
- Beneficial traffic effects across a wide area in North Leeds.
- Greatest level of public acceptability.
- Capable of implementation on a phased basis over a number of years, targeting key locations first.

3.2 In making these recommendations the consultant has also noted that:-

- Scenario 3 attracts new traffic (+30% in the morning peak) to the Ring Road away from other roads whereas the alternative scenarios tend to reduce traffic (-35%) at the expense of growth elsewhere.
- The impacts are localised to the vicinity of the Ring Road and none of the strategies yield any major impacts on the wider strategic network (i.e. A6110, M1, M621 etc).
- Affordability cannot be fully determined as part of such a study, it is ultimately a matter for the local authority and central government.
- Further work is needed to test in more detail the impacts and benefits of a link road to the Airport.
- A bypass for Seacroft and Cross Gates may be contingent on future development proposals (Leeds UDP Review, East Leeds Extension).
- Investment in orbital public transport measures does not achieve significant changes in travel mode nor offer value for money.

3.3 As the foregoing section highlights, considerable work remains to be done before final strategy proposals can be tabled. It is considered that whilst the recommended strategy offers a solution to the problems identified in the study within the Government's cost benefit criteria, there remains considerable scope for more detailed refinement of the proposals to produce the optimum approach in terms of the combination of measures proposed, affordability and programming.

3.4 Since the study was commissioned, the Regional Transport Board (RTB) has been established to advise the Department for Transport (DfT) on the transport priorities for the new Regional Funding Allocation. Any strategy for the Ring Road will therefore ultimately be reviewed by the RTB prior to a Government decision. The precursor to any submission will be the development of a robust business case (Annex E) in line with the DfT's requirements.



It is envisaged that further work to refine the strategy and developed the proposed measures will provide the detailed basis for this.

## 4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Two detailed consultations were undertaken during the course of the study. The first stage, during July 2003, involved a series of events at venues along the A6120 designed to obtain community views and opinions on the issues and problems along the route. This was followed by a second round of events in March 2004 which presented the three possible strategy scenarios the consultants were considering for the final analysis.
- 4.2 Three newsletters were distributed to residents in the vicinity of the Ring Road route. At stages 1 and 3 this included a questionnaire to elicit local views on the matters under consideration; the first survey enquired about the issues and the second survey sought views on the three potential strategy scenarios (described in §3 above). Briefings were held for Ward Members and offered to local Community Involvement Teams/Area Committees (3 accepted). Two thousand responses were received for each of the surveys.
- 4.3 A Wider Reference Group comprising stakeholders both within and outside the Council, including community representatives, was convened to guide the work through the first two stages to the final option appraisal stage. Detailed oversight has been provided by an officer steering group.
- 4.4 No specific consultation has been conducted prior to the submission of this report. However, completion of the study now allows consideration to be given to the next stage of public consultation and engagement in the development of the final proposals.

## 5.0 RISK ASSESSMENT/ISSUES

- 5.1 It is inevitable that in a study of this scale a number of issues requiring further attention will arise. As a strategic study it was always anticipated that further refinement and detailed development would be required to reach the stage at which the strategy and in its component parts could be adopted as policy.
- 5.2 The Government expects local authorities to meet the costs for developing their own major schemes up to the full (pre-contract) approval stage (at which point a proportion of the development costs may be reimbursed by the DfT). Bearing in mind the scale of the Ring Road proposals, this could well result in considerable expense on the Council's part which needs to be quantified. It is therefore essential that before any final Annex E business case is submitted to the DfT the Council is confident of its case. In this regard a number of critical areas of risk have been identified from the final consultants report as requiring further attention:
- i. **Value for Money and affordability.** Scenario 3 was the only option to achieve a positive BCR. A robust transport economic appraisal will be a vital pre-requisite to Government funding. Whilst the figure achieved is acceptable, it is less so for single scheme and affordability terms in relation to a constrained regional transport budget and tight funding nationally. More work to refine the strategy and ascertain investment priorities and timing is essential before any funding bids are prepared.
  - ii. **Demand management.** The consultants were not asked to consider in depth the role of demand management in the strategy. Initiatives such as the Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) have emerged subsequent to the commission. Within the likely timescale of this project, Government spending plans indicate that the TIF will become the largest source

of public funding for major local transport projects and as such will be of significance in relation to the potential scale of any proposals for the Ring Road.

- iii. **Airport access.** Airport traffic is a very small part of overall Ring Road travel and therefore, bearing in mind the recent publication of the draft Airport Masterplan, it is proposed that the detailed case for a link road should now be pursued separately from the A6120 strategy. This approach will enable the whole issue of meeting the airport's future access needs, including both road and rail based public transport options, to be pursued with the Airport Company in an holistic manner as part of a longer term strategy.
- iv. **Strategy measures and traffic forecasts.** The degree of public transport integration afforded by the proposals needs further consideration in conjunction with Metro and the operators. In particular it will be necessary to test park and ride proposals in greater detail to confirm that these can indeed form a robust part of the strategy. Similarly a more detailed refinement process using the base information provided by the study is needed to assess the traffic impacts. For example the study shows only the Horsforth-Rodley and Cross Gates sections to be approaching highway link capacity and other sections of the route will not reach this stage for some time. Therefore a phased approach which tackles key junction "hotspots" as an early priority will be worthy of closer investigation.
- v. **Supertram.** A high level review of public transport options following the Secretary of State's decision on Supertram is now taking place. This provides a fresh opportunity for the wider issues of public transport priority included within the Ring Road Study to be considered within this broader context, in order that comprehensive solutions to the highway and public transport issues can be identified and developed further.
- vi. **Community impacts and public participation.** The appraisal highlights potential conflicts that dualling of the route will have on local communities. In looking at the strategy these will need to be weighed up thoroughly against the alternatives. This aspect will need to be taken forward as part of a future public participation strategy to place while the final strategy proposals and schemes are developed.
- vii. **Programme and phasing.** Identifying early priorities and planning a realistic delivery programme that takes account of present and forecast future resource and statutory constraints will be essential. The timing of proposals for a bypass to Seacroft and Cross Gates will need to be considered in the light of the UDP Review Inspector's Report and future proposals for the East Leeds Extension.

## 6.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 This report does not seek funding approval. Any immediate follow up study work can be carried out within existing resources and current approvals.
- 6.2 In due course, further funding will be necessary to support the necessary detailed study work and consultation required to firm up the detailed proposals, for which approval will be sought from the Director of Development separately when the financial requirements are determined. Once the detailed financial implications of the strategy are determined these will be reported to the Executive Board.
- 6.3 At the present time there is no funding in place to meet the capital costs of implementing a strategy for the A6120. Once a preferred strategy is agreed it will be necessary to prepare and submit an investment business case in line with the DfT's requirements for Government funding either through the Regional Funding Allocation or Transport Innovation Fund.

## **7.0 PROGRAMME**

7.2 There is no programming information related to this report. It is intended that a programme for the delivery of the Ring Road Route Strategy will be prepared as part of the next stage in the development of the strategy.

## **8.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY**

8.1 The content of this report is not considered to have implications under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. However, clearly individual projects will address issues for community safety as well as those of a road safety nature. As such specific implications for Section 17 will be detailed as individual project reports are brought forward.

## **9.0 COMPLIANCE WITH COUNCIL POLICIES**

9.1 The development of a long term strategy for the A6120 is consistent with the objectives of the Local Transport Plan, Vision for Leeds and Corporate Plan 2005-08. It is considered that the adoption and implementation of an appropriate strategy for the Ring Road will provide wider benefits to the community in terms of improved road safety, reduced community severance, enhanced movement and reduced congestion.

## **10.0 CONCLUSIONS**

10.1 The consultant's final recommendations are for a Highway Investment Scenario aimed at an eventual upgrading of the Ring Road to dual carriageway throughout, including a bypass of Seacroft and Cross Gates and a potential road link to Leeds Bradford Airport. This would be accompanied by investment in public transport priorities at radial junctions and the provision of park and ride and interchanges along the route together with enhancements to the provision made for pedestrians and cyclists.

10.2 The estimated gross cost of the recommended scenario is £165 million and has an economic benefit cost ratio (BCR) of 2.82 to 1. This option received the highest level of support in the study consultation, 45% of 2000 respondents. Alternative lower cost "Best Use" and "Balanced" scenarios for the route were also developed, however the benefits of these options did not yield a positive BCR.

10.3 Issues such as project phasing and timing which reflect the likely need and urgency for implementation of the various elements of the strategy along with community considerations will need to be taken into account if a scheme which meets regional and national policy and funding criteria is to be achieved.

10.4 Further work is now necessary in order to examine these proposals in detail. This will review the value for money offered and the business case for the strategy, together with options for prioritising and phasing future works.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

11.1 Members are requested to:

- i. Note the contents of this report and the findings of the consultants' study of the A6120 Ring Road.
- ii. Approve the continued development of a strategy for the A6120 Ring Road, to consider in detail the scope and extent of future proposals, their value for money and business case and the options for prioritising and phasing implementation of the potential measures.

- iii. Approve that detailed work is undertaken separately with Leeds Bradford International Airport to develop proposals for an airport link road.
- iv. Approve the preparation of a further report to Executive Board when the necessary detailed work has been completed.

## **12.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

12.1 The following documents provide background information for this report:

- i. A6120 Ring Road Route Strategy, stage 1,2 and 3 reports, Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick, October 2005
- ii. West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-06, West Yorkshire LTP partnership, July 2000

Capital Scheme No:

AGENDA  
ITEM NO.:

Parent Scheme No:

DCR Clearance No.

**Design & Cost Report**

REPORT OF Director of City Services

REPORT TO Executive Board

SUBJECT : Civic Hall Portland Crescent Entrance

Electoral Wards Affected :

Specific Implications For :

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Executive  
Function

Eligible for Call In

Not eligible for Call In

*(details contained within the report)*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report outlines proposals to remodel and refurbish the Portland Crescent Entrance at Leeds Civic Hall to provide new reception and security arrangements appropriate for the main administrative headquarters for the City of Leeds.

A Concept Study and full Feasibility Study has been completed by Architectural Design Services (ADS), Development Department and tender documentation has been prepared for advertising subject to approval of this report.

The report seeks approval to the design, an injection to the capital programme, and Authority to Spend £ 260,000 on this project.

**1.0. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inject £260k into the Capital Programme and gain Authority to Spend of the same amount on proposals to remodel and refurbish the Portland Crescent Entrance at Leeds Civic Hall. In addition it seeks approval to the design proposals.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 Leeds Civic Hall is the Council's main administrative headquarters and it is essential that the building continues to present the right image for a major international City. The building is Grade II\* listed building and the architecture, design and external appearance

ORIGINATORS NAME: John Kearsley  
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 24 74121

DATE: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2005  
FAX NUMBER: 2474984

is impressive. The Civic areas (Lord Mayor's accommodation and Council Chamber) also present a good impression. However, it is some time since the most used entrance to the building, Portland Crescent entrance, was refurbished and at the present time it does not provide a good first impression for the Council or the building.

- 2.2 Since the last refurbishment of the area, carried out in the 1980's, the requirements have changed. Since the implementation of One Stop Services the need for, and usage of, the Civic Hall Information Centre has dramatically reduced. Reception and waiting requirements have changed as has the need for adequate and appropriate security arrangements.
- 2.3 Members have requested that consideration be given to refurbishing and remodelling the Portland Crescent entrance. A concept study outlining the potential options for improvement was completed in April 2005. The best option was selected to be progressed through to a full feasibility study which has now been completed.

### **3.0 DESIGN PROPOSALS**

3.1 The key elements of the proposals are to:

- Open up the whole entrance area by providing a full height opening to the current Information Office.
- Create a new open plan waiting area in place of the Information Office.
- Provide a new Visitor Reception counter
- Create two small interview rooms
- Provide new security access control systems
- Refurbish whole area to an appropriate standard (including electrical, mechanical and ventilation, redecoration, carpets, floor finishes and furniture).

3.2 Drawings showing the proposed layout and a number of artist impressions of the refurbished areas are available and will be on display at the meeting.

3.3 The proposals have been discussed with relevant Officers from Planning, Development Department and an application for listed building consent has been submitted.

### **4.0 PROJECT PROGRAMME**

4.1 The feasibility study included the completion of design work and preparation of tender documentation. This work has been completed and the proposed project programme is as follows:

- Tenders Out                      20<sup>th</sup> January 2006
- Tenders In                        24<sup>th</sup> February 2006
- Start on Site                      15<sup>th</sup> May 2006
- Practical Completion        15<sup>th</sup> September 2006

Subject to approval of this report and receipt of suitable tenders there are no foreseeable reasons why this programme cannot be achieved.

- 4.2 Inevitably there will be some disruption to the operation of the building whilst the work is carried out. However, it is anticipated that this can be minimised by careful programming of the work and the use of alternative entrances for short periods.

## 5.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 ADS have provided a detailed pre-tender estimate for the project with a base date of 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2005. The total cost of the scheme is estimated at £226K plus fees estimated at £34K. Clearly, the final costs of the project will depend on tenders submitted.

- 5.2 The capital funding and cashflow statement is set out below:

Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme	TOTAL £000's	O MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Authority to Spend required for this Approval	TOTAL £000's	O MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	168.5			162.9	5.6		
FURN & EQPT (5)	57.5			57.5			
DESIGN FEES (6)	34.0			34.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>260.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>254.4</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)	TOTAL £000's	O MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LCC Funding	260.0			254.4	5.6		
Total Funding	260.0	0.0	0.0	254.4	5.6	0.0	0.0
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

5.3 There are no significant revenue implications for these proposals. The Department's current revenue budget includes provision for staffing, maintaining and servicing this area.

## **6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

6.1 A major risk to this project is that tenders submitted exceed the budget available. There is some evidence that tender price inflation is rising due to the amount of construction work being carried out in the City. However, the project budget has been set using a detailed pre-tender estimate (base date 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2005) with most of the design work completed.

6.2 In any refurbishment project for a building of this age there is the potential for unforeseeable works to arise. The risks of such problems have been minimised through carrying out all the relevant tests and surveys as part of the feasibility study.

6.3 Difficulties may arise through the work being carried out whilst the rest of the building continues to operate normally. There is the potential for the work to disrupt other activities in the building or for delays in the project due to requests to stop work. The tender documents refer to the need to minimise disruption to the operation of the building and careful consideration will be given to detailed work plan provided by the successful contractor.

## **7.0 COMPLIANCE WITH COUNCIL POLICIES**

7.1 This project complies with Council Policies, Strategies and Initiatives, and the Council's Corporate Plan. In particular health and safety, environmental matters, equal opportunities and customer care issues have all been carefully considered in the development of the proposals.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Executive Board is requested to :

1. Approve the scheme design proposals as set out in the report
2. Approve an injection of £260,000 into the Capital Programme
3. Authorise expenditure of £260,000 on this project.

## **9.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Concept Study, Civic Hall Portland Crescent Entrance April 2005.



---

**Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods and Housing**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: The Future of ALMOs in Leeds**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

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

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report updates members of the Executive Board on progress made in the review of Arms Length Management Organisations (ALMOs) in Leeds and seeks authorisation for a ballot on future options.

**1.0 Purpose**

The purpose of this report is:

- 1.1 To update members of the Executive Board on progress made in the review of ALMOs and
- 1.2 To authorise a ballot of tenants on the future options

**2.0 Background**

2.1 A report was presented to the September 2005 Executive Board outlining reasons for a review of the ALMOs in Leeds. The report set out a number of key drivers for the need for a review. Amongst these key drivers were:

- The need for long term financial viability
- The continuing reduction in the numbers of council houses

- A report from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) on the long term future for ALMOs after they have delivered “Decent Homes”

2.2 In view of the advantages gained by the move to ALMO’s, most notably the access to decency funding, it was agreed that this would not include the option of bringing the management of council housing back to the Council. In view of the fact that Leeds has a clear strategy to achieve decency through the ALMO route, the stock transfer option is also not relevant at this present time. The review is therefore confined to considering the most appropriate organisation of ALMO’s in the city, bearing in mind the following criteria.

- Long term financial viability
- Retention of local decision making
- Continued involvement of tenants in decision making
- Ability to continue to spend the decency money
- Ability to deliver improved performance against government indicators

### **3.0 Progress Made**

- 3.1 Officers from the department of Neighbourhoods and Housing have visited all of the ALMO Boards to present the basis for the review and to stress that this is a review in which the ALMOs will be fully engaged.
- 3.2 Price Waterhouse and Coopers (PWC) were employed to make an independent assessment of the financial position based upon the position of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), ALMO business plans and certain agreed assumptions. The Council’s Strategic Landlord is currently assessing the robustness of ALMO business plan projections in order to ensure they are deliverable and accurate. The PWC report confirmed the need for a review and identified a projected overspend of £11.8m by 2010. This report has now been shared with the ALMO chief officers. Two further factors are affecting the financial viability of the ALMO’s. The ODPM have announced the housing subsidy determination for 06/07 since the work by PWC was completed. The determination, which worsens the situation, will add further pressures of £2m per annum, based on next year’s settlement.
- 3.3 Taking all these pressures into account, a reduction of management and overhead costs through the review is essential if front line services to the tenants are to be protected.
- 3.4 In addition, as limited companies all 6 Leeds ALMOs are required to fully comply with FRS17<sup>1</sup> for the financial year 2005/2006. Previously disclosure was only required in the notes to the accounts but now all balances must be shown on the face of the accounts by the way of a provision for pension liabilities. The total of such liabilities at 30/03/05 was £3.4 million.
- 3.5 Officers from Neighbourhoods and Housing, along with ALMO staff, have held 12 small scale tenant consultation events to introduce the need for the review. It is planned that there will be further more widespread events as the review progresses.
- 3.6 Officers from the Council and the ALMO’s are considering a report on governance options. The report looked at different numbers of ALMO’s, from one to three, and offered options to retain local decision making. The report also considered other

---

<sup>1</sup> Financial Reporting Standard 17 is the accounting standard relating to retirement benefits.

ALMO arrangements in other cities, particularly those with large stock holdings such as Sheffield and Nottingham.

- 3.7 A project plan which outlines the timetable for the next year has been drafted and shared with the ALMO chief officers.

#### **4.0 Ballot**

- 4.1 As part of the “Going Local” project, which established the ALMOs, a ballot of tenants was held. The ballot asked tenants whether or not they wanted an ALMO in their area. Whilst this was not a legal requirement, it was felt that due to the significance of the proposed change a ballot should be held.
- 4.2 Officers have discussed the need for a ballot with officials from the ODPM. Their view is that a ballot is not a requirement as the method of service delivery, i.e. by ALMO, is not changing. It is merely the number of ALMOs that will change.
- 4.3 However, moving from six ALMOs to fewer ALMOs is still a significant shift and Members of all parties have expressed a view that they would wish to see a ballot in order to allow tenants to feel fully consulted. The leadership of the administration have now made public commitments in support of a ballot.
- 4.4 In light of these comments, the Executive Board is asked to formalise the proposal to hold a ballot. It should be noted that there will be a cost to a ballot. The cost of the ballot of tenants in 2002 was £54,372 and costs can be anticipated in this order again.
- 4.5 Subject to the Executive Board’s decision, it is proposed to inform tenants by letter of the nature of the review and the commitment to a ballot

#### **5.0 Recommendations**

- 5.1 Members of the Executive Board are asked to note the progress made in the review of ALMOs in Leeds and to request further updates.
- 5.2 Members of the Executive Board are asked to confirm that there will be a ballot of all tenants on the future options for ALMOs in the city, in line with the commitment expressed at 4.3.

**Design & Cost Report**

**REPORT OF** Director, Department of Neighbourhoods and Housing  
**REPORT TO** Executive Board

**SUBJECT:** Provision for older men with enduring alcohol problems

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">City and Hunslet</p>	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Women <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Executive Function report) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Eligible for Call In <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not eligible for Call In <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(details contained within the report)</i></p>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to:

1. Request the insertion of £1 million from the Hostels Capital Improvement Fund (allocated by the ODPM) into the Strategic Landlord (HRA) Capital Programme.
2. Request authority to spend up to £1 million to develop a hostel for older men with alcohol problems in Leeds.

**1.0. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 A need for hostel which catered for older men with significant alcohol problems was identified from research undertaken by Leeds City Council, published in 2002. There is currently insufficient specialist support for people who, due to their addiction, are likely to drink in their accommodation. This absence can lead to either inappropriate placements which can adversely affect other users, or to rough sleeping. Executive Board approved in principle that the Council should seek to develop accommodation for chronic alcoholics as part of the Homelessness Strategy, ratified in 2003.
- 1.2 Subsequently the Department of Neighbourhoods and Housing made a bid to the ODPM for capital support for the project. ODPM have now confirmed that they will provide £1m for the scheme.
- 1.3 Subject to the approval of the Executive Board, the Supporting People Commissioning Body, which has recognised the gap in provision within the city, has agreed to provide revenue funding for this service. The service will be procured from a specialist independent provider, following a tendering process.

## **2.0 DESIGN PROPOSALS / SCHEME DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 The purpose of this service will be to provide 10 units of supported housing for older men with support needs relating to their long term alcohol use. Housing related support will be provided, and personal care as required. The service will provide 24 hour cover. This service will be used by older men with serious physical health issues related to their enduring alcohol use. This has been fully taken into consideration in the proposals for the building.
- 2.2 The brief is being developed in conjunction with White Young Green (consultants appointed to project manage the work). They will produce a design for customer approval prior to work starting. The work will involve refurbishing Prospect House, formerly a homeless hostel for single young men, in order to provide ten bedrooms, three of which will be on the ground floor.
- 2.3 The entire ground floor will be wheelchair accessible. Providing the downstairs bedrooms will involve building an extension in an existing footprint (there are currently some outbuildings which will be demolished). A lift will be installed to the first floor to cater for service users with impaired mobility. On the ground floor, in addition to the bedrooms, there will be an office, a one-to-one room, a lounge, a dining room, a staff kitchen, a small service user kitchen, a laundry room, a staff toilet, and a disabled access bathroom. On the first floor will be the remaining bedrooms which will have en suite toilets and showers where possible. The second floor will hold the staff sleep-in area and a manager's office.
- 2.4 The planning application for the extension is due to be submitted shortly. A one storey extension is planned. In the event that permission is not granted, the refurbishment would take place without the extension which would entail losing two bed spaces from the scheme.
- 2.5 The garden will be partially landscaped and it is intended to include scope for residents to undertake a gardening project, for example a greenhouse and shed will be included.

## **3.0. CONSULTATIONS**

- 3.1 Holbeck Police have already been consulted and are satisfied that there are no issues from their perspective. (Consultation with local ward members will take place prior to the release of the papers).

## **4.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY**

- 4.1 The proposals contained in the report have implications under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and these are as follows:- the members of the client group who will be accessing this service have sometimes been perceived as being associated with anti-social behaviour, and have also been victims of crime, particularly when sleeping rough. Providing safe and secure accommodation where service users are permitted to drink will minimise the risk of anti-social behaviour associated with this client group.

## **5.0. PROGRAMME**

- 5.1 The construction work will be carried out as part of an existing contract for building refurbishments which has already been tendered. The ODPM restrictions on when the funding must be spent do not allow sufficient time to undertake a separate tender exercise. This approach will save the council the cost of procuring a new contract. Work is due to start on site on 1 March 2006 and the estimated date of completion is 1 June 2006.

## **6.0. SCHEME DESIGN ESTIMATE**

- 6.1 The costs are estimated as follows:

Construction:	£650,000
Furniture and equipment:	£135,000
Fees (professional, planning and building regulation):	<u>£103,500</u>
Total	£888,500

- 6.2 The costs of the scheme will not be allowed to exceed the £1 million ODPM capital allocation. Cost controls are in place to ensure that the project will not go over-budget. If cost estimates increase, the scope of the scheme will be adjusted to reflect this so that spending is restricted to a maximum of £1 million.

## 7.0. CAPITAL FUNDING AND CASHFLOW

Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Authority to Spend required for this Approval	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CONSTRUCTION (3)	650.0		400.0	250.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	135.0			135.0			
DESIGN FEES (6)	103.5		60.0	43.5			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>888.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>460.0</b>	<b>428.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2005 £000's	FORECAST				
			2005/06 £000's	2006/07 £000's	2007/08 £000's	2008/09 £000's	2009 on £000's
LCC Funding			-428.5	428.5			
Government Grant	1000.0		1000.0				
Total Funding	1000.0	0.0	460.0	428.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## 8.0. REVENUE EFFECTS

- 8.1 The following table illustrates the alterations which will be necessary to the department's revenue budget:

REVENUE EFFECTS	2005/06 £000's	2006/07 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS £000'S
EMPLOYEES		£128,401 in 1st yr, then
PREMISES COSTS		£154,700
SUPPLIES & SERVICES		
EXTERNAL INCOME GENERATED		

The revenue costs will be met through the ring fenced Supporting People budget.

## 9.0. RISK ASSESSMENTS

### 9.1 Not obtaining planning permission for the extension

In this case the refurbishment would still be carried out but the service would provide 8 units instead of 10, which would increase the weekly unit cost. Planning have confirmed that change of use permission for the building is not required.

### 9.2 Unsuccessful tender process

The Supporting People Team is aware of several organisations likely to be interested in bidding

### 9.3 ODPM Funding

Funding has to be drawn down from ODPM in this financial year and as much spent as possible. Due to time constraints around planning permission (for the alterations to the building), and obtaining building regulation approval, construction work is unlikely to begin until towards the end of the financial year. However the consultants appointed by Leeds Neighbourhoods and Housing Department Property Services section to project manage the development (White Young Green) are aware of the need for work to begin as soon as possible and progress is being closely monitored.

The total cost of the project is estimated at £888,500 which leaves a contingency of £111,500, which can only be used to fund enhancements to this development, such as additional facilities to enable service users to reintegrate into the community.

## 10.0. COMPLIANCE WITH COUNCIL POLICIES

- 10.1 The tender process to select the organisation to provide this service will ensure that the organisation has an appropriate and effective equal opportunity policy. The tender process will also ensure that appropriate levels of customer care will be provided to the service users who access the project. Once operational, the service will be subject, under the terms of the contract with LCC, to Supporting People monitoring and review requirements.
- 10.2 The external consultants project managing this development (White Young Green) will ensure that there is full compliance with health and safety, and environmental legislation.

## 11.0. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Board is requested to:

1. Approve the insertion of £1 million from the Hostels Capital Improvement Fund (allocated by the ODPM) into the Strategic Landlord (HRA) Capital Programme.
2. Authorise scheme expenditure of up to £1 million to develop a hostel for older men with alcohol problems in Leeds

£0	On Land	CPRH (1)
£650,000	On Construction	CPRH (3)
£135,000	On Furniture & equipment	CPRH (5)
£25,000	On Internal Fees	CPRH (6)
£78,500	On Other Costs	CPRH (7)

---

**£888,500 TOTAL**

---

---

**Report of the Director of Learning and Leisure**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: The Charging Policy for Early Years Service**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

---

**1.00 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to:

- Seek approval to proceed with proposed changes to the charging policy for Early Years Services with effect from April 3rd 2006

**2.00 BACKGROUND**

2.01 In December 2004 the Chancellor published a pre budget report "Choice for parents, the best start for children: a ten year strategy for childcare." This report was considered by Executive Board in January 2005. The strategy seeks to make work pay but is clear that working parents will be expected to pay the costs of childcare regardless of income. Parents on modest or low incomes are supported by an increase in the childcare element of working tax credit (WTC) to £300 per week in April 2005 and an increase in the proportion of fees that can be claimed from 70% to 80% in April 2006. On the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2005 Executive Board approved a report setting changes to the charging policy for Early Years services in line with the strategy and the outcome of the Best Value Review of the Early Years Service.

2.02 The proposed changes accepted by Executive Board in January 2005 reflected the first change which came into force in April 2005 and approved an increase in minimum fee from £25.50 to £60 per week which has resulted in £400k additional income to Leeds City Council. This large increase only resulted in small additional charges to families on modest or low incomes who were eligible for the increased WTC childcare element. The changes to the charging policy did not result in any changes to the number of working parents using the service. This represented the first move towards more realistic fees and a clear targeted strategy to ensure that Leeds City Council fee subsidy rests with those



most in need.

- 2.03 This report seeks to revalorise that charging policy to take account of the second proposal in the 10 year strategy that increases the proportion of childcare fees that can be claimed by parents eligible for WTC childcare element. This will place subsidy directly into the wages of families on low and modest incomes to support the realistic costs of childcare. The percentage will rise from 70-80% in April 2006. The proposed increases to the lowest two bands will not result in any increase in costs to parents and parents with a child eligible for Nursery Education Grant (NEG) will pay less as their entitlement to a free 2 ½ hour educational session is to be extended from 33 weeks to 38 weeks as from April 2006. The increased charges will be repaid to the parent directly into their salary through the childcare element of working tax credits or through a fee adjustment for children in receipt of NEG.

### **3.00 PRINCIPLES UNDERPINNING EARLY YEARS CHARGING POLICY**

- 3.01 The principles underpinning the Early Years charging policy remain the same as those approved by Executive Board in January 2005:
- High quality provision must be maintained to promote positive outcomes for children and families and combat child poverty and exclusion
  - The fee structure should be fair and more closely represent the cost of a place in the centres.
  - The subsidy in the Early Years charging policy should impact where it is most needed. Families on modest or low incomes and lone parents accessing employment should receive subsidy but the fee level should be realistic.

### **4.00 PROPOSALS**

- 4.01 The proposed new charging policy is consistent with these principles and is attached as appendix 1
- 4.02 It is proposed to set the minimum fee at £90 per week, a charge that remains lower than any in the private or voluntary sector and represents 65% of actual cost of the provision. Working tax credits plus additional nursery education grant the term after the child's 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday would ensure that parents on low incomes are reimbursed 80% of the fees charged. Previously parents were reimbursed 70%. This would ensure that although the nursery fee will increase by 50% the parent entitled to the childcare element of working tax credit will be not pay more.
- 4.03 **It is proposed to set the maximum fee at £135 per week.** This represents a 3.85% rise. The charging rates in the private sector average £145 per week.
- 4.04 **It is proposed to raise band 2 and 3 to £120 and £125 per week respectively.** Although the Band 2 nursery fee will increase by 33%, parents entitled to the childcare element of working tax credit will pay approximately 50 pence less per day. Charges for parents in band 3 will increase by 4.17%.
- 4.05 **It is proposed to retain the power to waive fees in cases of hardship or where difficulties could result in parents leaving training or employment.** It is felt that the discretion to waive fees for limited and negotiated periods to prevent families experiencing hardship is a critical element to safeguard high quality childcare to parents, particularly lone parents seeking to access or maintain access to training or employment. The service has supported approximately 60 parents in this way from April 2005
- 4.06 Taken overall the proposed changes to the charging policy are estimated to raise income receipts in 2006/07 by £350K based on the current profile of users and pattern of usage adjusted for the impact on demand of price changes. Most of this increase will be reimbursed to parents through tax benefits, and the income will be coming to the council from HM Treasury via parent users.

## **5.00 CONSULTATION**

- 5.01 The Early Years Service continues to consult with service users on the issue of charging policy. No parent user wished to see the fees rise although many full fee payers are surprised at the level of the minimum fee.
- 5.02 The Early Years Service has consulted with partners in the private and voluntary sector. They believe the level of subsidy in our minimum fee precludes them developing services within the areas of social disadvantage. The proposed changes to the charging policy would enable more childcare providers to develop providing more choice to customers
- 5.03 The service has consulted with other core cities to see how our charging policies align. Kirklees and Manchester currently charge a single fee of £24 and £21.20 per day respectively regardless of family income. Birmingham charge between £18 and £24 per day. Liverpool charges between £21- 26 per day. Sheffield charge £30 per day. We are proposing a minimum fee of £18 per day and a maximum fee of £27 per day depending on family income. Our charging policy remains in line or favourable by comparison with other core cities and neighbours.
- 5.04 Early Years and Children's Centre managers have been involved in drafting and forming these proposals. They consider the proposals to be operationally sound provided that they retain a power to address possible hardship or families coming out of training or employment or using less high quality services. We believe that a procedure for hardship reliefs will ensure that in the early stages of change no family is disadvantaged .

## **6.00 TIMETABLE AND PROCEDURES**

- 6.01 The Early Years Service will need to publish and inform parents and service users of any changes to the charging system in late January 2006 so that the new charges can be incorporated into their Working Tax Credit assessment prior to April 2006 . The information provided will include new rates and scales and eligibility for the Working Tax Credit , childcare element. Additional support will be given in the centres to families when completing Working Tax Credit forms. The centre managers will complete fee reduction forms for any families who they believe will be placed in hardship by the changes. These will be considered by the Head of Early Years and Finance for Learning and Leisure.

## **7.00 IMPACT OF PROPOSALS ON FAMILIES**

### **7.01 Families paying the minimum fee.**

There will be no additional cost to parents entitled to the childcare element of WTC The minimum fee will rise by £6 per day but parents will receive all of that increase in their salaries (WTC childcare subsidy). If their child is over the age of three and entitled to NEG, they will be 9 pence per day better off.

### **7.02 Families paying the Band 2 Nursery Fee**

Parents entitled to the childcare element of working tax credit will be better off. Although the fee will increase by £6 per day, the parent will receive an additional £6.60 per day in working tax credit or £6.62 per day if also entitled to NEG.

### **Families paying the Band 3 Nursery Fee**

The additional cost to parents is £1 per day though this will be offset for those parents who are entitled to the childcare element of working tax credit and will be offset by 76 pence per day for all parents if they are entitled to Nursery Education Grant.

7.04 **Families paying maximum fee.**

The additional cost to parents is £1 per day. This is will be offset for those parents who are entitled to the childcare element of working tax credit and will be offset by 80 pence per day for all parents if they are entitled to Nursery Education Grant.

**8.00 RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.01 Executive Board is recommended to:-

- Approve the proposed changes to the charging policy for Early Years Services from 3rd April 2006 as set out in Section 3.00 above and detailed in Appendix 1

1.1.1 Background Papers

**APPENDIX 1 . CHILDREN'S CENTRE LOCALITY SHEET PHASE 2 AND 3  
2006-10**

**PHASE 2 : LOCALITIES IN SUPER OUTPUT AREAS IN THE 30% MOST  
DISADVANTAGED - 24 centres with enhanced core offer to be  
developed by March 2008**

WEDGE	COMMUNITY	CONSULTATION RECOMMENDATION
NORTH EAST	Meanwood	2 sites developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carr Manor</li> <li>• Scotthall EYC with Potternewton/ Miles Hill</li> </ul>
	Alwoodley	Inconclusive- additional consultation
	Chapelallerton	TecNorth in partnership with Bracken Edge
	Harehills (2)	Shepherds Lane with Bankside PS
NORTH WEST	Horsforth	Inconclusive- additional consultation
	Yeadon	Queensway PS
	Otley	Ashfield PS linked with St Josephs
	Kirkstall	Beecroft/ Sacred Heart
EAST	Gipton	2 sites developed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wykebeck</li> <li>• Henry Barran/ Oakwood PS</li> </ul>
	Osmondthorpe	Victoria PS linked with Doreen Hamilton
	Swarcliffe	Langbar EYC- linked to Swarcliffe and Grimes Dyke PS
	Kippax	Kippax cluster- hub centre Ashtree or North
SOUTH	Morley	Morley Victoria
	Rothwell	Rose Farm EYC
	East Ardsley/ Robin Hood	Rodillian High School
	Driglington/ Gildersome	Gildersome PS
	Tingley	Inconclusive- additional consultation
WEST	Pudsey	Southroyd PS
	Farnley/ Wortley	Farnley Park- work with

		Education Leeds
	New Wortley	Castleton PS
	Swinnow	Swinnow PS
	Whingate	Inconclusive- further consultation

**PHASE3 : LOCALITIES IN SUPER OUTPUT AREAS IN THE 70% MORE ADVANTAGED - 20 centres with reduced core service offer to be developed by March 2010**

<b>WEDGE</b>	<b>COMMUNITY</b>	<b>CONSULTATION OUTCOME</b>
<b>NORTH EAST</b>	Wetherby	Crossley Street
	Shadwell / Wigton Moor	Wigton Moor PS
	Wetherby Villages	Bardsey PS
	Elmet Villages	Barwick PS
	Moortown	Talbot PS/ Moor Allerton Hall-
	Boston Spa	Primrose lane
	Roundhay	NE SILC
<b>NORTH WEST</b>	Guiseley	Guiseley Infants
	Adel	A linked development to both PS
	Headingley	Inconclusive – further consultation
	Cookridge	Iveson PS
<b>EAST</b>	Garforth	Garforth Community college linked to Firthfields
	Great and Little Preston	Great and Little Preston PS
	Temple Newsam	Whitkirk
	Whinmoor	Fieldhead Carr/ Oakdale
	Cross gates	St. Theresa's
	Methley	Inconclusive- further consultation
<b>SOUTH</b>	Oulton/ Woodlesford	Inconclusive- further consultation
<b>WEST</b>	Calverley/ Rodley	Inconclusive- further consultation
	Farsley	Springbank / Farfield

## Appendix 2

### Comparison of Nursery Fees between 2005/06 and 2006/07

Bandings	2005/06	2006/07
	£	£
Band 1	12.00	18.00
Band 2	18.00	24.00
Band 3	24.00	25.00
Band 4	26.00	27.00

### Illustration of Fee Increase on Parents in Bands 1 and 2

Parent Entitled to the Working Tax Credit Childcare Element		
	2005/06	2006/07
Nursery Fee (Daily Rate)	£12	£18
Working Tax Credit	£8.40 (70%)	£14.40 (80%)
Parent Pays	£3.60	£3.60
cost neutral to parents		
	2005/06	2006/07
Nursery Fee (Daily Rate)	£18	£24
Working Tax Credit	£12.60 (70%)	£19.20 (80%)
Parent Pays	£5.40	£4.80
parents gains 60p per day		

Parent entitled to wtc childcare element and Nursery Ed Grant		
	2005/06	2006/07
Nursery Fee	£12	£18
Nursery Ed Grant	£1.90	£3.29
Working Tax Credit	£7.07 (70% of net fee)	£11.77 (80% of net fee)
Parent Pays	£3.03	£2.94
parents gains 9p per day		
	2005/06	2006/07
Nursery Fee	£18	£24
Nursery Ed Grant	£2.86	£4.38
Working Tax Credit	£10.60 (70% of net fee)	£15.70 (80% of net fee)
Parent Pays	£4.54	£3.92
parent gains 62p per day		

---

**Report of the Director of Learning and Leisure**

**Executive Board**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Subject: Implementing the Ten Year Strategy: New Statutory Duties and Phase 2 of the Children's Centre Plan**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In December 2004 the Chancellor published a pre budget report "Choice for parents; the best start for children. A ten year strategy for childcare". The Ten Year Strategy represents a significant change to welfare state services and is a key plank in the Every Child Matters: Change for Children agenda. The Childcare Bill will give statutory force to the proposals in the ten year strategy. The Bill proposes 4 new statutory duties to be placed on Local Authorities (LA):

- To secure sufficient childcare for children up to the September after the child turns 14
- To improve the wellbeing of children aged 0 to 5 and establish a proactive, accessible Early Years Service (EYS) focused on the under 5s.
- To secure the development of a children's centre in every locality by 2010
- To provide parents with access to the full range of information they need as parents of children aged 0 to 19

## **1.0 Purpose Of This Report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- Inform Executive Board of the proposed content and implication of the Childcare Bill.
- Approve the children's centre phase 2 plan where consultation has been conclusive
- Advise on the further development of extended services, particularly childcare and family support, on school sites

## **2.0 Background Information**

2.1 In December 2004 the Chancellor published a pre budget report "Choice for parents; the best start for children. A ten year strategy for childcare". The implications of this report were discussed at Executive Board in January 2005. The Chancellor's report included proposals to:

- Develop a children's centre in every community by 2010
- Establish childcare on school sites for children aged 3 to 14, 48 weeks a year from 8 am till 6pm
- Increase the number of hours of free early education from 12 to 15 with the aspiration of a further increase to 20 hours in 2010
- Provide an integrated information service for children, young people and families
- Ensure that Local Authorities become childcare market managers
- Change the inspection and regulation framework
- Increase the childcare element of working tax credit
- Increase allowances for parental leave

2.2 The Ten Year Strategy represents a significant change to welfare state services for children and families and is a key plank in the Government's Every Child Matters: Change for Children agenda.

2.3 In November 2005 the Government published the Childcare Bill which will give legislative force to many of these proposals. All new duties in this proposed legislation will impact upon CPA and be key indicators with the JAR. The Childcare Bill covers four key elements of the Ten Year Strategy.

- Securing sufficient childcare
- Information to parents
- Reform to the regulation and inspection framework
- Quality assurance

The new statutory duties for LAs are located in the recommendations for securing sufficient childcare and information to parents:

## **3.0 Securing Sufficient Childcare**

3.1 The Bill proposes a new duty to be placed on Local Authorities (LA) to secure sufficient childcare for children up to the September after the child turns 14. The LA will need to assess:

- the local childcare market
- parental need and demand
- respond to parental complaint on sufficiency
- include data on neighbourhood level population, income and labour market information, OFSTED reports as well as surveys
- give specific regard in this assessment to the needs of lower income families and families with disabled children
- need for childcare with atypical hours

The LA will be judged by the sufficiency of childcare that is registered by OFSTED, on school sites, managed by schools, or eligible for the OFSTED Childcare register.



- 3.2 The legislation assumes that as a result of the 10 Year Strategy MOST childcare for school age children will be linked to an extended school, although not necessarily provided by it, and that all schools will be fit for purpose and able to respond to demand for childcare in the communities they serve.
- 3.3 The legislation secures a children's centre for every community and provides certainty that children's centres will be a sustained and secure part of the mainstream education provision.
- 3.4 LA's will have a new duty to improve the wellbeing of children aged 0 to 5. The implementation of that duty will be taken forward with the active engagement of the Children's Trust and Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and must be evidenced in the strategic planning for the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP). The duty is supported by a statutory requirement for LAs to establish a proactive, accessible Early Years Service (EYS) focused on the under 5s. Early years provision is defined in the bill as childcare including education and other supervised activities.

The legislation gives statutory status to guidance on the children's centre delivery model. The legislation sets out the required elements of an EYS to ensure access to integrated early learning and childcare, parenting and family support, and health including maternity services. The key elements of delivery style specified in the legislation are around partnership and participation and services must be integrated, actively reach out to children and families and include community and parental involvement in planning and delivery.

- 3.5 As a result of the new duty, Local Authorities will effectively become childcare market managers. It is not clear what levers the new Early Years Services will have to steer a mixed economy market that includes schools, the private, voluntary and independent sector beyond the duty to co-operate in the Children Act and the new OFSTED framework. It underscores the crucial role of the Sure Start Partnership (formerly EYDCP) and endorses the decision made by Leeds in 2003 not to downgrade the influence of the partnership to that of an advisory body.

#### **4.0 Information to Parents**

- 4.1 Local Authorities currently discharge the duty to establish and maintain a service providing information to the public about childcare and related services in the area. Under the proposed legislation this will be expanded and will require LAs to ensure that parents with children aged 0 to 19 have access to the full range of information they need as parents. This links with the proposals in the youth matters green paper. LA plans for facilitating the childcare market and securing early childhood services and information to parents must be included in the CYPP.
- 4.2 This proposal will significantly increase the scope and range of statutory responsibilities currently undertaken by the Children's Information Service. (CIS). The CIS in Leeds is an award winning service. It has led on the development of the multi agency Children and Family Resource Directory in partnership with Social Services, Health and Leeds Children's Fund. Leeds is strategically well placed to expand the CIS and meet the new requirements. It may be timely to review other web based systems for providing information to parents, children and young people in more joined up ways and consider the implications outlined in Youth Matters and arising from the extended schools programme.

#### **5.0 Progress to Date on the Children's Centre Phase 2 and 3**

- 5.1 The first phase of the Children's Centre programme in Leeds will be completed by May 2006. At that time Leeds will have 23 Children's Centres covering all of the wards of greatest disadvantage and four pockets of significant disadvantage in more affluent wards. These centres will provide approximately 1400 integrated early education and childcare

places; family support services, including health and social care to 3400 families and reach 6500 families with information and advice. The centres already open can demonstrate support to parents accessing training and employment and improved educational outcomes for children. They are also successful in encouraging vulnerable families to access services and reduce the risk of social exclusion.

5.2 In April 2005 Leeds received notification of a capital allocation of £6.7 million and a revenue allocation of £7.5 million to develop integrated children's centres for 2006/08, concentrating on development in the super output areas (SOAs) in the 30% most disadvantaged localities on the ODPM index. Phase two Children's Centre guidance was issued in August 2005 and requires Local Authorities to ensure all families living in the 30% most disadvantaged areas, as defined by the ODPM Super Output Areas, will have access to children's centre services by March 2008. This programme will be a key part of the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP)

5.3 The guidance recommends that centres be developed around existing good practice and located where possible on the site of extended Primary Schools. They should promote and facilitate the integration of other providers onto those extended school sites. This should be done on an agreed cluster model, ensuring services are provided across a neighbourhood and improving access for all families.

5.4 In Leeds this will require the development of a further 23 children's centres. The new centres must deliver a core offer that includes:

- Integrated early education and childcare for 0 to 5 year olds
- Childcare to support working parents for 48 weeks a year from 8am till 6 pm
- Early identification of children with particular needs
- Links to local extended schools and out of school hours activities
- Outreach services
- Visits to all families in the catchment area within two months of a child's birth
- Information services to parents about the range of support services in the locality
- Support and advice on parenting including support at significant transition points
- Access to specialist, targeted services for those families that need them
- Activities which increase parents understanding and involvement in their child's development
- Specific strategies and activities that increase the involvement of fathers
- Ante natal advice and support for parents
- Child health promotion programme
- Information and guidance on breast feeding, nutrition and safety
- Promoting positive mental health and emotional wellbeing- including the identification and support for those suffering from maternal depression
- Speech and language and other specialist support
- Support for healthy lifestyles
- Help in stopping smoking
- Direct parental involvement in the development and improvement of services
- Links to job centre plus and other local job placement/ ready initiatives
- Teenage Pregnancy Services

5.5 Since the publication of the Chancellor's pre budget report : " Choice for parents, the best start for children, a ten year strategy for childcare", the Early Years Service has been working with Education Leeds, Social Services, the 8 Sure Start local programmes and other partners including health, schools, and the private and voluntary sector childcare providers on shaping children's centre services. We have begun to plan for the roll out of the programme into the 30% most disadvantaged SOAs in 2006 – 08 and across the city from 2008- 10. We propose to plan the programme for all communities at the same time. Whilst priority in 2006- 08 will be to the localities of greatest disadvantage, it should not

inhibit quick wins in more affluent areas that can be made as a result of innovative thinking up to this time.

- 5.6 Working jointly with Education Leeds, the service has pin pointed the localities in the 30% most disadvantaged SOAs and isolated those that have not developed a children's centre in phase one of the programme. These represent the high priority neighbourhoods for the development of children's centres before March 2008. For these, and all other localities we have identified, we have identified the schools and other service providers and gathered information around such issues as school numbers, building condition, quality and the capacity of leadership and management to embrace the wider children's services agenda. The Early Years Service consulted with all stakeholders, including parents, in these localities through October and November 2005. Combining the outcomes of consultation and strategic planning for developments will result in firm first proposals by January. Full feasibility and costing will begin at this point. Schemes will be approved individually by Chief Officer Approval or DCR to Executive Board depending upon the scale and scope of the centre works. This work will be undertaken jointly by Learning and Leisure and Education Leeds. The proposals are outlined in **appendix 1** . Where the first consultation process has been unable to recommend a site for the children's centre, a fresh consultation will begin in January with all stakeholders.

## **6.0 Progress to Date in Developing Childcare on School Sites**

- 6.1 The Early Years Service secured agreement in principle from Leeds City Council in 2003 to the vision that no new school, PFI or conventional, should be built without the capacity for fully integrated early education and childcare services. This was extended by Education Leeds to include all major refurbishments. The notion of a network of schools fit to provide flexible services for families is an established principle in the city
- 6.2 It is likely that by 2010, 1 in every 4 -6 schools will have a children's centre functioning on site. In most, but not all localities, this will be a primary school. In any locality the other 3 to 5 schools will also be developing flexible childcare services as part of a network linked to the children's centre hub service delivery point. The same joint planning process that will identify the best location for the children's centres can be utilised to inform the development of childcare on school sites and the readiness of the school estate to deliver flexible services throughout the year. The delivery of flexible services throughout the year is the core offer of the extended schools initiative. The planning process for the LA to discharge the statutory responsibility will involve seamless working between Early Years, the current Extended Schools team, the new and existing children's centres and the extended schools clusters. This is being developed through the Children's Leeds integrating and refocusing frontline services work stream

## **7.0 Financial and Resource Implications**

- 7.1 The legislation expects the new duties on the LA to be cost neutral. Leeds City Council has a well resourced and proactive Early Years Service and we will be able to consider use of current capacity to meet the new mandates. However, it is difficult to understand how a service can move from market co-ordination to management, with a significant uplift to the CIS function and a clutch of new statutory responsibilities, without some increase in capacity. We believe cost neutral to be an optimistic prediction and are looking to the General Sure Start grant for additional Government funding.
- 7.2 The children's centre programme, the development of childcare on school sites and the changes needed to provide increased hours and flexibility for early education places are given statutory force in the Childcare Bill. This will result in changes to the way places are funded. The Government remains clear. Early education will be funded, increased in hours and made more flexible. Childcare will be paid for by parents. Those on modest or low

incomes will receive childcare tax credit of up to £300 per week to cover 70%, rising to 80%, of their childcare costs. Early intervention and preventative services delivered from within this new universal service for children and families will be funded through refocused budgets, LAAs and the integration of existing funding streams and hopefully in the long term by a reduction in the demand for acute intervention services. It is the Government's intention to make children's centres and extended schools a sustainable part of the universal welfare state offer as an early intervention and preventative strategy.

- 7.3 The capital allocation for the children's centres and extended schools does not allow the construction of all new centres. Although capital costs will vary from project to project the allocation will clearly not allow the construction of purpose built centres which are currently running at £1.4 million per 60 place centre. Extending existing sites or joining with other initiatives, such as Building Schools for the Future, represents the best option for investment.

## **8.0 Consultation**

- 8.1 Families have been consulted on the development of integrated services through the Children Leeds work stream, Sure Start local programmes, existing children's centres and EYCs and a city wide event that brought parents and key professionals together in June 2005. The Sure Start local programme management boards are working to migrate to the new children's centre management committees. A key worker from one local programme has been seconded full time to the early years Service to support the active and meaningful development of community engagement on the ground in the planning and development of the centres. Schools participating in the consultation have been involving parents in the process.
- 8.2 The Children Leeds work stream for refocusing and integrating frontline services has advised on the development of children's centres as part of the new universal offer. The programme has been integrated with the Extended School programme and officers from Education Leeds and Early Years work closely together to deliver both the 5 and 10 year strategies which are inter dependent. It is essential that both the Five and Ten Year strategies are delivered seamlessly. The development of children's centres and the development of childcare on school sites represent the majority of the core offer of an extended primary school.
- 8.3 Full community and partner consultation in the localities has been undertaken by the Area Childcare Planning and Consultation Networks through October and November. This will be widened to include other wedge based partnerships. A Children's Centre partners meeting has been convened to ensure full engagement and consultation with all key partners including , social services, health visitors, midwives and CAHMS. The consultation will also inform planning for the extended schools programme and the childcare on school sites element of the Ten Year Strategy.
- 8.4 The Early Years Planning in schools group has been fully consulted in July and September. This group is representative of schools across the city. It organised a series of 6 workshops for Headteachers on the 10 year strategy. Ninety heads attended the sessions. Schools were invited to the October / November full partner consultation. The Head of Early Years has spoken at two conferences for governors and senior managers have attended Governors meeting on request. The Head of Service has discussed the issue at Head Teachers forum.
- 8.5 Consultation with colleagues from Social Services has resulted in a proposal to develop and implement a guarantee to ensure all children and families deemed to be vulnerable can access children centre services. This will be co-ordinated across the five wedges by Social Services area managers and the Heads of larger children's centres. This will include some low and moderate risk family assessments. Each children's centre will have a named social worker and more detailed work will be carried out to identify the key gains from those Sure

Start local programmes that directly employ social workers. It is hoped that social workers will consider the posts of Head of Children's Centre attractive.

8.6 Consultation with colleagues from health services has identified the key role of health visitors, CAMHS workers, speech and language therapists and dieticians in the new universal offer delivered through children's centres and extended schools. It is hoped that every centre will have a named health professional who will be a part of multi agency teams developing on site. Consultation will continue to form up more concrete proposals. Joint children's centre and health visitors' forum meets regularly to make contacts integrate frontline services and influence strategic partners. All children's centres will have an identified health visitor and an agreement to joint planning and attendance at each other's staff meetings. It is hoped that a range of health workers will consider the posts of Head of Children's Centre attractive

## **9.0 Recommendations**

9.1 Executive Board is recommended to:

- Note the content and implications of the proposed Childcare Bill.
- Note the impact of the new statutory duties on CPA and JAR
- Consider & approve the proposals for the children's centre phase 2 roll-out programme and childcare on school sites as part of extended schools.
- Request a further report on the localities where the first consultation process has proved inconclusive

**APPENDIX 1 . CHILDREN'S CENTRE LOCALITY SHEET PHASE 2 AND 3  
2006-10**

**PHASE 2 : LOCALITIES IN SUPER OUTPUT AREAS IN THE 30% MOST  
DISADVANTAGED AND BELOW ACROSS THE CITY - 24 centres with  
enhanced core offer to be developed by March 2008**

WEDGE	COMMUNITY	CONSULTATION RECOMMENDATION
NORTH EAST	Meanwood	2 sites developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carr Manor</li> <li>• Scotthall EYC with Potternewton/ Miles Hill</li> </ul>
	Alwoodley	Inconclusive- additional consultation
	Chapelallerton	TecNorth in partnership with Bracken Edge
	Harehills (2)	Shepherds Lane with Bankside PS
NORTH WEST	Horsforth	Inconclusive- additional consultation
	Yeadon	Queensway PS
	Otley	Ashfield PS linked with St Josephs
	Kirkstall	Beecroft/ Sacred Heart
EAST	Gipton	2 sites developed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wykebeck</li> <li>• Henry Barran/ Oakwood PS</li> </ul>
	Osmondthorpe	Victoria PS linked with Doreen Hamilton
	Swarcliffe	Langbar EYC- linked to Swarcliffe and Grimes Dyke PS
	Kippax	Kippax cluster- hub centre Ashtree or North
SOUTH	Morley	Morley Victoria
	Rothwell	Rose Farm EYC
	East Ardsley/ Robin Hood	Rodillian High School
	Driglington/ Gildersome	Gildersome PS
	Tingley	Inconclusive- additional consultation
WEST	Pudsey	Southroyd PS
	Farnley/ Wortley	Farnley Park- work with

		Education Leeds
	New Wortley	Castleton PS
	Swinnow	Swinnow PS
	Whingate	Inconclusive- further consultation

**PHASE3 : LOCALITIES IN SUPER OUTPUT AREAS IN THE 70% MORE ADVANTAGED ACROSS THE CITY - 20 centres with reduced core service offer to be developed by March 2010**

<b>WEDGE</b>	<b>COMMUNITY</b>	<b>CONSULTATION OUTCOME</b>
<b>NORTH EAST</b>	Wetherby	Crossley Street
	Shadwell / Wigton Moor	Wigton Moor PS
	Wetherby Villages	Bardsey PS
	Elmet Villages	Barwick PS
	Moortown	Talbot PS/ Moor Allerton Hall-
	Boston Spa	Primrose lane
	Roundhay	NE SILC
<b>NORTH WEST</b>	Guiseley	Guiseley Infants
	Adel	A linked development to both PS
	Headingley	Inconclusive – further consultation
	Cookridge	Iveson PS
<b>EAST</b>	Garforth	Garforth Community college linked to Firthfields
	Great and Little Preston	Great and Little Preston PS
	Temple Newsam	Whitkirk
	Whinmoor	Fieldhead Carr/ Oakdale
	Cross gates	St. Theresa's
	Methley	Inconclusive- further consultation
<b>SOUTH</b>	Oulton/ Woodlesford	Inconclusive- further consultation
<b>WEST</b>	Calverley/ Rodley	Inconclusive- further consultation
	Farsley	Springbank / Farfield

<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>
<b>Originator:</b> Richard Stiff
<b>Telephone:</b> 224 3749

---

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS**  
**REPORT TO EXECUTIVE BOARD**  
**DATE: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

---

**SUBJECT: Primary Review: Outcome of Statutory Notices for the Reorganisation Proposal in Headingley**

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform Executive Board of the outcome of the statutory representation period for the reorganisation of primary provision in Headingley.

1.2 The report provides a summary of the representations received in respect of the statutory notice to close Headingley Primary School and St Michael's Church of England (Aided) Primary School in August 2006 and to establish a one form of entry voluntary controlled Church of England primary school in the current St Michael's building in September 2006.

### **2.0 The Issue: Statutory Representations**

2.1 No statutory representations have been received.

### **3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3.1 Based on the 2004-5 school budgets, there would be an annual revenue saving of approximately £120,000 from the closure of Headingley Primary School and an annual revenue saving of approximately £128,000 from the closure of St Michael's Primary School. This would be reduced by approximately £120,000 due to the creation of the new 1FE primary school to accommodate existing pupils.

3.2 There may be a need for some temporary accommodation on the St Michael's site to manage a bulge of pupils over the next two to three years when the pupils at both schools come together. This would be funded as part of the transition costs. It is anticipated that some long-term improvements will be made to the St Michael's building, funded through access to a capital receipt from the Headingley building.



## **4.0 Recommendation**

### **4.1 Executive Board is invited to:**

- i) Agree to proceed with the proposal to close Headingley Primary School and St Michael's Church of England (Aided) Primary School on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2006.
- ii) Note that these proposals are linked to a proposal promoted by the Church of England Diocese to establish a new one form of entry voluntary controlled Church of England school on the St Michael's site in September 2006 and this is reflected in the publication of a joint notice with the Diocese.
- iii) Under current regulations, any proposal for structural change to provision promoted by the Diocese has to be determined by the School Organisation Committee. Therefore the determination of the linked notice falls to the School Organisation Committee.



**AGENDA ITEM:**

**Originator:** Richard Stiff

**Telephone:** 224 3749

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS  
REPORT TO EXECUTIVE BOARD  
DATE: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**SUBJECT: Primary Review: Outcome of Statutory Notices for the Reorganisation Proposal in Headingley**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Headingley, Kirkstall

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People


**Please indicate that the following have been addressed within the report:**

**Resource Implications:**

Finance

Personnel

Accommodation/Buildings

✓
✓
✓

**Policy Implications:**

--

Executive Board Decision

✓
---

Eligible for Call-in

✓
---

Not Eligible for Call-in

--

**1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of the report is to inform Executive Board of the outcome of the statutory representation period for the reorganisation of primary provision in the Headingley Planning Area.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

**2.1** At its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2005, the Executive Board agreed the publication of a statutory notice to close Headingley Primary School and St Michael's Church of England (Aided) Primary School on 31st August 2006 and to establish a one form of entry primary school in the current St Michael's building on 1st September 2006.

**2.2** The objective of the reorganisation proposal is to address the long-term viability of schools in the Headingley Primary Planning area, which comprises Headingley, Springbank, and St Michael's Church of England (Aided) Primary Schools. Headingley Primary school has seen rapidly declining numbers in recent years and St Michael's is experiencing a similar decline. Headingley Primary is located on an extremely restricted site in a building not well suited to delivery of the modern curriculum. The majority of pupils at both of the schools actually live nearer to other schools and travel some distance to the two schools.

### **3.0 The Issue: Statutory Representations**

3.1 No statutory representations have been received.

### **4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 Based on the 2004-5 school budgets, there would be an annual revenue saving of approximately £120,000 from the closure of Headingley Primary School and an annual revenue saving of approximately £128,000 from the closure of St Michael's Primary School. This would be reduced by approximately £120,000 due to the creation of the new 1FE primary school to accommodate existing pupils.

4.2 All children on the roll of Headingley and St Michael's Primary Schools at the time of closure will automatically be offered a place in the new school on the St Michael's site. Current accommodation on the site is sufficient for 210 pupils and there may be a need for some temporary accommodation to manage a bulge of pupils over the next two to three years. This would be funded as part of the transition costs.

4.3 The Headingley Primary School site would be declared surplus to educational requirements if this proposal proceeds. The intention is that a capital receipt generated from the site would be used to fund long-term improvement works on the St Michael's Primary School site. A business case would be developed to identify how the potential costs of spending in advance of the capital receipt would be funded. There is, however, a potential for the building to be retained by the City Council for public service provision and/or community use.

### **5.0 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The review of primary provision fulfils the LEA's statutory requirement to keep under review the supply and demand of school places.

5.2 The proposal to close Headingley and St Michael's Primary Schools is a linked proposal with the Church of England Diocese's proposal to establish a new voluntary controlled primary school on the St Michael's site. Any proposals of this nature promoted by the Diocese have to be determined by the School Organisation Committee. The statutory notice that linked the proposals expired on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2005. The statutory process requires the LEA to formally place the proposal before the School Organisation Committee within a month of the expiry of the notice, which in this case is before 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2005.

### **6.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Equality impact assessment indicates that these proposals are not likely to have differential impacts on the basis of ethnicity or gender.

### **7.0 LINKS TO KEY PRIORITIES AND CORPORATE PLAN**

7.1 Proposals under the Primary Review reflect key priorities identified in the Education Development Plan, the Asset Management Plan and the Corporate Plan in terms of contributing to the target to reduce primary surplus places, the raising achievement agenda and improving the school estate.

## **8.0 COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF EDUCATION OFFICER**

- 8.1** Proposals for the establishment, alteration or discontinuance of schools and the determination to implement such proposals remain a function to be performed by the Council under the arrangements involving Education Leeds.
- 8.2** The arrangements require that the Council have regard to advice and draft plans where appropriate from Education Leeds when carrying out this function.
- 8.3** The normal set of considerations and decisions by Members following the close of statutory notices is to:
- (i) Consider whether there are statutory representations (if not, the Executive Board can determine the proposals unless they are linked proposals or dependent on PFI funding)
  - (ii) Consider and agree the responses to the statutory representations
  - (iii) Decide how next to proceed in the light of the representations and the information provided in response. The options being:
    - the School Organisation Committee to consider the proposals for determination; or
    - to decide to take the proposals no further; or
    - to decide on a further public consultation exercise with a revised set of options.
- 8.4** The contents of the report have been discussed with the Chief Education Officer. The Chief Education Officer feels that the report includes the points, observations and argument he would wish to be drawn to the Executive Board's attention in considering this matter.

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**9.1** Executive Board is invited to:

- 9.2** iv) Agree to proceed with the proposal to close Headingley Primary School and St Michael's Church of England (Aided) Primary School on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2006.
- v) Note that these proposals are linked to a proposal promoted by the Church of England Diocese to establish a new one form of entry voluntary controlled Church of England school on the St Michael's site in September 2006 and this is reflected in the publication of a joint notice with the Diocese.
- vi) Under current regulations, any proposal for structural change to provision promoted by the Diocese has to be determined by the School Organisation Committee. Therefore the determination of the linked notice falls to the School Organisation Committee.

---

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS  
REPORT TO EXECUTIVE BOARD  
DATE: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

---

**SUBJECT: Building Schools for the Future: Secondary Provision in Inner West Leeds**

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** This report informs the Executive Board of the outcomes of consultation on the proposal to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools to form a new high school on the West Leeds site from September 2007 and to expand Farnley Park High School from its current capacity offering an admission number of 150 to an admission number of 210.

### **2 Proposal for the future pattern of provision serving inner West Leeds**

**2.1** At its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2005, the Executive Board approved the content and submission of the Strategic Business Case (SBC) for the BSF programme. In relation to West Leeds, it was proposed to rationalise provision and provide through BSF funding one new school for inner West Leeds and to increase the size of Farnley park from 5FE to 7FE in order to effectively meet projected demographic demand. It was acknowledged that the provision of one new school in West Leeds would be subject to full consultation. The SBC was approved by DfES on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005.

**2.2** The BSF projects for West Leeds, Wortley and Farnley Park are scheduled in Phase 2 of the Leeds Wave 1 BSF programme with delivery in 2009. The deadline for approval of the Outline Business Case (OBC) for the Phase 2 BSF projects is July 2006. To deliver the projects within this timescale, the statutory process for changes to the structure of provision have to be completed before approval of the OBC.

**2.3** At its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2005, the Executive Board of the City Council approved that public consultation was undertaken on proposals to rationalise provision in the area. From 7<sup>th</sup> November until 16<sup>th</sup> December 2005, public consultation was undertaken on a proposal:

- to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools from September 2007, using existing buildings until a new school is built under BSF funding on the West Leeds site to be completed in September 2009,
- and to expand Farnley Park.

## 2.4 The report presents the main issues raised during the public consultation:

- the demographic rationale for the proposal
- opposition to the closure of West Leeds and Wortley
- managing the implementation of the proposal and alternative ways of doing so
- the impacts of disruption on standards
- the impacts of the proposal on staff
- the design process for the new school

Education Leeds has listened to the concerns expressed and has considered the alternative proposals presented. Education Leeds remains of the view that an amalgamation of West Leeds and Wortley High Schools and an expansion of Farnley Park is the appropriate way forward to reshape high school provision in inner West Leeds.

A key issue identified by the schools is the proposed implementation timescale. West Leeds and Wortley High Schools have both indicated that they would prefer to manage the transition period from 2006 to 2009 through a federation of the two schools, rather than as one large amalgamated school. The two schools would be supported throughout this period to manage the contraction of the existing schools, prior to consolidation on the West Leeds site when the new building is delivered. This will involve a staged reduction in admission limits and staff as the schools downsize.

Education Leeds therefore recommends that the proposal to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools is pursued, but that the implementation date for the amalgamation is September 2009 rather than September 2007. This was discussed with stakeholders during the consultation period. The expansion of Farnley Park to an admission number of 210 would coincide with this timeframe. On the West Leeds and Farnley Park site, the Building Schools for the Future investment programme will provide the local community with two excellent resources, offering extended school facilities.

## 3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 There would be annual revenue savings of approximately £400,000 from the net effect of reducing the number of schools in the area by one. This could be reduced by potential costs incurred through the transition period, for example to protect staff.

## 4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The Executive Board is asked to agree that statutory notices are published:
- to discontinue West Leeds and Wortley High Schools in August 2009
  - to establish a new high school on the West Leeds site in September 2009, in a new school building delivered through Building Schools for the Future
  - to expand Farnley Park High School to an admission number of 210.
- 4.2 Executive Board is also asked to note that Education Leeds will support the establishment of a federation between West Leeds and Wortley High Schools during the next academic year (2006/07).

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS**

**REPORT TO EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**DATE:** 18<sup>th</sup> January 2006

**SUBJECT: Building Schools for the Future: Secondary Provision in Inner West Leeds**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Armley, Farnley & Wortley

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People


**Please indicate that the following have been addressed within the report:**

**Resource Implications:**

Finance

Personnel

Accommodation/Buildings

✓
✓
✓

**Policy Implications:**

--

Executive Board Decision

✓
---

Eligible for Call-in

✓
---

Not Eligible for Call-in

--

**1.0 Purpose of the Report**

This report informs the Executive Board of the outcomes of consultation on the proposal to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools to form a new high school on the West Leeds site from September 2007 and to expand Farnley Park High School from its current capacity offering an admission number of 150 to an admission number of 210.

**2.0 Background**

**2.1** In February 2004 Leeds was identified as a Wave 1 Authority in the national Building Schools for the Future Programme. A total of capital £188m of investment has been secured to deliver the Wave 1 Programme which includes the rebuilding of 5 existing schools and the refurbishment of a further 9 schools.

**2.2** Investment was secured for schools serving inner West Leeds on the basis that a review of provision would be undertaken with a view to rationalising that provision in the context of falling demographic demand. The Building Schools for the Future programme has been a prime driver in considering the appropriate pattern of secondary provision across the city in the context of demographic demand. Secondary school intakes peaked in 2002 at 8,722. In January 2005 there were 8217 pupils in Year 7 and this number is projected to continue to decline year on year to around 7,500 by 2011. Inner West Leeds is currently served by three high schools: West Leeds, Wortley and Farnley Park. Key data on the schools is provided in Table 1 of the

Appendix to this report.

**2.3** At its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2005, the Executive Board approved the content of the BSF Strategic Business Case (SBC). In relation to West Leeds and Wortley, the project scope contained within the submission acknowledged that projections of pupil numbers in the local area showed insufficient children to support two schools. It was proposed to provide through BSF funding one new school for inner West Leeds and to increase the size of Farnley park from 5FE to 7FE in order to effectively meet the projected demand through a comprehensive refurbishment programme. It was acknowledged that the provision of one new school in West Leeds would be subject to full consultation. The SBC was approved by DfES on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005.

**2.4** The BSF projects for West Leeds, Wortley and Farnley Park are scheduled in Phase 2 of the Leeds Wave 1 BSF programme with delivery in 2009. The deadline for approval of the Outline Business Case for the Phase 2 BSF projects is July 2006. To deliver the projects within this timescale, the statutory process for changes to the structure of provision have to be completed before approval of the OBC. It is likely that any new build on the West Leeds site will be delivered through PFI.

### **3.0 The Issue**

**3.1** At its meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2005, the Executive Board of the City Council approved the recommendation that public consultation be undertaken on proposals to rationalise provision in the area. From 7<sup>th</sup> November until 16<sup>th</sup> December 2005, public consultation was undertaken on a proposal:

- to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools as from September 2007, using existing buildings until a new school is built on the West Leeds site in September 2009,
- and to expand Farnley Park from an admission number of 150 to 210.

**3.2** A consultation document was widely distributed to parents, staff, governors and other agencies working in the area and was made available through a number of outlets including the local library. It was also sent to 16 primary schools whose children feed into one of the three high schools. The consultation document included a pro-forma response form to encourage written responses. During this period, meetings were held with a range of stakeholders and minuted for the purposes of recording the views expressed. A copy of all written responses and the minutes from the consultation meetings are available in the Members' Library.

#### **Timetable of Consultation Meetings**

10 <sup>th</sup> November	Farnley/Wortley Forum
14 <sup>th</sup> November	Staff of Farnley Park High School
14 <sup>th</sup> November	Governing Body of Farnley Park High School
15 <sup>th</sup> November	Armley Forum
21 <sup>st</sup> November	Staff of West Leeds High School
21 <sup>st</sup> November	Governing Body of West Leeds High School
22 <sup>nd</sup> November	Governing Body of Wortley High School
23 <sup>rd</sup> November	Public meeting at Farnley Park High School
28 <sup>th</sup> November	Lawns Park Primary School
29 <sup>th</sup> November	Staff at Wortley High School
29 <sup>th</sup> November	Wortley High School
1 <sup>st</sup> December	West Leeds High School
8 <sup>th</sup> December	Inner West Area Committee
16 <sup>th</sup> December	Outer West Area Committee



The staff and governors meetings were well attended. Approximately 15 people attended the public meeting at Farnley Park and around 250 attended the public meetings at Wortley and West Leeds. A total of 129 individual responses have been received, from parents, staff, governors, pupils and other stakeholders. 2 petitions have been received, one with 215 signatories and one with 395 signatories organised by West Leeds student council. A duplicated letter was received signed by 444 pupils and other respondents opposed to the proposal.

There is considerable support for the significant opportunities that BSF provides for secondary school provision in inner west Leeds, for the wider community benefits that will ensue, and a recognition that such investment is long overdue. This support is understandably tempered in some quarters by concerns about consequences for the existing institutions and for the period of transition leading up to the opening of the new buildings and the establishment of a new institution.

The main issues raised during the public consultation are summarised in this report.

### **3.3 Demographic Rationale**

The reasons why Education Leeds and the City Council felt that there was a need to rationalise provision were questioned, in particular the underlying demographic data that supported the case for rationalisation. Whether provision would be able to absorb any future rise in pupil numbers was queried, if, for example, housing patterns changed. There was concern that the proposal was being driven by the fact that there was only sufficient funding to build one school and to refurbish Farnley Park under Building Schools for the Future.

#### **Education Leeds response:**

As part of the initial bid for Building Schools for the Future Funding, the DfES required a thorough examination of demographic projections and Education Leeds was required to submit this information as part of the general approval process for the Wave 1 BSF proposals. This demographic information was independently audited. The secondary population across the city is anticipated to fall by around 4000 pupils by 2011, as smaller intakes enter secondary schools. The projections that Education Leeds uses are generated from known children in primary schools, and reflect the fall in the primary population that Leeds has witnessed since the mid 1990s. In the Inner West area, projections suggest that the current pattern of provision will not be sustainable as the number of Year 7 pupils entering the secondary schools falls. This is the basis on which BSF funding has been allocated.

The aim of the proposal to amalgamate Wortley and West Leeds High Schools and to enlarge Farnley Park High School is to secure a strong pattern of provision for the future, with a good geographic distribution of schools in relation to where pupils live. It is acknowledged that this proposal is likely to affect a shift in preference patterns, in particular with relation to Farnley Park High School, which has seen an increasing number of first preferences in recent years. It is also intended to achieve maximum benefit from the capital resources available to provide high quality and up-to-date educational facilities.

### **3.4 Opposition to the closure of West Leeds High School and Wortley High School**

Many of the responses made during public consultation drew attention to the strengths of the existing schools, and questioned the need to take any action. The improvements that the schools have made in respect of pupil attainment and achievements were raised, and the staff at both schools were praised for their dedication and the quality of

education they deliver. Concerns were also expressed that the proposal would remove parental choice.

**Education Leeds response:**

That both schools are valued is acknowledged. However, there are not projected to be sufficient pupils for the current pattern of provision to be retained. The proposal is to amalgamate the two schools, with the intention that the new school is founded on the strengths of the two existing schools. Through an amalgamation as much continuity as possible is retained – the intention being that all of the pupils in the two schools transfer to the new school if they wish and posts in the new school (apart from the headteacher and deputy head posts) are ring-fenced to staff in the existing schools. If this proposal proceeds investment provided by BSF will enable both existing schools to shape the facilities available in the new school, building on existing strengths. Education Leeds would work closely with the temporary governing body of the new school (formed from governors of both schools) and other agencies during the transition period to plan for the development of an extended school that serves the local community.

**3.5 Managing implementation of the proposal**

Concerns have been raised that the proposal would be very disruptive to all three schools and the communities they serve. In particular there would be too many pupils at West Leeds/Wortley when the new school building is ready for occupation. The use of portakabins to house children is not considered to be acceptable. A split-site school of nearly 2000 pupils would be difficult to manage. Some pupils have said that the schools find managing the current number of pupils difficult and there is a lot of bullying and they have suggested that this will be exacerbated in a larger school.

**Education Leeds response:**

Implementation of change such as this requires very careful management. Education Leeds has developed a comprehensive process for planning and managing implementation and supports schools through the process. A transition action plan will be developed collaboratively with the schools, covering a wide range of areas, and will include strategies to mitigate against negative impacts.

It was recognised that in the amalgamated school the upper year groups are likely to be larger than the capacity of the planned new school. To some extent this is inevitable when two schools are amalgamated to form a brand new one. It will be important to work with the schools to manage this transition and to carefully consider the accommodation requirements of the new school to ensure that no child is unfairly disadvantaged.

**3.6 Impact on Standards**

Concern was expressed that the new school would have too many pupils and that this would make management very difficult. Concerns were raised that the two schools have a very different ethos and that bringing the two together would be difficult. Concerns were raised about the possible impact of disruption on pupils over the next few years and the need for a range of strategies to support teaching and learning during this period, in particular for pupils in Year 11. It was felt that the amalgamation would jeopardise some of the initiatives the schools have established to raise achievement, such as the Technology College Status that West Leeds has recently acquired. The point was also made that West Leeds High Schools has been subject to reorganisations since 1992 and that experience shows that the disruption will adversely affect pupils' attainment and employment opportunities.

**Education Leeds response:**

Education Leeds recognises that the reorganisation process is disruptive and warrants very careful management to ensure that there are minimal impacts on teaching and learning. Both existing schools will be fully involved in developing the vision for the new school and will inform the transition process. Bringing two school communities together is difficult. However, the new school formed by amalgamating West Leeds and Wortley has the potential to contribute to community cohesion by bringing people together. However, for the success of this proposal to be maximised families, pupils and staff will need to be supported throughout the transition and implementation phases and this could require additional resources.

**3.7 Impacts on Staff**

There are concerns about the impact of the amalgamation proposal on the morale of staff, who may seek jobs elsewhere if they are uncertain about their future careers. It has been suggested that a range of strategies should be considered to support the retention of good, quality staff throughout the transition period, such as financial incentives. The downsizing would lead to job losses and questions were asked about how this would be managed and how staff would be supported. Education Leeds was asked to ensure that any new posts in Farnley Park High School as it enlarges are ringfenced to staff at West Leeds and Wortley as part of the package of proposals for the area.

**Education Leeds response:**

Education Leeds acknowledges that any changes to the structure of school provision are disruptive, and in particular for staff who can feel vulnerable and uncertain about their futures. Experience in Leeds suggests that despite these concerns a fairly good degree of continuity is preserved during the transition period. There is a very limited amount of transition funding available to support schools through this process, targeted at the restructuring process. Careful and detailed processes, however, have been developed to support staff throughout the transition period. In the case of the amalgamation, all posts in the new school would be ringfenced to staff in the closing school. Staff would be supported by Education Leeds Personnel team throughout the appointment process and would be supported to seek redeployment if they are unsuccessful in obtaining a post in the new school. As part of the implementation process, Education Leeds would encourage Farnley Park High School to consider staff affected by the amalgamation for any new posts in the school as it increases in size.

It should be noted that even if the amalgamation was not being proposed, there would be a natural turnover of staff. Given the projected demographic decline in inner West Leeds, the schools would find themselves facing a need to reduce staffing in response making one or more of them increasingly unviable.

**3.8 Designing the new school**

The processes for developing the new school building project were questioned, as there is a very strong feeling that all stakeholders should be involved in the design process. A range of facilities at the new school have been suggested such as IT, art and sports facilities. There is a concern that the new building will be smaller than the existing West Leeds building. The view was expressed that a PFI school conflicts with the concept of an autonomous and self-governing high school.

**Education Leeds response:**

This proposal has been largely driven by concerns around demographic demand and the sustained educational viability of secondary schools in inner West Leeds, resolution of which will enable access to the BSF funding stream. However, as the

building project moves into the development phase a comprehensive process of engagement with all stakeholders will commence, offering the opportunity for a range of individuals and groups to contribute to the building design. This will include pupils, staff, governors and other agencies. It is important that the vision for the new school is owned by those who will use it and both Senior Management Teams and governing bodies will be directly involved in its development.

The Building Schools for the Future investment programme will provide the local community with two excellent resources offering extended school facilities on the Farnley Park and West Leeds sites. There would also be the opportunity to consider the development of the West Leeds site as a Learning Campus, offering integrated service provision. The schools will provide an inspiring physical environment in which children learn, including new technologies and the capacity to accommodate new curriculum initiatives. The design of the schools will encourage inclusive opportunities to ensure that the needs of all pupils can be met, including those with special educational needs.

### **3.9 The size of Farnley Park**

A range of views were expressed on the size of Farnley Park, from it being valued as a small school to the view that the school needed to have an admission number of 210 to be able to deliver a range of 14-19 curriculum pathways.

#### **Education Leeds response:**

Education Leeds agrees that larger schools are better placed to offer a wider curriculum offer than smaller schools. The proposal will establish two strong schools to serve the inner West area.

### **3.10 Alternative proposals**

The governors and staff of both West Leeds and Wortley expressed the preference that both schools remained open. However, Wortley and West Leeds governors suggested that if this was not an option, then federation of the two schools should be given further consideration, rather than an amalgamation in 2007. It was suggested that through a federation the two schools could collaboratively manage the transition period and the reduction in pupil numbers and staff. The amalgamation could then be effected for 2009, to coincide with delivery of the new buildings. West Leeds put forward alternative proposals to federate the two schools, with Wortley High School gradually diminishing in size until it closed in September 2009 when West Leeds moved into the new build. This was suggested as a more easily manageable route to the downsizing of provision.

#### **Education Leeds response:**

The proposal subject to consultation was one of three possible routes to achieve a reduction in the number of high schools in West Leeds. Federation of West Leeds and Wortley High Schools as an interim measure with consolidation onto the West Leeds site in September 2009 was one of the options discussed during the consultation process. Education Leeds agrees that this would be an alternative route to achieve the contraction of existing provision, but that the statutory process to establish one school on the West Leeds site should be through an amalgamation and not the closure of one school. This is the most equitable route for staff and pupils, with all staff being treated in the same way in both schools, and as such is likely to achieve the widest ownership and support for the new school from both school communities.

### **3.11 The Way Forward**

**3.12** Education Leeds has listened to the concerns expressed and has considered the

alternative proposals presented. Having considered all of the issues, Education Leeds remains of the view that an amalgamation of West Leeds and Wortley High Schools and an expansion of Farnley Park is the appropriate way forward to reshape high school provision in inner West Leeds.

A key issue identified by the schools is the proposed implementation timescale. West Leeds and Wortley High Schools have both indicated that they would prefer to manage the transition period from 2006 to 2009 through a federation of the two schools, rather than as one large amalgamated school. The two schools would be supported throughout this period to manage a contraction of provision prior to consolidation on the West Leeds site when the new building is delivered. This will involve a staged reduction in admission limits and staff as the schools downsize.

Education Leeds therefore recommends that the proposal to amalgamate West Leeds and Wortley High Schools is taken forward, but that the implementation date for the amalgamation is September 2009 rather than September 2007. This was discussed with stakeholders during the consultation period. The expansion of Farnley Park to an admission number of 210 would coincide with this timeframe. The Building Schools for the Future investment programme will provide the local community with two excellent resources offering extended school facilities on the Farnley Park and West Leeds sites.

It is intended that the statutory process for the proposals is completed by early summer 2006. If the proposals are accepted, this timescale will provide the DfES and the Treasury with their required certainty about the route to be followed to consolidate provision and would therefore enable the release of the funding. The statutory process would also be completed before any likely changes to legislation that would require a competition bidding process.

The envisaged timeframe is as follows:

**Late January – early March 2006** Publish notices – six week Statutory Representation Period

**April 12<sup>th</sup> 2006** Report to Executive Board of Leeds City Council, for determination if no objections or seeking agreement to proceed to School Organisation Committee

**April 2006** Submission to School Organisation Committee

**June 2006** Deadline for decision by School Organisation Committee

### **3.13 SEN**

**3.14** Careful management of the impact of this proposal on pupils with Special Educational Needs would be built into the implementation phase, should a proposal to change provision in this area proceed. The West SILC currently located at Farnley Park has been consulted about the proposals and welcomes the opportunities that they offer.

### **4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**4.1** There would be annual revenue savings of approximately £400,000 from the net effect of reducing the number of schools in the area by one. This could be reduced by potential costs incurred through the transition period, for example to protect staff.

### **5.0 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

**5.1** The LEA has a statutory requirement to keep under review the supply and demand of school places. Any proposals within the Building Schools for the Future Programme have been subject to analysis in respect of future demand for places.

**5.2** The recommendation of this report is to proceed with a modification of the proposal consulted upon initiates the required statutory process. The next stage in the process is the publication of a statutory notice. If objections are received during the representation period of the statutory notice, the proposal will be forwarded to the School Organisation Committee for consideration.

## **6.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

The proposals have been subject to equality impact assessment. There are no anticipated significant differential impacts on the basis of ethnicity, disability or gender associated with the proposals. The pupil populations of West Leeds and Wortley High Schools have broadly similar ethnicity – West Leeds is 83% white British and Wortley is 89% white British. A small percentage of pupils at both schools are of Indian and Pakistani origin. The amalgamation could shift the ethnic balance in local schools, but this is not likely to cause significant issues or impact on pupils' achievement.

## **7.0 LINKS TO KEY PRIORITIES**

**7.1** This proposals links to key priorities identified in the Education Development Plan, the Asset Management Plan and the Corporate Plan by contributing to targets within the raising achievement agenda and improving the school estate.

## **8.0 CHIEF EDUCATION OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

**8.1** Proposals for the establishment, alteration or discontinuance of schools and the determination to implement such proposals remain a function to be performed by the Council under the arrangements involving Education Leeds.

**8.2** The arrangements require that the Council has regard to advice and draft plans where appropriate from Education Leeds when carrying out this function.

**8.3** The contents of this report have been discussed with the Chief Education Officer. The Chief Education Officer feels that the report includes all the analysis and considerations that he would wish to be drawn to the Executive Board's attention in considering this matter.

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**9.1** The Executive Board is asked to agree that statutory notices are published:

- to discontinue West Leeds and Wortley High Schools in August 2009
- to establish a new high school on the West Leeds site in September 2009, in a new school building delivered through Building Schools for the Future
- to expand Farnley Park High School to an admission number of 210.

**9.2** Executive Board is also asked to note that Education Leeds will support the establishment of a federation between West Leeds and Wortley High Schools during the next academic year (2006/07).

## Appendix A

### Consultation responses for proposal to amalgamate West Leeds High School and Wortley High School on the West Leeds site and to enlarge Farnley Park High School

<b>Access</b>	Concerns over increased traffic near West Leeds	3
	Improved car parking and access	2
	Increased travel across Ring Road/ need improved bus links to Farnley Park	2
	Dangerous roads to cross	1
<b>Site &amp; Buildings</b>		
<b>Site &amp; Buildings</b>	Should close both sites and build on a new site	3
	Concerns of future use of Wortley High	3
	very congested around site	1
	Portacabins should not be used to house the extra pupils	16
	Open plan would be a disaster. Spend the money on improving current West Leeds buildings	6
	Too much glass in new building	2
<b>Community</b>		
<b>Community</b>	Establish one stop shop within new school	1
	School is for children, not the local community	2
	West Leeds will have high ethnic minority, Farnley Park very low	1
	Children from the two schools are rivals	28
	West Leeds has good links with local business	3
	West Leeds is at heart of local community	6
<b>Disruption to children</b>		
<b>Disruption to children</b>	Larger class sizes are detrimental to education	11
	Split sites will lead to disruption and lack of attainment	21
	Will disrupt education of children	56
<b>Facilities</b>		
<b>Facilities</b>	Wortley have just had lots of re-fitting	1
	New school should have state of art IT, sports, swimming pool	16
	No hiding places for pupils	1
	What is future of CLC?	1
	Involve local people in decisions	2
	all facilities, including sports grounds, should be on one site	3
	Could be used for adult education	3
	What about Technology college status recently achieved by West Leeds?	15
<b>Finance</b>		
<b>Finance</b>	What will happen to money from sale of Wortley?	2
	PFI status will lead to conflicts in school organisation	3
	Should use money to develop existing schools	17
	Lot of money has been spent on West Leeds & Wortley	5
	better to use taxpayers money to reduce class size	8
	Should improve Wortley instead	3
<b>Parental Choice</b>		
<b>Parental Choice</b>	Reduced parental choice, forced to use Intake	9
	Parent's choice will be over-ridden by re-organisation	6
	Will Wortley parents be able to transfer to Farnley Park?	1
<b>Process</b>		
<b>Process</b>	Keep split sites until 2009, to avoid portakabins at new school	2
	There should be no slippage in timescale	2
	Pupils should be consulted	4
	Will be demoralising working at Wortley in 2005-2009 period	1
	Some parents can't get to public meetings	1
	Proposal announced 1 month after admission forms submitted	5

<b>Pupil numbers</b>	Accept the need to address falling numbers issue	6
	Concerned about ability to accommodate future rise in pupil number	11
	Unconvinced about accuracy of demographic analysis	17
	Future housing pattern may change	5
	New school will be too big, with bad behaviour and bullying	32
	New school should be big enough to sustain a sixth form	1
	West Leeds numbers are steadily rising	1
	New school will be too big to meet needs of vulnerable people	4
<b>SEN issues</b>	Not enough places in new school	3
	Language Resource pupils at Wortley High School should be protected from disruption	1
<b>Staffing</b>	Ensure minimum disruption to staff	5
	New school needs enough staff to stop bullying	4
	Will new jobs at Farnley Park be ringfenced to Wortley High School and West Leeds High School staff?	1
	Amalgamation would mean more job losses	28
	There will be disruption of staff in transition period and low morale	40
	Keep the Headteacher and Deputy from West Leeds to run new school	3
	Advertise nationally for Headteacher and Deputy	1
	Distribute staff of West Leeds, Wortley and Farnley Park in reorganisation	1
	Loss of best staff will affect teaching and learning	2
<b>Standards</b>	New school should maintain high standards	3
	West Leeds deals well with bullying	1
	schools have different curriculum and ethos	11
	Wortley High is a successful school and should continue	15
	West Leeds is most improved school in Leeds	9
	Disruption will cause fall in attainment	17
	West Leeds has been steadily improving - this will be affected	6
	Amalgamation will bring Wortley down to level of West Leeds	3
	West Leeds gets brilliant results and should continue	5
<b>Transition</b>	Where will 6th form be, in 2007-2009	2
	Lack of clarity of 2007-9 period	10
	Transition period will determine success or failure of the new school	3
	Lot of funding needed for transition period	2
<b>Other</b>	New school needs to offer flexible curriculum	1
	Keep two schools separate. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.	23
	Federation would be less disruptive	6
	Don't want it to follow South Leeds path	16
	Accept the proposal	5
	Do not accept the proposal	81
	Close Wortley, keep West Leeds	5
	Amalgamate Farnley Park and Wortley instead	4
	Difficulty for staff and pupils having to use two sites	2
	Don't enlarge Farnley Park	2
	Investment in West Leeds is welcome	2
	West Leeds children come from very deprived background	2
Need period of stability after last change	2	

**Summary of other responses:**

1. Petition signed by 395 pupils opposed to the proposal
2. Petition signed by 215 parents opposed to the proposal
3. Identical letter signed by 444 pupils opposed to the proposal



## Appendix B: Data

**Table 1: Current position (2004/2005)**

	Admission Limit 2004/5	11-16 Number on Roll Jan 2005	Post 16 Number on Roll Jan 2005	11-18 Number on Roll Jan 2005	Net Capacity	Surplus Places	% Surplus
Farnley Park High School	150	716	27	743	717	-26	-3.6
West Leeds High School	210	1045	102	1147	1176	29	2.5
Wortley High School	180	824	76	900	961	61	6.3

**Table 2: Projections for West Leeds, Wortley and Farnley Park High Schools**

	YR7	AD LT	11-16 TOTAL	16+ TOTAL	11-18 TOTAL	NET CAPACITY	SURPLUS	% SURPLUS
2005\6	496	540	2588	201	2789	2854	65	2.3%
2006\7	498	540	2581	200	2781	2854	73	2.6%
2007\8	485	540	2533	208	2741	2854	113	4.0%
2008\9	498	540	2504	207	2711	2854	143	5.0%
2009\10	474	540	2450	204	2654	2854	200	7.0%
2010\11	455	540	2386	217	2603	2854	251	8.8%
2011\12	462	540	2376	193	2569	2854	285	10.0%

**Table 3: Siblings & 1<sup>st</sup> Preferences**

	Sibs & 1 <sup>st</sup> Prefs for Sep 2003	PLASC 2004 Year 7	Sibs & 1 <sup>st</sup> Prefs for Sep 2004	PLASC 2005 Year 7	Sibs & 1 <sup>st</sup> Prefs for Sep 2005	Allocation Sep 2005	AL
Farnley Park High School	156	154	173	155	159	148	150
Wortley High School	148	166	133	169	123	146	180
West Leeds High School	166	206	173	204	187	206	210

**Table 4: GCSE Achievement (5 A\*-C GCSE grades)**

	2004	2005
Farnley Park High School	29%	36.4%
Wortley High School	25%	37.7%
West Leeds High School	33%	34.1%
City Average	45.4%	48.1%
National Average	53.7%	55.7%

**Table 5: Envisaged Procurement Timetable**

October 2005-July 2006	Work up scheme scope and details i.e. accommodation schedule / school vision / specific requirements
July 2006	Pass scheme details to Preferred Bidder (PB)
July -October 2006	Work up Business Case with LEP PB then Submit Business Case to Treasury in order to get approval for PFI credits before the end of 2006.
February 2008	Start construction on site
July 2009	School Complete

