



SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR on
Tuesday, 17th May, 2011 at 10.00 am

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

MEMBERSHIP Councillors

J Akhtar	-	Hyde Park and Woodhouse;
B Atha	-	Kirkstall;
D Atkinson	-	Bramley and Stanningley;
B Cleasby	-	Horsforth
J Elliott	-	Morley South;
G Harper	-	Hyde Park and Woodhouse;
J Jarosz	-	Pudsey;
M Lobley	-	Roundhay;
J Procter (Chair)	-	Wetherby;
R Pryke	-	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill;
M Rafique	-	Chapel Allerton;
M Robinson	-	Harewood;
B Woroncow	-	Co-optee (Non voting)

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

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

Principal Scrutiny Adviser:
Richard Mills
Tel: 24 74557

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
8			<p>INQUIRY TO REVIEW HOME FARM, TEMPLE NEWSAM - DRAFT FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the draft final report and recommendations in relation to the Inquiry to review Home Farm, Temple Newsam.</p>	1 - 4
9			<p>GRANTS TO CULTURE AND SPORT RELATED ORGANISATIONS</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on Grants to Culture and Sport Related Organisations.</p>	5 - 10



Report of **Acting Director of City Development**

Report to **City Development Scrutiny Board**

Date: **17 May 2011**

Subject: **Response to Report of Working Group on Home Farm, Temple Newsam**

Report author: **Richard Mond**

Contact telephone number: **0113 247 8395**

Does the report contain information which has been identified as confidential or exempt?

No, this report does not contain information identified as confidential or exempt.

Is the decision eligible for call-in? **Not applicable**

Summary of main issues and corporate governance considerations

The report responds to the report of the Working Group on Temple Newsam Home Farm.

Recommendations

That Scrutiny Board considers this response alongside the report of the Working Group.

1 Purpose of this report

1.1 To provide a response to the Working Group's report for consideration by the Board.

2 Background information

2.1 This report is drafted to be read in conjunction with the Working Group's report and does not seek to present new background information.

2.2 The following text responds one by one to the recommendations of the Working Group report. Responses are generally limited to agreement (or otherwise) with the text of the recommendation, and any necessary clarification on the implications of this. Lack of comment on the text leading up to the recommendation does not mean full agreement with it; see comment at 3.9 (conclusions).

3 Main issues

3.1 **Recommendation 1:** That the Acting Director of City Development ensure that the accounts for Home Farm are simplified to show more readily income and expenditure for the farm and which excludes all other operations.

3.1.1 **Response:** agreed.

3.2 **Recommendation 2:** That the Acting Director of City Development considers engaging a consultant to look specifically at:

- (i) how the farm could operate on a commercial basis but integrated as a whole visitor experience rather than seeing the current visitor attraction in isolation from the farming operation.

Response: Agreed, but not if the implication is that no action should be taken now to staunch unnecessary losses being incurred.

- (ii) maximising all grants and subsidies that are available for Home Farm.

Response: Agreed; advice is already being taken.

3.3 **Recommendation 3:** That the Acting Director of City Development identifies the Farm Manager's key role as the commercial success of Home Farm and its integration as a total visitor experience and that a business plan and timetable be developed to achieve this.

3.3.1 **Response:** Agreed that there should be a single Farm Manager (as proposed in paragraph 24 of the report), subject to further staff consultation, and that there should be a business plan. The rest of the recommendation needs to take account of capacity and skills, and also of the need to develop coherent management of the visitor experience and business of all aspects of the estate.

3.4 **Recommendation 4:** That the Acting Director of City Development

- (i) undertakes a review of the staffing levels and job descriptions at Home Farm to incorporate the visitor attraction

- (ii) considers how to attract volunteers to work at Home Farm and where they could best be used to reduce operating costs.

3.4.1 **Response:** Agreed (with qualification on ii). The Parks Service intends greatly to increase the opportunities and level of volunteering across parks, though not always or primarily as a cost saving, but because of the inherent benefits of greater community involvement and participation, and the enjoyment and learning that the volunteers benefit from. Temple Newsam already has a very successful volunteer programme, though not currently on the farm. Agriculture with heavy machinery and livestock is a notoriously risky area for amateurs and it is likely that most volunteer support would be at the visitor attraction and in environmental improvements around the farmland.

3.5 **Recommendation 5:** That the Acting Director of City Development, in conjunction with the Farm Manager and RBST, determines the land management, livestock numbers and mix of breeds for Home Farm and the visitor and rare breed centres which ensures the continued viability of Home Farm.

3.5.1 **Response:** agreed subject to clarifying that [a] "conjunction" does not transfer responsibility or final authority to these consultees, or any others) [b] the mix and numbers of livestock and the land management regime are important but are not the only issues affecting Home Farm's viability, which is currently hampered by financial losses due mainly to excessive staff costs.

3.6 **Recommendation 6:** That the Director of Resources ring fences the profits from Temple Newsam Café for use by Home Farm, Temple Newsam.

3.6.1 **Response:** not agreed. This recommendation is incompatible with Recommendation 1. Moreover other activities in the estate also generate turnover in the café, and no doubt a review of these could come up with equivalent recommendations for each of them.

3.7 **Recommendation 7:** That the Acting Director of City Development undertakes a review of the visitors' entrance to the farm to identify a more cost effective and appropriate way for visitors to gain admission to the farm and which improves their overall visitor experience.

3.7.1 **Response:** agreed. This is a helpful suggestion, which we will pursue.

3.8 **Recommendation 8:** That the Acting Director of City Development

(i) considers how Home Farm and the visitor and rare breed centres can be better promoted to increase visitor numbers and income.

(ii) develops a long term strategy that would improve the educational experience of the centres and would encourage schools to participate and pay a fee for the experience.

3.8.1 **Response:** agreed.

3.9 **Conclusion to Working Group report**

3.9.1 Officers have much common ground with the Working Group and agree with most recommendations. The consultation document set out modest first steps to improve the financial performance of the farm, and its description in paragraph 40 of the report as "slash and burn" is wrong. Officers agree that the longer term, bigger picture must be the priority, but do not agree that the £100k saving this year required by the council's budget should be shelved.

4 **Corporate governance considerations**

4.1.1 N/A as no specific proposals

4.2 **Consultation**

4.2.1 N/A

5 **Recommendations**

5.1 City Development Scrutiny Board is asked to consider this response alongside the report of the Working Group.

6 **Background documents**

6.1 Report of the Working Group.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of Chief Libraries, Arts and Heritage Officer

Report to Scrutiny Board

Date: 17 May 2011

Subject: Update on External Arts Grants to Leeds Organisations

Report author: Catherine Blanshard

Contact telephone number: 0113 2478330

Does the report contain information which has been identified as confidential or exempt?

Yes (if exempt, please see the public interest test in section 4)
Relevant section of the report:
In accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule:

√ **No**, this report does not contain information identified as confidential or exempt.

Is the decision eligible for call-in? Yes No – exempt Not applicable

Summary of main issues and corporate governance considerations

1. The Arts Council England has announced their grant funding for 2012-2015 and this report outlines the impact of that in Leeds.
2. West Yorkshire Grants have allocated their 2011/12 grants and the impact of that decision is outlined in the report.

Recommendations

1. To note the allocation of grants by external organisations to Leeds organisations.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To update Scrutiny Board on the recent decisions by major grant making organisations and how they impact on the Arts organisations in Leeds.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The proposals by the Arts Council and West Yorkshire Grants to change their grant making approach have been raised with Scrutiny Board during the year but it is only in the past two months that the full impact of these proposals have been identified.
- 2.2 Arts Council England made a 6.9% cut to grants for 2011/12 and then invited bids from all interested organisations for 3 year funding. West Yorkshire Grants meanwhile investigated a range of options, finally deciding reductions in line with an impact assessment. While the view is that the grants will cease completely in 2012 the final decision on this has yet to be taken.

3 Main issues

3.1 Arts Council Grants

Table 1 outlines the grants to Leeds based Arts Organisations who will receive Arts Council funding through the National Portfolio scheme. These organisations will not be eligible for Grants for the Arts and so there is still significant budget (but yet to be defined) available for an organisation to seek project specific funding. The Arts Council expect to announce the detail of these schemes shortly.

There have been some casualties who have lost their regular funding:

- Pavilion who received £47,807 in 2011/12
- Pyramid of Arts who received £19,039 in 2011/12
- Skippko who received £27,161 in 2011/12
- Jabadao who received £103,125 in 2011/12
- LMU Gallery & Theatre who received £41,468 in 2011/12
- Lumien Arts Ltd who received £20,739 in 2011/12

3.2 West Yorkshire Grants

Leeds based organisations have traditionally gained relative to organisations based in the other five districts due to their work across the region. Leeds based organisations received in 2010/11 £700,209 out of the total budget spend of £1,077,774 (65%).

The Joint Committee decided to reduce grants in line with impact assessment, this resulted in a reduction of £142,821 across Leeds organisations. This included a total cut to East Street Arts, Theatre Company Blah, Blah, Blah, Yorkshire Dance and Pavilion. The Council raised concern about some of the conclusions raised by the impact

assessment. The Council has also asked for clarity on whether the 2012/13 grants have ceased or whether there will be further debate on this issue.

In 2011/12 the organisations below will receive:

Organisation	£
Citizens Advice Speciality Support	54,579
Northern Ballet	122,086
Opera North	215,862
West Yorkshire Playhouse	71,971
Art Link	6,610
Ascendance Rep	8,640
BTCV	10,415
Dyslexia Action	8,640
Interplay Theatre	6,566
Jabadao	8,640
Sports Aid	4,500

3.3 Next Steps

The Council has met with the arts organisations receiving large grants and they are keen to move to longer term funding. A further meeting is planned in July to discuss this further. The Council has also met with the Arts Council following their new grant allocations and discussed the potential and advantages of aligning funding periods and monitoring data. This would reduce the burden on organisations and improve the data quality. Smaller organisations and individual artists have also met to discuss their needs.

Discussions have also taken place with the team developing the new vision to ensure that the data received from a new scheme would form a fundamental part of reporting action against the new City priorities. The principle has been agreed but the actual monitoring cannot be defined until the plan is finalised. However the organisations' contribution to the profile of the City and their contribution to the economy are likely to be fundamental and could include measures such as the number of apprenticeships and training opportunities for local people.

Once clarity has been received on West Yorkshire Grants, the Arts Council's new grants for the arts scheme and the city plan, it is proposed to review Leeds City Council's grant process with a view to introducing longer term grant funding, a streamlining in the

application process and monitoring which can become a fundamental part of reporting on cultural activity so that there is a clear link between grants and the impact on the City.

4 Corporate governance considerations

4.1 Risk management

4.1.1 Not applicable

4.2 Public Interest Test

4.2.1 Not applicable

4.3 Forward Plan

4.3.1 Not applicable

4.4 Scrutiny process: Call-In

4.4.1 Not applicable

4.5 Constitution and legal matters

4.5.1 Not applicable

4.6 Financial and resource implications

4.6.1 As these are external grants the changes do not have an impact on the Council.

4.7 Equality and Diversity and Cohesion and Integration

4.7.1 Not applicable

4.8 Council policies and City priorities

4.8.1 Not applicable

4.9 Consultation

4.9.1 Not applicable

5 Recommendations

5.1 To note report on changes to grant funding by external organisations

6 Background documents

6.1 None

Table 1

Name	Total Revenue 10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	Real % change (Oct inflation estimate)
Alchemy	44,297	41,241	66,000	66,000	66,000	35.7%
Artlink	72,934	67,901	64,845	66,402	68,193	-14.9%
Axis Web	382,098	355,733	364,626	373,377	383,085	-8.7%
East Street Arts	49,837	46,398	190,000	194,560	193,015	252.6%
Interplay Theatre Trust	108,404	100,924	150,000	153,600	157,594	32.4%
Northern Ballet	2,825,644	2,630,674	2,512,294	2,572,589	2,641,977	-14.9%
Opera North	10,805,880	10,060,274	9,574,000	9,822,545	10,092,692	-15.0%
Peepal Tree Press	82,336	76,655	113,206	114,962	116,911	29.3%
Phoenix Dance Theatre	478,259	445,259	425,222	435,428	447,172	-14.9%
Project Space Leeds		0	60,000	50,000	40,000	
Red Ladder Theatre Company	253,442	235,955	160,000	163,840	168,100	-39.6%
RJC Dance Productions	83,957	78,164	74,647	76,438	78,500	-14.9%
Slung Low	-	0	99,000	101,376	104,012	
South Asian Arts – UK	89,204	83,049	113,000	115,712	118,721	21.2%
Theatre Company Blah, Blah, Blah	83,863	78,076	108,000	110,000	112,000	21.6%
Tutti Frutti Productions	94,450	87,933	117,500	181,760	186,486	79.8%
Unlimited Theatre Company	94,450	87,933	165,000	168,960	173,353	67.1%
West Yorkshire Playhouse	1,608,969	1,497,950	1,497,950	1,533,901	1,573,782	-10.9%
Yorkshire Dance	199,397	185,639	323,600	331,366	339,982	55.2%

This page is intentionally left blank