



**A meeting of the Council will be held in the Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 6th April, 2011 at 1.30 pm**

**Members of the Council are invited to attend and transact the following business:**

**1. Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2011.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

To receive any declarations of interest from Members

**3. Communications**

To receive such communications as the Lord Mayor, the Leader, Members of the Executive Board or the Chief Executive consider appropriate

**4. Deputations**

To receive deputations in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10

**5. Reports**

To consider reports as follows (the Chief Executive considers that these reports are appropriate to be received at this meeting in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.2(f))

- a) That the report of the Chief Executive on amendments to the officer delegation scheme (executive functions) in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 1.4 and other consequential amendments be noted.

( Report to follow)

**K WAKEFIELD**

- b) That the report of the Chief Executive on a nomination for receipt of the Leeds Award be approved:-

Freda Matthews

**K WAKEFIELD**

## **6. Questions**

To deal with questions in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11

## **7. Recommendations of the General Purposes Committee**

- (a) That the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee of the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2011 as contained in the report of the Chief Executive be approved.(report attached).
- (b) That the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee of the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011 as contained in the report of the Chief Executive be approved. (report to follow).

### **K WAKEFIELD**

## **8. Minutes**

To receive the minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.2(o)

## **9. White Paper - Yorkshire Heart Centre at the Leeds General Infirmary**

This Council supports the excellent work of the Yorkshire Heart Centre at Leeds General Infirmary, and notes with concern the unit's limited inclusion in NHS proposals for the national reconfiguration of children's cardiac surgery services.

This Council requests that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Health in order to call for the retention of these vitally important surgical services in Leeds. It also recognises the ongoing efforts of Leeds MPs to lobby the Secretary of State to the same effect.

### **M DOBSON**

## **10. White Paper - Mobility Component of the Disability Living Allowance**

This council is deeply concerned by the proposal in the Welfare Reform Bill to remove the mobility component from Disability Living Allowance for people living in registered care homes.

The mobility component provides essential support for many vulnerable people living in care homes. It helps people with disabilities live independent lives by taking part in every day activities that require them to spend more money on mobility costs. Removing the benefit will cut this vital avenue for inclusion and empowerment, which is something that should be protected.

Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to urge that the proposal to remove the mobility component from Disability Living Allowance for people living in registered care homes be withdrawn from the Welfare Reform Bill.

### **L YEADON**

## **11. White Paper - Post Offices**

This council believes there are many potential benefits to local communities from delivering council services through sub post offices including saving taxpayers money, improving access to local services for residents and assisting in the revival of our sub post offices by improving the revenues that flow through them.

Council therefore calls on the chief executive to contact the senior management of Post Office Limited (POL) with a formal request to enter into discussions with a view to establishing a new partnership with POL, that aims to use the network of local sub post offices across our community to deliver council services where that is in the best interests of the citizens of Leeds and to report back regularly to the council so we can monitor progress. Council further requests that a report is presented to Executive Board updating members on the outcome of this request and any subsequent discussions with POL.

**M HAMILTON**

## **12. White Paper Submitted Under the Provisions of Council Procedure Rule 12.2 (b)(c) - Frontline Services**

Given the strong public opposition to the cuts to frontline services proposed by the Labour led administration at the Council's budget meeting in February, this council believes that the ruling administration should give further consideration to the unnecessary decisions to cut popular frontline services, namely Bramley Baths, the Leeds Crisis Centre, the Mental Health Day Centres, the free City Centre Bus, East Leeds Leisure Centre, Garforth Leisure Centre and the plans to close 20 of the city's much valued libraries.

Council further believes that these frontline savings could be achieved by re-examining the decisions taken to reject proposed savings in IT, Trade Unions expenditure, Office furniture expenditure, the publication of brochures, the use of non-council venues for meetings and for publications and advertising.

**A CARTER**

## **13. White Paper Submitted Under the Provisions of Council Procedure Rule 3.1(d) - Proposed Reform of the Local Government Pension Scheme**

This Council recognises the cross party concerns relating to the proposed reform of the Local Government Pension Scheme as expressed by LGA representatives Baroness Eaton and Sir Steve Bullock in their co-signed letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the 16<sup>th</sup> of February.

This Council therefore requests that the Chief Executive writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in support of these views.

**J LEWIS**

**14. White Paper Submitted Under the Provisions of Council Procedure Rule 3.1(d)  
- High Speed Rail**

This Council expresses concern that the Government's proposed hybrid bill relating to High Speed Rail will only adopt legal and planning powers for a route from London to the West Midlands.

This Council therefore calls on the Government to reaffirm its commitment to bringing the social, economic and environmental benefits of High Speed Rail to Leeds by expanding the detail of the upcoming hybrid bill to include a framework for the north of England.

This Council requests that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Transport in support of expanding the scope of the initial bill.

**R LEWIS**

**15. White Paper Submitted Under the Provisions of Council Procedure Rule 3.1(d)  
- Low Emission Zones**

This Council recognises the health and environmental benefits of reduced air pollution to Leeds communities, especially those in inner city areas, and notes the success of the Low Emissions Zones in London and Oxford which prevents the most polluting vehicles from entering the city.

Council therefore requests the Executive Board to undertake a feasibility study with a view to implementing a similar scheme in Leeds.

**J MONAGHAN**

**16. White Paper Submitted Under the Provisions of Council Procedure Rule 3.1(d)  
- Highway Planning Issues**

This Council requests the Executive Board to instruct the Council's Highways Department to ensure that consultation with ward members takes place with regard to Planning Applications' highways matters before the Highways Department passes formal comment to Planning Officers. This will ensure that ward members' and residents' views on highways issues are properly reflected in Planning Department reports.

**A CARTER**

Civic Hall  
Leeds  
LS1 1UR

Chief Executive

NOTE – The order in which White Paper motions will be debated will be determined by Whips prior to the meeting.

Proceedings of the Meeting of the Leeds City Council held  
Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 23rd February, 2011

**PRESENT: The Lord Mayor Councillor James McKenna in the Chair**

**WARD**

**ADEL & WHARFEDALE**

Clive Fox  
Barry John Anderson  
John Leslie Carter

**ALWOODLEY**

Peter Mervyn Harrand  
Ronald David Feldman  
Ruth Feldman

**ARDSLEY & ROBIN HOOD**

Lisa Mulherin  
Karen Renshaw  
Jack Dunn

**ARMLEY**

Janet Harper  
Alison Natalie Kay Lowe  
James McKenna

**BEESTON & HOLBECK**

David Congreve  
Angela Gabriel  
Adam Ogilvie

**BRAMLEY & STANNINGLEY**

Neil Taggart  
Angela Denise Atkinson  
Ted Hanley

**BURMANTOFTS & RICHMOND HILL**

Ron Grahame  
Ralph Pryke  
Richard Brett

**WARD**

**CALVERLEY & FARSLEY**

Rod Wood  
Andrew Carter  
Joseph William Marjoram

**CHAPEL ALLERTON**

Jane Dowson  
Eileen Taylor  
Mohammed Rafique

**CITY & HUNSLET**

Mohammed Iqbal  
Elizabeth Nash  
Patrick Davey

**CROSS GATES & WHINMOOR**

Peter John Gruen  
Suzi Armitage  
Pauleen Grahame

**FARNLEY & WORTLEY**

John Hamilton Hardy  
David Blackburn  
Ann Blackburn

**GARFORTH & SWILLINGTON**

Thomas Murray  
Andrea McKenna  
Mark Dobson

**GIPTON & HAREHILLS**

Kamila Maqsood  
Alan Leonard Taylor  
Arif Hussain

**GUISELEY & RAWDON**

Pat Latty  
Graham Latty  
Paul Wadsworth

**HAREWOOD**

Matthew James Robinson  
Ann Castle  
Rachael Procter

**HEADINGLEY**

Martin Hamilton  
Jamie Matthews  
James John Monaghan

**HORSFORTH**

Brian Cleasby  
Christopher Townsley

**HYDE PARK & WOODHOUSE**

Javaid Akhtar  
Penny Ewens  
Gerry Harper

**KILLINGBECK & SEACROFT**

Brian Michael Selby  
Graham Hyde  
Veronica Morgan

**KIPPAX & METHLEY**

Keith Ivor Wakefield  
John Keith Parker  
James Lewis

**KIRKSTALL**

Bernard Peter Atha  
Lucinda Joy Yeadon  
John Anthony Illingworth

**MIDDLETON PARK**

Kim Groves  
Geoffrey Driver  
Judith Blake

**MOORTOWN**

Sharon Hamilton  
Mark Daniel Harris  
Brenda Lancaster

**MORLEY NORTH**

Thomas Leadley  
Robert Finnigan  
Robert William Gettings

**MORLEY SOUTH**

Shirley Varley  
Judith Elliott  
Terrence Grayshon

**OTLEY & YEADON**

Ryk Downes  
Graham Peter Kirkland  
Colin Campbell

**PUDSEY**

Mick Coulson  
Josephine Patricia Jarosz  
Richard Alwyn Lewis

**ROTHWELL**

Barry Stewart Golton  
Donald Michael Wilson  
Steve Smith

**ROUNDHAY**

Ghulam Hussain  
Matthew Lobley  
Valerie Kendall

**TEMPLE NEWSAM**

Michael Lyons  
William Schofield Hyde  
David Schofield

**WEETWOOD**

Judith Mara Chapman  
Ben Chastney  
Susan Bentley

**WETHERBY**

John Michael Procter  
Gerald Wilkinson  
Alan James Lamb

**72 Announcements**

- a) The Lord Mayor reported the recent death of Mrs Joyce Wainwright.
- b) The Lord Mayor informed Council of the recent Freedom Parade for HMS Ark Royal and made reference to the possible formation of a 'Friends of Ark Royal' Group.
- c) The Lord Mayor referred Members to the robustness reports of the Director of Resources in respect of the submitted amendments.

**73 Minutes**

It was moved by Councillor Gruen, seconded by Councillor J Procter and

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 19<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be approved.

**74 Declarations of Interest**

The Lord Mayor announced that a list of written declarations submitted by Members was on deposit in the public galleries and had been circulated to each Member's place in the Chamber.

Following an invitation to declare further individual interests, declarations in accordance with the Council's Member's Code of Conduct were made as follows:-

- a) Members declared personal interests in minute 79 of this meeting as follows:-

Cllr J Akhtar	25 Sholebroke View, Leeds, LS7 3HQ
Cllr S Armitage	3 Bailey's Lane, Seacroft, Leeds LS14 6PN United Co-operatives St Gregory's Youth and Adult Centre
Cllr B Atha	25 Moseley Wood Croft, Leeds 16 7JJ Leeds Arts Centre United Cooperatives Scarborough Trust Wades Charities Sports Aid Trust Middleton Equestrian Centre Renton Foundation Red Ladder Theatre Co Craft Centre and Design Gallery Disability Sports Development Trust Northern Ballet Theatre UKSAPLD United Leeds Hospital Charitable Foundation Mary Jane Butler Trust British & Internat Federation of Festivals Leeds National Trust Leeds Independent Studios WG Friends of Hyde Park Picture House Friend of the City Varieties Relate Leeds

Cllr D Atkinson	67 Valley Road, Bramley, Leeds LS13 1EU 21 Warrels Avenue, Bramley, Leeds, LS13 Lineham Farm Children's Centre Stanningley ARLFC John Fisher Millenium Green
Cllr J Blake	Opera North Pavilion Middleton Sure Start South Leeds Health for All United Cooperatives Woodview, Billams Hill, Otley LS21 2DZ
Cllr D Congreve	31a Half Mile, Stanningley, Leeds, LS13 1BN
Cllr M Coulson	Pudsey in Bloom 23a The Towers, Leeds, LS12 3SQ
Cllr P Davey	United Co-operatives 56 Church Lane, Crossgates, Leeds LS15 8BD 3 Meadow Garth, Bramhope, Leeds LS16 9DY
Cllr M Dobson	Garforth Pre-school Playgroup 24 Beech Grove Avenue, LS25 1EF 25 Lidgett Lane, Garforth, LS25 1EH 37c Stocks Rise, Leeds, LS14 AVHL ALMO Member
Cllr J Dowson	Sikh Welfare Trust 6 Wharfe Crescent, Pool-in-Wharfedale, Nr Otley, West Yorkshire, LS21 1LU Groundwork Trust
Cllr G Driver	United Cooperatives Belle Isle Working Men's Trust Hunslet Carr Sports and Social Club Friends of Middleton Park Groundwork 13 Ashwood Villas, Leeds LS6 2EJ Aire Valley Homes Care and Repair Leeds College of Building Corporation Belle Isle Tenant Management Organisation
Cllr J Dunn	Middleton Park Riding for the Disabled Equestrian Centre United Co-operatives Leeds Normandy Veterans Association Carlton Working Mens Club Leeds Rifles 14 Middleton Park Mount, Leeds 10



Cllr A Gabriel	Holbeck Gala Watsonia Community Centre 12 Wooler Avenue, Beeston, LS11 234 Cross Flatts Grove, Beeston, LS11 7BW Besston Festival Friends of Cross Flatts Park Health 4 All Holbeck in Bloom Beeston in Bloom Cottingley in Bloom
Cllr P Grahame	St Gregory's Social Club Harehills Labour Club Leeds Co-operative Society 41 Swardale Green, Leeds LS14 5HJ
Cllr R Grahame	41 Swardale Green, Leeds LS14 5HJ Leeds City College Friends of East End Park ENEHL ALMo Member
Cllr K Groves	Friends of Middleton Park Sue Ryder Care 59 Old Run Road, Leeds, LS10 3AZ
Cllr P Gruen	Northern School of Contemporary Dance West Yorkshire Playhouse Fieldhead Carr Community Centre Management Committee St Gregory's Social Club Hawthorn House, 474 Shadwell Lane, Leeds, LS17 8BA
Cllr S Hamilton	Hillcrest Primary School Holy Rosary Primary School Leeds Women Aid Chapeltown Citizens Advice Bureau Leeds West Indian Centre Women Group Jamaican Society Leeds West Indian Centre Women Walking Group 19 Upland Grove, LS8 2SX
Cllr T Hanley	Leeds Civic Trust St Georges Crypt North and Yorkshire Business Forum Bramley Elderly Action Lineham Farm Children's Centre 66 Newlay Grove, Horsforth, LS18 4LH West Yorkshire Pension Fund 230 Stanningley Road, Bramley, LS13 3BA 232 Stanningley Road, Bramley, LS13 3BA
Cllr J Hardy	27 Cross Flatts Drive, Leeds, LS11 7HY

	Governor, Five Lane Primary School
Cllr G Harper	12 Manor Street, Otley, LS21 1AX
Cllr J Harper	2A Back Lane Farsley LEEDS LS28 5EU Kirkstall Valley Park
Cllr A Hussain	66 Easterly Road, Leeds, LS8 3AN 13 Brompton Grove, Leeds, LS11 58 Bayswater Crescent, Leeds, LS8 5QQ 11 Kepler Grove, Leeds, LS8 7 Trafford Avenue, Leeds, LS9 9 Winfield Grove, Leeds, LS2 64 Easterly Road, Leeds, LS8 7 Kitchener Close, Leeds, LS9
Cllr G Hussain	Leeds Muslim Consortium (Leeds educational achievement project) Andhral Welfare Trust 36 Amberton Crescent LS8 2 Easterly Mount LS8 107 St Wilfred's Crescent LS8 283 Harehills Lane LS8 41 Foundry Place LS9 10 Potternewton View LS7 41 Bayswater Row LS8 65 Bayswater Road LS8 82 St Wilfred's Crescent LS8 33 St Wilfred's Grove LS8 51 Ellers Road LS8 93 St Wilfred's Avenue LS8 2 Bexley Avenue LS8 25 Thorn Crescent LS8 4 Compton Row LS9 458 Oakwood Lane LS8 18 Ashton Mount LS8 15 Sunningdale Walk LS17 17 Copgrove Road LS8 36 and 38 Amberton Approach LS8 1A Florence Street LS9 71 Upland Road LS8 30 Copgrove Road, Leeds
Cllr G Hyde	North Seacroft Good Neighbours Scheme Co-op South/North Seacroft Good Neighbours Scheme 21 Wilfred Avenue LEEDS LS15 7SP Grave plot at Harehills Cemetery ENEHL ALMO Member
Cllr J Illingworth	Leeds Organic Growers Dig2Ride Cooperative Group

Kirkstall Valley Park  
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  
37 Kirkwood Way LEEDS LS16 7EU  
Burley Mills Allotments

Cllr M Iqbal

Leeds Co-operative Society  
Association of Blind Asians  
Path Yorkshire Ltd  
Hunslet Festival/Gala  
Hamara Healthy Living Centre  
52 Headingley Mount LS6  
54 Headingley Mount LS6  
56 Headingley Mount LS6  
11a Roundhay Mount, LS8  
14 Roundhay Mount, LS8  
31 Roundhay Mount, LS8  
4 Roundhay Grove LS8  
74 Headingley Avenue, LS6  
13 Manor Drive, LS6  
16 Manor Drive, LS6  
25 Norwood Place, LS6  
13 Norwood Road, LS6  
39 Mayville Avenue, LS6  
65 Headingley Lane, LS6  
18 Autumn Avenue, LS6  
5 Royal Park View, LS6  
9 Milan Road, LS8  
4 Berkeley Street, LS8  
537 Harrogate Road, Leeds, LS17 9NA  
17 Manor Drive, Leeds, LS6  
11 Trentham Row, LS11  
21A Copgrove Road, Leeds, LS8 2SP  
Chair of KMWA

Cllr J Jarosz

Co-operative Group  
Theatre in Education  
Royal British Legion, Pudsey  
11 Radcliffe Lane Pudsey Leeds LS28 8AB

Cllr J Lewis

United Co-operative Society  
Methley Working Men's Club  
41 Leeds Road Kippax Leeds LS25 7HG

Cllr R Lewis

Leeds Co-operative Society  
Leeds City Council Credit Union  
121 Roker Lane Pudsey LS28 9NB  
Land adjacent to 110 Roker Lane

Cllr A Lowe

Leeds Mental Health Foundation Trust  
Cooperative Group  
Leeds Credit Union  
LICS  
Dosti Asian Womens Project, based at Stocks

Hill Day Centre MIC.  
Board of Trustees of Harrison and Potter Trust  
Management Committee of the St Vincent  
Support Centre  
Armley Common Rights Trust  
Leeds Survivor Led Crisis Service  
PAFRAS  
Wooden Spoon  
WNWHL ALMO Member  
Leeds Healthy Living Network  
TOUCHSTONE  
36 Sholebroke Avenue, LS7 3EY  
52 Reginald Terrace, LS7 3HB

Cllr M Lyons	12 Mayfield Road Leeds
Cllr K Maqsood	Leeds Education Achievement Project 7 Savile Road, Chapeltown, LS7 3ES 47 Savile Place, Chapeltown, LS7 3EP 75 Mexborough Place, Chapeltown, LS7 3EB 350A Dewsbury Road, Beeston, LS11 7BU
Cllr A McKenna	Swillington Miners Welfare Relate 24 Victoria Park Avenue, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3DG
Cllr J Mckenna	United Co-operatives 24 Victoria Park Avenue Kirkstall Leeds LS5 3DG
Cllr V Morgan	South Seacroft Good Neighbours Scheme 38 Town Street Belle Isle Leeds LS10 3PS
Cllr L Mulherin	Epilepsy Action 12 Church Lane, Meanwood, LS6 4NP Grand Theatre Enterprises Ltd
Cllr T Murray	Garforth Football Club Learning Partnerships Swillington Educational Charity United Co-operatives Co-op Party Garforth Jubilee Band 11 Hodgson Crescent Leeds LS17 8PG Director of IGEN
Cllr E Nash	Hamara Healthy Living Centre The Co-operative Group Leeds Art Collection Fund Friends of Opera North Leeds Philosophical & Literary Society 92 Morris Lane, Leeds LS5 3EN Domestic Garage adjacent 94 Morris Lane,

Leeds, LS5 3EN (end Kepstorn Close)

Cllr A Ogilvie

Cottingley Community Centre  
St Matthews Community Centre  
Co-operative Society  
South Leeds Community Radio  
Friends of Cross Flatts Park  
Holbeck Gala  
Beeston Festival  
125 Cross Flatts Grove Leeds, LS11 7BN  
Grand Theatre Enterprise Ltd

Cllr K Parker

Leeds Rugby Foundation  
6 Lyndale Kippax Leeds LS25 7LF

Cllr M Rafique

REEMAP  
Co-op  
Leeds Islamic Centre  
43 Burley Lodge Road, Leeds 6  
26 Bayswater Crescent, Leeds 8  
25 Bayswater Terrace, Leeds 8  
17 Baldoran Terrace, Leeds 8  
67 Upland Crescent, LS8 2TB  
Employee of Education Leeds  
Renew Leeds

Cllr K Renshaw

East and West Ardsley Allotments Association  
East Ardsley General WMC  
Winthorpe Residents Association  
Management Committee of St Gabriel's  
Community Centre  
East Ardsley Community Group  
St Michaels Parish Church, East Ardsley  
Royal British Legion  
32 Casson Avenue East Ardsley Wakefield  
WF3 2EG

Cllr B Selby

Financial Inclusion Leeds Limited  
Friends of Marjorie and Arnold Ziff Community  
Centre  
Etz Chaim synagogue  
Cooperative Group  
Leeds Jewish Representative Committee  
Leeds Jewish Workers Co-operative Society  
South Seacroft Good Neighbours Scheme  
Daughter works for Leeds Library Service  
Daughter works for Education Leeds  
4 Primley Park Road, Leeds, LS17 7HS  
Whitehall Road, New Farnley

Cllr N Taggart

United Co-operatives  
Kirkstall Valley Park Ltd.  
Leeds Theatre Trust Ltd  
Leeds Vietnamese Community Association

	<p>Bramley Band Club  Swillington Miners Welfare Club  Stanningley Amateur Rugby League Club  Theatre in Education Company  20 Marlowe Court Garforth LEEDS LS25 1PR</p>
Cllr E Taylor	<p>6 St Martin's Crescent Leeds LS7 3LH  39 St Martin's Road, Leeds, LS7</p>
Cllr K Wakefield	<p>Governor of Ashtree School  Governor of Brigshaw School  Kippax Tenants and Residents  Micklefield Tenants and Residents  Meanwood Valley Urban Farm  Methley Working Men's Club  Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  United Co-operatives  35 Beech Grove Avenue, Leeds, LS25 1EF</p>
Cllr L Yeadon	<p>Hawksworth Wood Community Association  Kirkstall Valley Community Association  Yorkshire Disabled Cricket Team  2 Vesper Place, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3JR  Mary Butler Trust  Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust</p>
Cllr Barry Anderson	<p>Holy Trinity Primary School Governor  Owner of 30 Dale Park Walk, Cookridge,  Leeds, LS16 7PS</p>
Cllr Andrew Carter	<p>School Governor at Westroyd Infants School  and Farsley Springbank Junior School  Owner of 15 Clarke Street, Calverley, Pudsey  LS28 5NH (Including land at the rear)</p>
Cllr John Leslie Carter	<p>School Governor at Adel Primary School  Owner of 25 Oaklands Avenue, Adel, Leeds,  LS16 8NB  Vice Chair of the West Yorkshire Police  Authority</p>
Cllr Ann Castle	<p>School Governor at Scholes Primary School  Personal – Member, West Yorkshire Fire  Authority  Personal – Holder of a Business Parking  Permit for Clarendon Road  Owner of 9 St John's Court, Thorner, Leeds,  LS14 3AX</p>
Cllr Ruth Feldman	<p>Owner of 22 Sandmoor Court, Harrogate  Road, Leeds, LS17 7HY</p>
Cllr Ronnie Feldman	<p>Owner of 22 Sandmoor Court, Harrogate  Road, Leeds, LS17 7HY  School Governor at Brodetsky Primary School</p>

and Allerton High School

Cllr Bill Hyde	Governor of Temple Moor High School, Colton Primary School and West Leeds Academy Chair, Crossgates Good Neighbours N.N. Scheme. Owner of 8 Kirkfield View, Colton, Leeds, LS15 9DX
Cllr Valerie Kendall	Governor of Roundhay High School Owner of 5 Woodlea Square, LS6 4SW
Cllr Alan Lamb	School Governor - Wetherby High Personal interest – Fox & Hounds, Walton, LS23 7DQ Member of Wetherby Town Council
Cllr Matthew Lobley	Member, Community Action for Roundhay Elderly Management Committee Chairmanship of Renewal Leeds Ltd Renting 221 Oakwood Lane, LS8 2PE
Cllr Joe Marjoram	Governor, Pudsey Bolton Royd Primary School Owner of 15 Woodhall Road, LS28 5WL Landlord of 40 Carr Hill Road, Calverley LS28 5IZ
Cllr John Procter	Leeds Grand Theatre Board and Opera House Board of Management Owner of Tithe House, LS17 9DX The Estate Office, Hill Top Farm, The Ginnel, Bardsey, Leeds, LS17 9DU
Cllr Gerald Wilkinson	Governor of Lady Hastings Primary School
Cllr Clive Fox	Owner of 99 Breary Lane East, Bramhope, Nr Leeds, LS16 9EU Member of Arthington Parish Council Member of Bramhope Parish Council
Cllr Peter Harrand	Owner of 8 Overdale Avenue, Leeds, LS17 8TE Member of the West Yorkshire Fire Authority
Cllr Graham Latty	Owner of 110 Harrogate Road, LS19 6ND
Cllr Pat Latty	Owner of 110 Harrogate Road, LS19 6ND
Cllr Rachael Procter	Owner of Tithe House, LS17 9DX
Cllr Matthew Robinson	16 Syke Green, Scarcroft, Leeds, LS14 3BS
Cllr David Schofield	Personal interest – shared owner of 5 Greenway Close, LS15 7DU Personal interest – shared owner of 3

	Greenway Close, LS15 7DU
Cllr Paul Wadsworth	Owner of 27 Lingfield Road, LS17 6DE
Cllr Gerald Wilkinson	Owner of 33 Clarendon Road, Boston Spa, Wetherby, LS23 6NG Member of Wetherby Town Council
Cllr Rod Wood	Owner of The Covert, Foxholes Crescent, Leeds, LS28 5NT
Cllr Andy Barker	Resides, 1 Broadgate Rise, Horsforth, LS18 4DL Governor of Horsforth Featherbank Infants
Cllr Sue Bentley	Owner 51 Alwoodley Lane Governor Lawnswood High, Iveson Primary, Member of Advisory Board at Ireland Wood Children's Centre
Cllr Richard Brett	Joint owner of 991 Scott Hall Road, Leeds LS17 6HJ Member of Management Committee of Burmantofts Senior Action Board Member for ENEHL
Cllr Colin Campbell	Own or have interest in 11 Prince Henry Road, 23 Harecroft Road, Otley Governor of Queensway Primary
Cllr Judith Chapman	Owner Apt 1 Gledhow Manor, 350 Gledhow Lane, LS7 4NH Part Owner 17 Brackenhurst Drive LS17 Governor Weetwood Primary School Weetwood Primary School Member of Sinai Synagogue Roman Avenue Leeds
Cllr Ben Chastney	46 Carisbrooke Road, Leeds LS16 Governor of Ireland Wood Primary
Cllr Brian Cleasby	House adapted for mother in law Owner: 11 Carr Lane, Rawdon. Governor Westbrooke Lane and Horsforth School Member Fostering Panel. Member LBIA Consultative Committee
Cllr Ryk Downes	Resident of Chapel House, Manor Gardens, Pool-in-Wharfedale Governor at Ashfield Primary and Nursery, Prince Henry's Grammer, Rufford Park Primary Governor Prince Henry Foundation, Otley
Cllr Penny Ewens	Board Member, Swarthmore Adult Education



	Centre 3 Holmwood Drive, Leeds LS6 4NF Governor Primrose High School Governor City of Leeds High School North West SILC Trustee Burley Lodge Centre.
Cllr Stewart Golton	5 Farrer Lane, Oulton Governor of Oulton and Royds School
Cllr Martin Hamilton	1 Lydgate Street, Leeds LS28 Governor of Shire Oak Primary
Cllr Mark Harris	25, Gledhow Wood Avenue, 95 Gledow Park Grove and part owner of 17 Brackenhurst Drive Member of Sinai Synagogue, Roman Avenue, LS8 Governor of Roundhay School
CllrGraham Kirkland	Resides: Westholme Westgate Otley, LS21 3AT
CllrBrenda Lancaster	Owner of 21 Cross Bentley Lane, Leeds LS6 4AS Vice Chair Governor of Carr Manor High School
Cllr Jamie Matthews	Flat 4, 134 Otley Road, Headingley, LS16 5JX Spring Bank Primary
CllrJames Monaghan	Flat 21, Merchants House, 66 North Street
Cllr Ralph Pryke	St Aidan's Vicarage, Elford Place West, LS8 Governor Primrose High School Governor Ebor Garden's Primary
Cllr Steve Smith	Resides at 129 Holmsley Lane, Woodlesford, Leeds Governor Oulton Primary School
Cllr Alan Taylor	Resides at St Aidan's Vicarage, Elford Place West LS8 Wades Trust Governor Harehills Primary Governor of Oakwood Primary Member of Management Committee Action for Gipton Elderly
Cllr Chris Townsley	Owner 98 Newlathes Road, Horsforth Governor Horsforth High School Governor Westbrook Lane Primary
Cllr Don Wilson	Board of Governor at Rothwell Haigh Road Infants School and Rothwell Primary Roseville Board Owner 7 The Paddock, Rothwell, Leeds

Cllr Robert Gettings	Owner of Springfield House, 1 Church Street Gildersome LS27 7AE
Cllr Judith Elliott	Owner of 109 Rein Road, Tingley, Wakefield, WF3 1JQ
Cllr Shirley Varley	Owner of 8 Queens Promenade, Morley
Cllr Terry Grayshon	Employee of RBS
Cllr Leadley	Governor, Westerton Primary School Committee member and Trustee, Morley Elderley Action Elected Member, Morley Town Council
Cllr Ann Blackburn	Part owner 9 Cobden Grove, LS12 5PA Mother-in-law in receipt of Social Care Governor at Ryecroft Primary School Governor at Lawns Park Primary School Director of Leeds Groundwork Trust Director of The Charities of Thomas Wade and Others Director of West North West Homes Leeds
Cllr David Blackburn	Part owner 9 Cobden Grove, LS12 5PA Mother in receipt of Social Care Governor of Whingate Primary School Member of the Roseville Enterprises Board of Management Joint Countryside Forum Green Leeds Ltd Governor of West Leeds Country Park Member of the Council Housing Investment Review - Councillor Consultation Group Member of Leeds Initiative - Climate Change Member of Leeds Initiative - Narrowing the Gap Board Member of Nuclear Free Zones English Forum Member of the Area Employment, Enterprise and Training Partnership Chair of the Affordable Warmth Partnership

b) Members declared personal interests in minute 80 of this meeting as follows:-

Cllr A Blackburn	Governer at Ryecroft Primary School Governer at Lawns Park Primary School
Cllr R Grahame	Director of North East Homes

- c) Councillor Varley also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 80 as a member of Morley Elderly Action Committee.

**75 Communication**

The Chief Executive thanked Council, Members, officers and the Police for their handling of the occupation of the Chamber by demonstrators causing the delay to the start of this meeting.

**76 Reports**

a) Amendments to Officer Delegation Scheme (Executive Functions)

It was moved by Councillor Gruen, seconded by Councillor J Procter and

**RESOLVED** – That the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) on amendments to the Officer Delegation Scheme (Executive Functions) and other consequential amendments to the Constitution, as detailed in the report, be noted.

b) Leeds Award

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor Gruen and

**RESOLVED** – That the nominations for the receipt of the Leeds Award be approved and that the Lord Mayor be requested to undertake an appropriate ceremony:-

- Hillary Wilmer
- Glynis Homes

**77 Recommendations of the General Purposes Committee**

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor Gruen, and

**RESOLVED** – That the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee to approve amendments to the Chief Planning Officer's Scheme of Delegation, as detailed in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance), be approved.

**78 Motion to Suspend Council Procedure Rules**

It was moved by Councillor Gruen and seconded by Councillor J Procter that Council Procedure Rule 14.7(b) be suspended to allow Councillor A Carter to move, and Councillor J Procter to second, amendments 1 to 12 en bloc, and to allow Councillor Golton to move, and Councillor Hamilton to second, amendments 13 to 19 en bloc.

**RESOLVED** – That Council Procedure Rule 14.7(b) be suspended to allow Councillor A Carter to move, and Councillor J Procter to second, amendments 1 to 12 en bloc, and to allow Councillor Golton to move, and Councillor Hamilton to second, amendments 13 to 19 en bloc.

**79 Budget**

Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 14.10, leave of Council was given to alter paragraph (ii)3 by the deletion of the words 'are expected to issue' and replace with 'have issued'.

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor R Lewis

i) **Revenue Budget**

- a) That the Revenue Budget for 2011/12 totalling £582,228,000 as detailed and explained in the submitted report and accompanying papers be approved, with no increase in the Leeds' element of the Council Tax for 2011/12.
- b) That with respect to the Housing Revenue Account the following be approved:-
  - i) approve the budget at the average rent increase figure of 6.84%
  - ii) increase the charges for garage rents to £6.49 per week
  - iii) increase service charges in line with rents (6.84%)

**ii) Council Tax**

1 It was noted that at the meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2011, Council agreed the following amounts for the year 2011/12, in accordance with regulations made under Sections 33(5) and 34(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- a) 238,247 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended) as its Council Tax base for the year.

b)

PARISH	TAX BASE
Aberford and District	787
Allerton Bywater	1,375
Alwoodley	3,704
Arthington	294
Austhorpe	26
Bardsey cum Rigton	1,175
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	2,037
Boston Spa	1,866
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	735
Bramhope and Carlton	1,814
Clifford	753
Collingham with Linton	1,639
Drighlington	1,917
Gildersome	1,974
Great and Little Preston	498
Harewood	1,826
Horsforth	7,012
East Keswick	589
Kippax	3,101
Ledsham	96
Ledston	167
Micklefield	563

Morley	9,927
Otley	4,947
Pool in Wharfedale	973
Scarcroft	674
Shadwell	960
Swillington	1,064
Thorner	757
Thorp Arch	353
Walton	120
Wetherby	4,628
Wothersome	8

being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

- 2 That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
- a) £2,020,745,851 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
- b) £1,437,070,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
- c) £583,675,851 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
- d) £314,560,775 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant, reduced by the amount which the Council estimates will be transferred from its General Fund into its Collection Fund under Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988.
- e) £1,129.563336 being the amount at 2(c) above, less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
- f) £1,447,851 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

g) £1,123.49

being the amount at 2(e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(f) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.

h)

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Band D £ p</b>
Aberford and District	1,134.93
Allerton Bywater	1,143.13
Alwoodley	1,133.40
Arthington	1,130.29
Bardsey cum Rigton	1,147.75
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	1,142.64
Boston Spa	1,142.25
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	1,150.70
Bramhope and Carlton	1,159.32
Clifford	1,151.38
Collingham with Linton	1,154.91
Drighlington	1,134.97
Gildersome	1,134.13
Great and Little Preston	1,140.56
Harewood	1,124.04
Horsforth	1,138.04
East Keswick	1,149.81
Kippax	1,138.08
Ledsham	1,150.05
Ledston	1,142.65
Micklefield	1,196.18
Morley	1,141.13
Otley	1,184.12
Pool in Wharfedale	1,158.20
Scarcroft	1,139.81
Shadwell	1,157.87
Swillington	1,147.43
Thorner	1,159.16
Thorp Arch	1,147.46
Walton	1,160.99
Wetherby	1,173.83

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above

divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

i)

	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
LEEDS EXCEPT PARTS BELOW:	748.99	873.82	998.66	1,123.49	1,373.15	1,622.82	1,872.48	2,246.98
<b>Parish of:</b>								
Aberford and District	756.62	882.72	1,008.83	1,134.93	1,387.14	1,639.34	1,891.55	2,269.86
Allerton Bywater	762.09	889.10	1,016.12	1,143.13	1,397.16	1,651.19	1,905.22	2,286.26
Alwoodley	755.60	881.53	1,007.47	1,133.40	1,385.27	1,637.13	1,889.00	2,266.80
Arthington	753.53	879.11	1,004.70	1,130.29	1,381.47	1,632.64	1,883.82	2,260.58
Bardsey cum Rigton	765.17	892.69	1,020.22	1,147.75	1,402.81	1,657.86	1,912.92	2,295.50
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	761.76	888.72	1,015.68	1,142.64	1,396.56	1,650.48	1,904.40	2,285.28
Boston Spa	761.50	888.42	1,015.33	1,142.25	1,396.08	1,649.92	1,903.75	2,284.50
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	767.13	894.99	1,022.84	1,150.70	1,406.41	1,662.12	1,917.83	2,301.40
Bramhope and Carlton	772.88	901.69	1,030.51	1,159.32	1,416.95	1,674.57	1,932.20	2,318.64
Clifford	767.59	895.52	1,023.45	1,151.38	1,407.24	1,663.10	1,918.97	2,302.76
Collingham with Linton	769.94	898.26	1,026.59	1,154.91	1,411.56	1,668.20	1,924.85	2,309.82
Drighlington	756.65	882.75	1,008.86	1,134.97	1,387.19	1,639.40	1,891.62	2,269.94
Gildersome	756.09	882.10	1,008.12	1,134.13	1,386.16	1,638.19	1,890.22	2,268.26
Great and Little Preston	760.37	887.10	1,013.83	1,140.56	1,394.02	1,647.48	1,900.93	2,281.12
Harewood	749.36	874.25	999.15	1,124.04	1,373.83	1,623.61	1,873.40	2,248.08
Horsforth	758.69	885.14	1,011.59	1,138.04	1,390.94	1,643.84	1,896.73	2,276.08
East Keswick	766.54	894.30	1,022.05	1,149.81	1,405.32	1,660.84	1,916.35	2,299.62
Kippax	758.72	885.17	1,011.63	1,138.08	1,390.99	1,643.89	1,896.80	2,276.16
Ledsham	766.70	894.48	1,022.27	1,150.05	1,405.62	1,661.18	1,916.75	2,300.10
Ledston	761.77	888.73	1,015.69	1,142.65	1,396.57	1,650.49	1,904.42	2,285.30
Micklefield	797.45	930.36	1,063.27	1,196.18	1,462.00	1,727.82	1,993.63	2,392.36
Morley	760.75	887.55	1,014.34	1,141.13	1,394.71	1,648.30	1,901.88	2,282.26
Otley	789.41	920.98	1,052.55	1,184.12	1,447.26	1,710.40	1,973.53	2,368.24
Pool in Wharfedale	772.13	900.82	1,029.51	1,158.20	1,415.58	1,672.96	1,930.33	2,316.40
Scarcroft	759.87	886.52	1,013.16	1,139.81	1,393.10	1,646.39	1,899.68	2,279.62
Shadwell	771.91	900.57	1,029.22	1,157.87	1,415.17	1,672.48	1,929.78	2,315.74
Swillington	764.95	892.45	1,019.94	1,147.43	1,402.41	1,657.40	1,912.38	2,294.86
Thornor	772.77	901.57	1,030.36	1,159.16	1,416.75	1,674.34	1,931.93	2,318.32
Thorp Arch	764.97	892.47	1,019.96	1,147.46	1,402.45	1,657.44	1,912.43	2,294.92
Walton	773.99	902.99	1,031.99	1,160.99	1,418.99	1,676.99	1,934.98	2,321.98
Wetherby	782.55	912.98	1,043.40	1,173.83	1,434.68	1,695.53	1,956.38	2,347.66

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 2(g) and 2(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in Valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- 3 That it be noted for the year 2011/12 that the West Yorkshire Police Authority and the West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority have issued the following precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Precepting Authority	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
West Yorkshire Police Authority	87.0017	101.5020	116.0023	130.5026	159.5032	188.5037	217.5043	261.0052
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority	34.939570	40.762832	46.586094	52.409355	64.055879	75.702402	87.348926	104.818711

- 4 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(i) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of council tax for the year 2011/12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
LEEDS EXCEPT PARTS BELOW:	870.93	1,016.08	1,161.25	1,306.40	1,596.71	1,887.02	2,177.33	2,612.81
<b>Parish of:</b>								
Aberford and District	878.56	1,024.98	1,171.42	1,317.84	1,610.70	1,903.54	2,196.40	2,635.69
Allerton Bywater	884.03	1,031.36	1,178.71	1,326.04	1,620.72	1,915.39	2,210.07	2,652.09
Alwoodley	877.54	1,023.79	1,170.06	1,316.31	1,608.83	1,901.33	2,193.85	2,632.63
Arthington	875.47	1,021.37	1,167.29	1,313.20	1,605.03	1,896.84	2,188.67	2,626.41
Bardsey cum Rigton	887.11	1,034.95	1,182.81	1,330.66	1,626.37	1,922.06	2,217.77	2,661.33
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	883.70	1,030.98	1,178.27	1,325.55	1,620.12	1,914.68	2,209.25	2,651.11
Boston Spa	883.44	1,030.68	1,177.92	1,325.16	1,619.64	1,914.12	2,208.60	2,650.33
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	889.07	1,037.25	1,185.43	1,333.61	1,629.97	1,926.32	2,222.68	2,667.23
Bramhope and Carlton	894.82	1,043.95	1,193.10	1,342.23	1,640.51	1,938.77	2,237.05	2,684.47
Clifford	889.53	1,037.78	1,186.04	1,334.29	1,630.80	1,927.30	2,223.82	2,668.59
Collingham with Linton	891.88	1,040.52	1,189.18	1,337.82	1,635.12	1,932.40	2,229.70	2,675.65
Drighlington	878.59	1,025.01	1,171.45	1,317.88	1,610.75	1,903.60	2,196.47	2,635.77
Gildersome	878.03	1,024.36	1,170.71	1,317.04	1,609.72	1,902.39	2,195.07	2,634.09
Great and Little Preston	882.31	1,029.36	1,176.42	1,323.47	1,617.58	1,911.68	2,205.78	2,646.95
Harewood	871.30	1,016.51	1,161.74	1,306.95	1,597.39	1,887.81	2,178.25	2,613.91
Horsforth	880.63	1,027.40	1,174.18	1,320.95	1,614.50	1,908.04	2,201.58	2,641.91
East Keswick	888.48	1,036.56	1,184.64	1,332.72	1,628.88	1,925.04	2,221.20	2,665.45
Kippax	880.66	1,027.43	1,174.22	1,320.99	1,614.55	1,908.09	2,201.65	2,641.99
Ledsham	888.64	1,036.74	1,184.86	1,332.96	1,629.18	1,925.38	2,221.60	2,665.93
Ledston	883.71	1,030.99	1,178.28	1,325.56	1,620.13	1,914.69	2,209.27	2,651.13
Micklefield	919.39	1,072.62	1,225.86	1,379.09	1,685.56	1,992.02	2,298.48	2,758.19
Morley	882.69	1,029.81	1,176.93	1,324.04	1,618.27	1,912.50	2,206.73	2,648.09
Otley	911.35	1,063.24	1,215.14	1,367.03	1,670.82	1,974.60	2,278.38	2,734.07
Pool in Wharfedale	894.07	1,043.08	1,192.10	1,341.11	1,639.14	1,937.16	2,235.18	2,682.23
Scarcroft	881.81	1,028.78	1,175.75	1,322.72	1,616.66	1,910.59	2,204.53	2,645.45
Shadwell	893.85	1,042.83	1,191.81	1,340.78	1,638.73	1,936.68	2,234.63	2,681.57
Swillington	886.89	1,034.71	1,182.53	1,330.34	1,625.97	1,921.60	2,217.23	2,660.69
Thorner	894.71	1,043.83	1,192.95	1,342.07	1,640.31	1,938.54	2,236.78	2,684.15
Thorp Arch	886.91	1,034.73	1,182.55	1,330.37	1,626.01	1,921.64	2,217.28	2,660.75
Walton	895.93	1,045.25	1,194.58	1,343.90	1,642.55	1,941.19	2,239.83	2,687.81
Wetherby	904.49	1,055.24	1,205.99	1,356.74	1,658.24	1,959.73	2,261.23	2,713.49

- 5 That the schedule of instalments for 2011/12 for payments to the principal authorities out of the Collection Fund be determined as set out in Appendix II of the submitted report.

**iii) Capital Programme Update 2010-2014**

- a) That the capital programme, as attached to the submitted report, be approved.
- b) That the Executive Board be authorised to approve in year amendments to the capital programme including transfers from and to the reserved programme in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules.



- c) That the proposed Minimum Revenue Provision policies for 2011/12 as set out in 5.5 and 5.6 of the report and explained in Appendix F be approved.

**iv) Treasury Management Strategy 2011/2012**

- a) That borrowing limits be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.4 of the submitted report.
- b) That treasury management indicators be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.5 of the report.
- c) That investment limits be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.6 of the submitted report.
- d) That the revised Treasury Management policy statement be adopted.

An amendment (1) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:-

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Adult Social Care budget of £471k to keep the Mental Health Crisis Centre, known as the Leeds Crisis Centre, in Headingley open
- b) an increase in the use of General Fund Reserves of £471k'

A further amendment (2) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in City Development budget of £270k for the continuation of the current Library Service
- b) a decrease in the Strategic budget of £300k to be achieved through cross cutting savings in the cost of information technology.
- c) a contribution to general fund reserves of £30k'

A further amendment (3) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Adult Social Care budget of £100k to be put into residential care

- b) an increase in the Strategic budget of £200k to increase the voluntary sector hardship fund to £300k
- c) an increase in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £335k, £250k to fund young peoples apprenticeships and £85k for kerbside garden collections in November and January.
- d) a decrease in the Central and Corporate budget of £321k to reflect the part year cessation of the Leeds Initiative and the International Relations section
- e) a decrease in the Strategic budget of £370k being £150k reduction in the budget the cost of the trade union facilities agreement and £220k cross cutting reductions in training budgets
- f) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £56k'

A further amendment (4) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £500k to keep the East Leeds Leisure Centre open
- b) a decrease in the Strategic Budget of £510k achieved by cross cutting reduction in the following budgets:-
  - Office Furniture and equipment - a 12 month moratorium 300k
  - Publications 10% reduction in the printing of brochures £210k
- c) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £10k'

A further amendment (5) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- (a) an increase in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £250k for the Area Committees Wellbeing fund
- (b) a decrease in the Strategic Budget of £250k achieved by a reduction in the use of non-Council venues for meetings'

A further amendment (6) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £68k for the reinstatement of crèche facilities in Sports centres
- b) a decrease in the Strategic Budget of £70k achieved by the ceasing of translation of brochures and leaflets
- c) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £2k'

A further amendment (7) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £189k for the reinstatement of the Council's contribution to the free city centre bus
- b) a decrease in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £40k in respect of income generation from extending car parking facilities at the former international pool site
- c) a decrease in the City Development budget of £17k by ending car parking charges at Temple Newsham
- d) a decrease in the Strategic Budget of £133k achieved by cross cutting reductions in the budgets for publications and advertising
- e) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £1k'

A further amendment (8) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £397k to be distributed to the Area Committees for Community safety issues
- b) a decrease in the Strategic Budget of £397k by reducing the Contingency Fund'

A further amendment (9) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £200k for an increase in opening hours at Garforth Leisure Centre
- b) a decrease in the Strategic budget in respect of a cross cutting reductions of £200k in stationery budgets'

A further amendment (10) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £80k for an increase in opening hours at Bramley baths
- b) a decrease in the Strategic budget of £100k in respect of the provision of equality services to the ALMOs
- c) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £20k'

A further amendment (11) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12 and, adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) a net reduction in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £93k to be achieved through an increase in income of £580k in the number of parking meters in three areas of the City offset by a 20% reduction in the Central Zone parking charges resulting in a reduction in income of £487k
- b) a contribution to General Fund Reserves of £93k'

A further amendment (12) was moved by Councillor A Carter, seconded by Councillor J Procter that

In 4 (iii) (a) after the words 'be approved', add:

'subject to an increase in the City Development Capital Programme of £1,800,000 for additional Highway Maintenance works, and a corresponding decrease in the Central and Corporate Capital Programme in respect of the Council's Web replacement scheme which is to be transferred to the reserved programme.'

A further amendment (13) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12, and adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City Development budget of £189k for the continuation of the Council's contribution to the free bus service for a further 12 months
- b) an increase in the use of General Fund Reserves of £189k'

A further amendment (14) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12, and adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Adult Social Care budget of £471k for keeping open the Mental Health Crisis centre in Headingley, known as the Leeds Crisis Centre
- b) the use of £471k of reserves earmarked for the future funding of Schools PFI schemes.'

A further amendment (15) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12, and adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £1,887k being:-
  - Reinstatement of Area wellbeing monies - £250k
  - Funding for Community Events - £50k
  - Area Wellbeing – additional money for environmental enhancements - £500k
  - Ring fencing of additional Community Safety Grants to Area wellbeing funds - £847k
  - Creation of a business engagement scheme for investment in local communities through the Third Sector - £240k
- b) a reduction in the Central and Corporate budget of £630k to be achieved by delaying part of the Invest to save programme for 12 months
- c) a reduction in the Strategic budget of £847k, £400k for Burglary Initiatives and £447k being the unallocated element of the Community Safety Grant for 2011/12.
- d) The use of £410k of reserves earmarked for the future funding of Schools PFI schemes
- (e) £500k included in the Strategic budget in respect to support to Jobs and Skills initiatives to be redirected to provide a fund for voluntary organisations to bid for to support projects to assist young unemployed people to gain relevant skills.

A further amendment (16) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12, and adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the Environment and Neighbourhoods budget of £170k to introduce an additional food waste collection round
- b) a reduction in the Central and Corporate budget of £170k to be achieved by delaying part of the Invest to save programme for 12 months'

A further amendment (17) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(a), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to amendments to the Council's estimates for 2011/12, and adjustments to the figures in 4(ii)2 (a) to (g) as appropriate, as set out below:

- a) an increase in the City development budget of £2,500k being:-
  - Additional provision for a programme of reactive and planned Highway maintenance to improve the condition of the network - £1,500k
  - Programme of 20mph zones /speed limits and residents parking schemes £1,000k
- b) the use of £2,500k of reserves earmarked for the future funding of Schools PFI schemes'

A further amendment (18) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(b), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to the transfer of £2.3m from the FRS17 Reserve in the Housing Revenue Account to enable a long term empty property fund to be established for the purchase and refurbishment of empty private sector properties to be taken into the HRA stock or sold on the open market.'

A further amendment (19) was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor Hamilton that

In 4 (i)(b), after the words 'be approved' add:

'subject to an increase in the Capital Programme of £1m for a new Community Buildings Fund and a corresponding decrease in respect of the Council's Web replacement scheme which is to be transferred to the reserved programme.'

Amendments 1 to 19 were declared lost and, upon being put to the vote, it was

## RESOLVED –

### i) Revenue Budget

- a) That the Revenue Budget for 2011/12 totalling £582,228,000 as detailed and explained in the submitted report and accompanying papers be approved, with no increase in the Leeds' element of the Council Tax for 2011/12.
- b) That with respect to the Housing Revenue Account the following be approved:-
  - i) approve the budget at the average rent increase figure of 6.84%
  - ii) increase the charges for garage rents to £6.49 per week
  - iii) increase service charges in line with rents (6.84%)

### ii) Council Tax

- 1 It was noted that at the meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2011, Council agreed the following amounts for the year 2011/12, in accordance with regulations made under Sections 33(5) and 34(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
  - a) 238,247 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended) as its Council Tax base for the year.

b)

PARISH	TAX BASE
Aberford and District	787
Allerton Bywater	1,375
Alwoodley	3,704
Arthington	294
Austhorpe	26
Bardsey cum Rigton	1,175
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	2,037
Boston Spa	1,866
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	735
Bramhope and Carlton	1,814
Clifford	753
Collingham with Linton	1,639
Drighlington	1,917
Gildersome	1,974
Great and Little Preston	498
Harewood	1,826
Horsforth	7,012
East Keswick	589

Kippax	3,101
Ledsham	96
Ledston	167
Micklefield	563
Morley	9,927
Otley	4,947
Pool in Wharfedale	973
Scarcroft	674
Shadwell	960
Swillington	1,064
Thorner	757
Thorp Arch	353
Walton	120
Wetherby	4,628
Wothersome	8

being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

- 2 That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
- a) £2,020,745,851 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
- b) £1,437,070,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
- c) £583,675,851 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
- d) £314,560,775 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant, reduced by the amount which the Council estimates will be transferred from its General Fund into its Collection Fund under Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988.
- e) £1,129.563336 being the amount at 2(c) above, less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.



f) £1,447,851 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

g) £1,123.49 being the amount at 2(e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(f) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.

h)

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Band D £ p</b>
Aberford and District	1,134.93
Allerton Bywater	1,143.13
Alwoodley	1,133.40
Arthington	1,130.29
Bardsey cum Rigton	1,147.75
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	1,142.64
Boston Spa	1,142.25
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	1,150.70
Bramhope and Carlton	1,159.32
Clifford	1,151.38
Collingham with Linton	1,154.91
Drighlington	1,134.97
Gildersome	1,134.13
Great and Little Preston	1,140.56
Harewood	1,124.04
Horsforth	1,138.04
East Keswick	1,149.81
Kippax	1,138.08
Ledsham	1,150.05
Ledston	1,142.65
Micklefield	1,196.18
Morley	1,141.13
Otley	1,184.12
Pool in Wharfedale	1,158.20
Scarcroft	1,139.81
Shadwell	1,157.87
Swillington	1,147.43
Thorner	1,159.16
Thorp Arch	1,147.46
Walton	1,160.99
Wetherby	1,173.83

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

i)

	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
LEEDS EXCEPT PARTS BELOW:	748.99	873.82	998.66	1,123.49	1,373.15	1,622.82	1,872.48	2,246.98
<b>Parish of:</b>								
Aberford and District	756.62	882.72	1,008.83	1,134.93	1,387.14	1,639.34	1,891.55	2,269.86
Allerton Bywater	762.09	889.10	1,016.12	1,143.13	1,397.16	1,651.19	1,905.22	2,286.26
Alwoodley	755.60	881.53	1,007.47	1,133.40	1,385.27	1,637.13	1,889.00	2,266.80
Arthington	753.53	879.11	1,004.70	1,130.29	1,381.47	1,632.64	1,883.82	2,260.58
Bardsey cum Rigton	765.17	892.69	1,020.22	1,147.75	1,402.81	1,657.86	1,912.92	2,295.50
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	761.76	888.72	1,015.68	1,142.64	1,396.56	1,650.48	1,904.40	2,285.28
Boston Spa	761.50	888.42	1,015.33	1,142.25	1,396.08	1,649.92	1,903.75	2,284.50
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	767.13	894.99	1,022.84	1,150.70	1,406.41	1,662.12	1,917.83	2,301.40
Bramhope and Carlton	772.88	901.69	1,030.51	1,159.32	1,416.95	1,674.57	1,932.20	2,318.64
Clifford	767.59	895.52	1,023.45	1,151.38	1,407.24	1,663.10	1,918.97	2,302.76
Collingham with Linton	769.94	898.26	1,026.59	1,154.91	1,411.56	1,668.20	1,924.85	2,309.82
Drighlington	756.65	882.75	1,008.86	1,134.97	1,387.19	1,639.40	1,891.62	2,269.94
Gildersome	756.09	882.10	1,008.12	1,134.13	1,386.16	1,638.19	1,890.22	2,268.26
Great and Little Preston	760.37	887.10	1,013.83	1,140.56	1,394.02	1,647.48	1,900.93	2,281.12
Harewood	749.36	874.25	999.15	1,124.04	1,373.83	1,623.61	1,873.40	2,248.08
Horsforth	758.69	885.14	1,011.59	1,138.04	1,390.94	1,643.84	1,896.73	2,276.08
East Keswick	766.54	894.30	1,022.05	1,149.81	1,405.32	1,660.84	1,916.35	2,299.62
Kippax	758.72	885.17	1,011.63	1,138.08	1,390.99	1,643.89	1,896.80	2,276.16
Ledsham	766.70	894.48	1,022.27	1,150.05	1,405.62	1,661.18	1,916.75	2,300.10
Ledston	761.77	888.73	1,015.69	1,142.65	1,396.57	1,650.49	1,904.42	2,285.30
Micklefield	797.45	930.36	1,063.27	1,196.18	1,462.00	1,727.82	1,993.63	2,392.36
Morley	760.75	887.55	1,014.34	1,141.13	1,394.71	1,648.30	1,901.88	2,282.26
Otley	789.41	920.98	1,052.55	1,184.12	1,447.26	1,710.40	1,973.53	2,368.24
Pool in Wharfedale	772.13	900.82	1,029.51	1,158.20	1,415.58	1,672.96	1,930.33	2,316.40
Scarcroft	759.87	886.52	1,013.16	1,139.81	1,393.10	1,646.39	1,899.68	2,279.62
Shadwell	771.91	900.57	1,029.22	1,157.87	1,415.17	1,672.48	1,929.78	2,315.74
Swillington	764.95	892.45	1,019.94	1,147.43	1,402.41	1,657.40	1,912.38	2,294.86
Thorner	772.77	901.57	1,030.36	1,159.16	1,416.75	1,674.34	1,931.93	2,318.32
Thorp Arch	764.97	892.47	1,019.96	1,147.46	1,402.45	1,657.44	1,912.43	2,294.92
Walton	773.99	902.99	1,031.99	1,160.99	1,418.99	1,676.99	1,934.98	2,321.98
Wetherby	782.55	912.98	1,043.40	1,173.83	1,434.68	1,695.53	1,956.38	2,347.66

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 2(g) and 2(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in Valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- 3 That it be noted for the year 2011/12 that the West Yorkshire Police Authority and the West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority have issued the following precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Precepting Authority	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
West Yorkshire Police Authority	87.0017	101.5020	116.0023	130.5026	159.5032	188.5037	217.5043	261.0052
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority	34.939570	40.762832	46.586094	52.409355	64.055879	75.702402	87.348926	104.818711

- 4 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(i) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of council tax for the year 2011/12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

	Band A £ p	Band B £ p	Band C £ p	Band D £ p	Band E £ p	Band F £ p	Band G £ p	Band H £ p
LEEDS EXCEPT PARTS BELOW:	870.93	1,016.08	1,161.25	1,306.40	1,596.71	1,887.02	2,177.33	2,612.81
<b>Parish of:</b>								
Aberford and District	878.56	1,024.98	1,171.42	1,317.84	1,610.70	1,903.54	2,196.40	2,635.69
Allerton Bywater	884.03	1,031.36	1,178.71	1,326.04	1,620.72	1,915.39	2,210.07	2,652.09
Alwoodley	877.54	1,023.79	1,170.06	1,316.31	1,608.83	1,901.33	2,193.85	2,632.63
Arthington	875.47	1,021.37	1,167.29	1,313.20	1,605.03	1,896.84	2,188.67	2,626.41
Bardsey cum Rigton	887.11	1,034.95	1,182.81	1,330.66	1,626.37	1,922.06	2,217.77	2,661.33
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	883.70	1,030.98	1,178.27	1,325.55	1,620.12	1,914.68	2,209.25	2,651.11
Boston Spa	883.44	1,030.68	1,177.92	1,325.16	1,619.64	1,914.12	2,208.60	2,650.33
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	889.07	1,037.25	1,185.43	1,333.61	1,629.97	1,926.32	2,222.68	2,667.23
Bramhope and Carlton	894.82	1,043.95	1,193.10	1,342.23	1,640.51	1,938.77	2,237.05	2,684.47
Clifford	889.53	1,037.78	1,186.04	1,334.29	1,630.80	1,927.30	2,223.82	2,668.59
Collingham with Linton	891.88	1,040.52	1,189.18	1,337.82	1,635.12	1,932.40	2,229.70	2,675.65
Drighlington	878.59	1,025.01	1,171.45	1,317.88	1,610.75	1,903.60	2,196.47	2,635.77
Gildersome	878.03	1,024.36	1,170.71	1,317.04	1,609.72	1,902.39	2,195.07	2,634.09
Great and Little Preston	882.31	1,029.36	1,176.42	1,323.47	1,617.58	1,911.68	2,205.78	2,646.95
Harewood	871.30	1,016.51	1,161.74	1,306.95	1,597.39	1,887.81	2,178.25	2,613.91
Horsforth	880.63	1,027.40	1,174.18	1,320.95	1,614.50	1,908.04	2,201.58	2,641.91
East Keswick	888.48	1,036.56	1,184.64	1,332.72	1,628.88	1,925.04	2,221.20	2,665.45
Kippax	880.66	1,027.43	1,174.22	1,320.99	1,614.55	1,908.09	2,201.65	2,641.99
Ledsham	888.64	1,036.74	1,184.86	1,332.96	1,629.18	1,925.38	2,221.60	2,665.93
Ledston	883.71	1,030.99	1,178.28	1,325.56	1,620.13	1,914.69	2,209.27	2,651.13
Micklefield	919.39	1,072.62	1,225.86	1,379.09	1,685.56	1,992.02	2,298.48	2,758.19
Morley	882.69	1,029.81	1,176.93	1,324.04	1,618.27	1,912.50	2,206.73	2,648.09
Otley	911.35	1,063.24	1,215.14	1,367.03	1,670.82	1,974.60	2,278.38	2,734.07
Pool in Wharfedale	894.07	1,043.08	1,192.10	1,341.11	1,639.14	1,937.16	2,235.18	2,682.23
Scarcroft	881.81	1,028.78	1,175.75	1,322.72	1,616.66	1,910.59	2,204.53	2,645.45
Shadwell	893.85	1,042.83	1,191.81	1,340.78	1,638.73	1,936.68	2,234.63	2,681.57
Swillington	886.89	1,034.71	1,182.53	1,330.34	1,625.97	1,921.60	2,217.23	2,660.69
Thornor	894.71	1,043.83	1,192.95	1,342.07	1,640.31	1,938.54	2,236.78	2,684.15
Thorp Arch	886.91	1,034.73	1,182.55	1,330.37	1,626.01	1,921.64	2,217.28	2,660.75
Walton	895.93	1,045.25	1,194.58	1,343.90	1,642.55	1,941.19	2,239.83	2,687.81
Wetherby	904.49	1,055.24	1,205.99	1,356.74	1,658.24	1,959.73	2,261.23	2,713.49

- 5 That the schedule of instalments for 2011/12 for payments to the principal authorities out of the Collection Fund be determined as set out in Appendix II of the submitted report.

**iii) Capital Programme Update 2010-2014**

- a) That the capital programme, as attached to the submitted report, be approved.
- b) That the Executive Board be authorised to approve in year amendments to the capital programme including transfers from and to the reserved programme in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules.

- c) That the proposed Minimum Revenue Provision policies for 2011/12 as set out in 5.5 and 5.6 of the report and explained in Appendix F be approved.

**iv) Treasury Management Strategy 2011/2012**

- a) That borrowing limits be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.4 of the submitted report.
- b) That treasury management indicators be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.5 of the report.
- c) That investment limits be set for 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 as set out in Section 3.6 of the submitted report.
- d) That the revised Treasury Management policy statement be adopted.

On the requisition of Councillors J Procter and Lobley, the voting on all of the amendments were recorded as follows:-

Amendment 1 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon

55

Amendment 2 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, Blackburn A, Blackburn D, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, R Grahame, P Grahame, R Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, Hamilton, S Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, Lewis J, Lewis R, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, McKenna A, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, Taylor E, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 3 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, Harris, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

56

ABSTAIN

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

18

Amendment 4 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

54

Amendment 5 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 6 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Monaghan, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

56

ABSTAIN

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

18

Amendment 7 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 8 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 9 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 10 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 11 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

ABSTAIN

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

19

Amendment 12 in the name of Councillor A Carter

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41



NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 13 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

54

ABSTAIN

Leadley.

1

Amendment 14 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray,

Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 15 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

Amendment 16 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

19

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

ABSTAIN

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

Amendment 17 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

19

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

ABSTAIN

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

Amendment 18 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

19

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

ABSTAIN

Anderson, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Harrand, W Hyde, Kendall, Lamb, G Latty, P Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, J Procter, R Procter, Robinson, Schofield, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wood.

22

Amendment 19 in the name of Councillor Golton

YES

Anderson, Bentley, Brett, Campbell, A Carter, J L Carter, Castle, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, Fox, Golton, M Hamilton, Harrand, Harris, W Hyde, Kendall, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, G Latty, P

Latty, Lobley, Marjoram, Matthews, Monaghan, J Procter, R Procter, Pryke, Robinson, Schofield, Smith, A Taylor, Wadsworth, Wilkinson, Wilson, Wood.

41

NO

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, A Blackburn, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

55

On the requisition of Councillors Gruen and Nash, the voting on the substantive motion was recorded as follows:-

YES

Akhtar, Armitage, Atha, Atkinson, D Blackburn, Blake, Congreve, Coulson, Davey, Dobson, Dowson, Driver, Dunn, Elliott, Finnigan, Gabriel, Gettings, P Grahame, R Grahame, Grayshon, Groves, Gruen, S Hamilton, Hanley, Hardy, G Harper, J Harper, A Hussain, G Hussain, G Hyde, Illingworth, Iqbal, Jarosz, Leadley, J Lewis, R Lewis, Lowe, Lyons, Maqsood, A McKenna, Morgan, Mulherin, Murray, Nash, Ogilvie, Parker, Rafique, Renshaw, Selby, Taggart, E Taylor, Varley, Wakefield, Yeadon.

54

NO

A Blackburn.

1

ABSTAIN

Bentley, Brett, Campbell, Chapman, Chastney, Cleasby, Downes, Ewens, Golton, M Hamilton, Harris, Kirkland, Lamb, Lancaster, Matthews, Monaghan, Pryke, Smith, A Taylor, Wilson.

20

**80 Minutes**

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor Gruen, and

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes be received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.2(i).

Council Procedure Rule 4, providing for the winding up of business, was applied prior to all notified comments on the minutes having been debated.

Council rose at 7.15 pm.



Originator:	Brenda Knott
Tel:	2474572

---

**Report of the Chief Executive**

**Council**

**Date: 6<sup>th</sup> April 2011**

**Subject: Leeds Award**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

**1.0 Purpose of Report**

1.1 The Leeds Award Panel met on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011 and are recommending that the following nomination receive the Leeds Award.

1.2 Mrs. Freda Matthews – details of nominee attached

**2.0 Background**

2.1 Executive Board on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2007 agreed to the creation of a Leeds Award in order to recognize people who have brought credit to the City of Leeds.

**3.0 Recommendations**

3.1 That Council approve the recommendations of the Leeds Award Panel.

**Background Papers**

- Executive Board Report : 17<sup>th</sup> October 2007 – Creation of the Leeds Award

This page is intentionally left blank

# LEEDS AWARD



NOMINEE:	<b>Freda Matthews</b>
<p><b>REASON FOR NOMINATION:</b></p> <p>Freda Matthews is what you would call " a pillar of society ". She has lived in little Woodhouse for all the time I have known her - I have known Freda Matthews for around twenty years. We first got together in the early 90's through the late Cllr Brian Dale who represented University Ward at the time.</p> <p>Freda and Brian set up the Little Woodhouse Community Association which is still going today. During this time she has dedicated her life to her local community and has given much of her time to help improve the area and the lives of the people who live in it.</p> <p>She has without doubt changed the lives of people in Leeds by continually demonstrating an exceptional commitment to the local community.</p> <p>If you read the testaments to her below from members of the local community you will see how much she is valued and loved by those you have had the pleasure of working with her. I can think of no one more deserving of recognition from our community in Hyde Park and I take great pleasure in nominating her for the Leeds Award.</p> <p><u>Testament 1: Director Swarthmore Education Centre</u></p> <p>Freda Matthews has devoted her retirement to helping her community for the past twenty years. Now going on 80 years old Freda is still an active trustee of Swarthmore Education Centre as well as Claremont local History society.</p> <p>Freda was Chair of Little Woodhouse Community Association until December 2010 and has worked tirelessly since 1993 helping local residents by liaising with Council officers and ward Councillors over local issues and making improvements happen in the area.</p> <p>Freda has brought extra money into the area by applying for grants and instigating the Neighbourhood Design statement.</p> <p>Through Freda's love of local history she has produced a range of booklets about the area creating a sense of community identity and pride.</p> <p>Last years first Picnic in the Park on Hanover Square, where a successful and enjoyable day was had by all, was down to Freda's hard work and stamina.</p> <p>Freda has brought her local knowledge and expertise to the board of trustees at Swarthmore where she has been Chair for several years in the past. She has helped Swarthmore acquire funding in the past for the refurbishment of room 3 (Ellen Heaton's drawing room) which is also a great community resource as well as a teaching room.</p> <p>Freda was paramount in the creation of the Rosebank Millennium Green from the late 90s onwards.</p> <p>Freda was also a member of the local Burley Network where her expertise was extremely valued.</p> <p>When the multi cultural centre on Woodsley Road had challenges a few years ago Freda stepped in to help them sort everything out with the Charity commission and succeeded.</p> <p>Freda is the Big Society and everything she does is for the greater good of the community in which</p>	

she lives. No one is more deserving of this Leeds award than Freda.

#### Testament 2: Rosebank Millennium Green Trust

I first met Freda about twenty years ago (possibly 1992 or 1993), when she and others set up Little Woodhouse Community Association. Originally from Keighley, I believe she's lived in Hanover Square for about fifty years and has therefore had a long association with the Little Woodhouse area. She's something of a local historian, having built up a wealth of knowledge of the buildings, streets and open spaces which constitute the locality, as well as knowing much about the people and their lives. An active member of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, and of the Civic Trust, she frequently conducts walks around - and gives talks on - this special part of Leeds.

Her interest in green spaces led her and others to establish the Rosebank Millennium Green Trust in 1998 in order to begin the process of turning a five-and-a-half acre overgrown hillside into Leeds's first millennium green and a site of unusual peace and tranquillity. She is still very active in this organisation and spends much of her time meeting and liaising with organisations and charities which help to provide some of the valuable funding, without which the project could not survive.

Trustee

Rosebank Millennium Green Trust

#### Testament 3: LWCA Committee Member and resident of Dennison Hall

When I first moved to Hanover Square, Freda made herself known to me as a neighbour and local historian. We arranged for her to come and talk to the new intake of residents after the refurbishment of Denison Hall in 2001 which she had been keenly involved in over the past few years.

It was immediately clear that the local knowledge Freda had acquired over the 50 or so years of living and bringing up a family in Hanover Square, was fascinating for incomers, invaluable as a local history resource, and delivered with a passion that is hard to match.

It was with a sense of pride that she told us of the most recent changes in our immediate area: railings around Hanover Square; conversion of derelict tennis courts to 5 a-side football pitch for all to use. Tarmac-ing of previously muddy paths in the park and new benches. It was some years later before I learnt just who had been instrumental in these changes, just who had filled in the endless application forms for grants, just who had gone to meetings with council officers and send hundreds of e-mails in order to make all these things happen - Freda Matthews. And that was just on our doorstep, there was so much more...

Freda has been a tower of strength leading the Little Woodhouse Community Association over the last decade or so and will be greatly missed by all on the committee and wider community.

Fortunately Freda has only 'retired' from one area of her interest. No doubt she will now use the time gained to continue working on her local history archive; keeping an eye on safety in the area through BCOS and supporting the Rosebank Millennium Green Trust, as well as enjoying more time with her family and friends.

LWCA Cttee Member and  
Resident of Denison Hall

#### Testament 4: Leeds Central

I would like strongly to support the nomination of Freda Matthews for a Leeds Award.

Freda has given outstanding service to the people of Little Woodhouse – a vibrant community and a priceless part of Leeds' Georgian and Victorian past - through her work in the Community Association. Freda has both helped to tell the story of the area's history – including through the publication of her walking guides - and played a leading role in preserving what remains through the Conservation Area Partnership Schemes and keeping a close eye on plans for development.

She led the campaign to create the Rosebank Millennium Green which has been such an addition to the area, and has been Chair of the Swarthmore Adult Education Centre. She also helped to organise last year's very successful Little Woodhouse Picnic. And when I got a card from her recently I learned that Freda is also a talented cartoonist!

Freda's determination, energy, wise counsel and concern for others mark her out as a very special



individual. She really deserves this recognition for everything that she has done for her neighbours and her community over the years.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ATTACHED:

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: A L Collinson

Tel: 39 51710

---

**Report of the Chief Executive**

**Full Council**

**Date: 6 April 2011**

**Subject: Recommendations from General Purposes Committee**

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

**Executive Summary**

1. This report sets out recommendations to full Council from the General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 23 March 2011 relating to amendments to the Council's Policy Framework, set out in Article 4.
2. The amendments reflect the changes to the city's partnership and planning framework considered by the Executive Board in December 2010. They bring consistency to these arrangements, and ensure that all of the city's strategic partnership plans are subject to full Council approval. .
3. General Purposes Committee recommends full Council to approve the amendments set out in this report and the attached appendix, with effect from the new municipal year 2011/2012.

## 1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 This report presents recommendations to full Council from the General Purposes Committee for amendments to the Constitution. Amendments are recommended to the Policy Framework set out in Article 4 , together with consequential amendments.

## 2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 General Purposes Committee is authorised to consider proposals to amend the Constitution. At its meeting on 23 March 2011, the General Purposes Committee considered an item about proposed amendments to the Policy Framework of Article 4 – Full Council. This report sets out the recommendations from General Purposes Committee relating to this item.

## 3.0 Main Issues

- 3.1 The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) to the General Purposes Committee set out a number of proposed amendments to Article 4, which sets out the policies and plans that are approved by full Council. Consequential amendments to the Constitution as a result of the proposed amendments were also detailed.
- 3.2 A number of changes to the city's partnership and planning framework, endorsed by Executive Board on 15 December 2010, impact on the Council's Policy Framework. These include the production of City Priority Plans, (to replace the Leeds Strategic Plan), aligned to the Strategic Partnerships.
- 3.3 In addition, there have been changes to legal requirements in relation to the plans and policies the Council which is required to have in place, as set out in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning Policy and Improvement).
- 3.4 General Purposes Committee considered the report which explained the impact of these various changes and the Council's revised planning framework. The following table shows the specific changes proposed to Article 4 and appendix 1 to this report sets out the document with amendments shown:

<b>Article 4 - Current Budget and Policy Framework</b>	<b>Article 4 - Revisions to Budget and Policy Framework</b>
Sustainable Community Strategy	This is the Vision for Leeds, so for transparency, it is proposed to remove the reference to the Strategy and refer explicitly to the Vision for Leeds.
Leeds Strategic Plan	To remove as this has been replaced by the 5 City Priority Plans.
Children and Young Peoples' Plan	To remain, but amend position to reflect that it is no longer statutory, and to indicate that this plan also fulfils the legal requirement to produce a Youth Justice Plan. In addition it will incorporate within it the Children and Families City Priority Plan.
Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy (CDRS)	This will be fulfilled by the Safer and Stronger Communities Plan, which will also incorporate the Safer and Stronger Communities City Priority Plan.

<b>Article 4 - Current Budget and Policy Framework</b>	<b>Article 4 - Revisions to Budget and Policy Framework</b>
Health and Well Being Plan	To be removed and replaced by the Health and Wellbeing City Priority Plan.
Economic Development Strategy	To replace with the Sustainable Economy and Culture City Priority Plan.
Leeds Housing Strategy	To replace with the Regeneration City Priority Plan.
Climate Change Strategy	Remove as this will be covered within the Sustainable Economy and Culture City Priority Plan.

- 3.5 General Purposes Committee resolved to recommend to full Council that Article 4 be amended as set out in appendix 1 to this report, to be of effect from the new municipal year 2011/2012
- 3.6 The Committee also recommended other consequential amendments, as follows, to be of effect from the new municipal year.
- 3.7 Firstly, amendments are recommended to reflect the replacement of the Leeds Strategic Plan by City Priority Plans. In particular, the following documents require the removal of the term “Strategic Plan” or “Leeds Strategic Plan”, as applicable, and insertion in its place of the term “City Priority Plans”:
- Part 1 Summary and Explanation
  - Article 1 – The Constitution
  - Area Committee Procedure Rules footnote 4
  - Roles of Members and Officers in Decision Making
  - Code of Corporate Governance
- 3.8 Secondly, amendments are recommended to the terms of reference of Scrutiny Boards, - except for Scrutiny Board (Health) - which currently refer to the Leeds Strategic Plan. The General Purposes Committee recommended that that item 1(g) in each of the terms of reference be amended to read as follows:
- 3.9 “To review outcomes, targets and priorities within any relevant City Priority Plans and to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate;”

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

- 4.1 It is in accordance with good governance principles to update the Constitution to ensure that it is fit for purpose.

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

- 5.1 There are no legal or resource implications arising from the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

#### **6.0 Conclusions**

- 6.1 The amendments reflect the changes to the city’s partnership and planning framework considered by the Executive Board in December 2010. They bring

consistency to these arrangements, and ensure that all of the city's strategic partnership plans are subject to full Council approval.

## **7.0 Recommendations**

- 7.1 General Purposes Committee recommends full Council to approve amendments to the Policy Framework in Article 4 –as set out in the appendix to this report.
- 7.2 General Purposes Committee also recommends full Council to approve the consequential constitutional amendments set out in paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 of this report.

## **8.0 Background Papers**

- 8.1 Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) to the General Purposes Committee, 23 March 2011.
- 8.2 Draft minutes of the General Purposes Committee, 23 March 2011.

**ARTICLE 4 – THE FULL COUNCIL**

**4.1 MEANINGS**

**• Policy Framework**

The Policy Framework means the following plans and strategies:

(i) those required by the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) 2000 to be adopted by the Council<sup>1</sup>:

- [Safer and Stronger Communities Plan](#)<sup>2</sup>
- Development plan documents<sup>3</sup>
- Licensing Authority Policy Statement<sup>4</sup>
- Local Transport Plan
- Plans and alterations which together comprise the Development Plan
- [Vision for Leeds](#)<sup>5</sup>
- Youth Justice Plan<sup>6</sup>

**Deleted:** <#>Children and Young Peoples Plan¶  
Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy

**Deleted:** Sustainable Community Strategy

(ii) other plans and strategies adopted by the Council<sup>9</sup>:

- Council Business Plan
- [Children and Young Peoples Plan](#)<sup>10</sup>
- [Health and Wellbeing City Priority Plan](#)
- [Sustainable Economy and Culture City Priority Plan](#)
- Climate Change Strategy
- [Regeneration City Priority Plan](#)

**Deleted:** (ii) , other plans and strategies adopted by the Council in accordance with ODPM guidance which recommends adoption by the Council as part of the Policy Framework : ¶  
¶  
<#>Leeds Strategic Plan<sup>8</sup> ¶  
¶

**Deleted:** i

**Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

**Deleted:** Health and Wellbeing Plan

**Deleted:** Economic Development Strategy

**Deleted:** Leeds Housing Strategy

Additional plans and strategies may be approved or adopted as part of the Policy Framework from time to time.

**• Budget**

<sup>1</sup> The 2000 Regulations specify that the council’s annual library plan needs to be part of this framework. The council is not however currently required to produce a library plan.

<sup>2</sup> This fulfils the requirement to produce a Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy and also includes within it the Safer and Stronger Communities City Priority Plan.

<sup>3</sup> Section 15 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

<sup>4</sup> This is the policy statement under the Gambling Act 2005.

<sup>5</sup> This is the authority’s Sustainable Community Strategy. When preparing or modifying this strategy, the authority must (Section 4 Local Government Act 2000):

- consult and seek the participation of each partner authority (as defined by Section 10-4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007) and such other persons as it considers appropriate; and
- have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

<sup>6</sup> Section 40 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 - this is included within the Children and Young Peoples Plan

<sup>9</sup> In accordance with Schedule 4 of the Regulations

<sup>10</sup> This includes within it the Children and Families City Priority Plan

**Deleted:** is

**Deleted:** the Safer Leeds Partnership Plan

The budget includes the allocation of financial resources to different services and projects, proposed contingency funds, the Council Tax base, setting the Council Tax and decisions relating to the control of the Council's borrowing requirement, the control of its capital expenditure and setting of virement limits.

- **Housing Land Transfer**

Housing Land Transfer means the approval or adoption of applications (whether in draft form or not) to the Secretary of State for approval of a programme of disposal of 500 or more properties to a person under the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 or to dispose of land used for residential purposes where approval is required under sections 32 or 43 of the Housing Act 1985.

#### 4.2 **FUNCTIONS OF THE FULL COUNCIL**

Only the Council will exercise the following functions:

- adopting and changing the Constitution;
- appointing the Leader;
- all local choice functions set out in Part 3 of this Constitution which the Council decides should be undertaken by itself rather than the Executive, except where those functions have been delegated by the Council;
- all those functions of the full Council set out in Section 2A of Part 3 of the Constitution; and
- all other matters which, by law, must be reserved to the Council.

#### 4.3 **COUNCIL MEETINGS**

There are three types of Council meeting:

- The annual meeting
- Ordinary meetings
- Extraordinary meetings

and they will be conducted in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules in Part 4 of this Constitution.

#### 4.4 **RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNCTIONS**

The Council will maintain the documents in Part 3 of this Constitution setting out the responsibilities for the Council's functions which are not the responsibility of the Executive.



## EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 9TH MARCH, 2011

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

Councillors A Blackburn, J Blake, S Golton,  
P Gruen, R Lewis, T Murray, A Ogilvie and  
L Yeadon

Councillors J Dowson and R Finnigan – Non-Voting Advisory Members  
Councillor J Procter – Substitute Member

**176 Substitute Member**

Under the terms of Executive Procedure Rule 2.3, Councillor J Procter was invited to attend the meeting on behalf of Councillor A Carter.

**177 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:-

- (a) Appendices A and B, together with Plans 1 to 3 to the report referred to in Minute No. 181, under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the documents include exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of a private developer and the Council and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because if disclosed, it may prejudice the development of the project and may adversely affect the business of the Council and the interests of the private developer.
- (b) Appendix 2 to the report referred to in Minute No. 182, under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(5) and on the grounds that it contains information relating to negotiations in connection with industrial relations and information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings. It is considered that in these circumstances that the public interest in maintaining the exemption from publication outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
- (c) The Appendix to the report referred to in Minute No. 184, under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that this report contains commercially sensitive information on the City Council's approach to procurement issues, and commercially

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 30th March, 2011

sensitive pricing and information about the commercial risk position of the City Council's proposed Preferred Bidder, where the benefit of keeping the information confidential is considered greater than that of allowing public access to the information.

**178 Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Wakefield, Blake, Gruen, R Lewis, Murray, Ogilvie, Yeadon, Dowson, Golton and Finnigan all declared personal interests in the item entitled, 'Attendance and Exclusions Report 2009/2010' due to any positions they held in respect of school governorships. (Minute No. 190 refers).

Councillor Murray declared a personal interest in the item entitled, 'Eastgate Quarter: Amendment to Legal Documentation and Commercial Deal', due to being a Director of igen, an organisation occupying buildings within the Eastgate Quarter which were within the area covered by the related Compulsory Purchase Order. (Minute No. 181 refers).

A further declaration of interest was made at a later point in the meeting. (Minute No. 188 refers).

**179 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be approved as a correct record.

**DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION**

**180 The Cardigan Centre**

Further to Minute No. 83, 13<sup>th</sup> October 2004, the Chief Asset Management Officer submitted a report outlining proposals to grant the current occupier of the Cardigan Centre a sublease for a term equivalent to the remainder of the Council's ground lease less one day at a peppercorn rent.

The report noted that Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration screening had been undertaken in respect of the proposals detailed within the submitted report, and that the outcomes from which were available upon request.

**RESOLVED** - That, being satisfied that the disposal of the land is likely to promote or improve the economic, social and/or environmental wellbeing of the area or of local residents, approval be given to the granting of a sublease of the subject property on a less than best basis for the remainder of the term held by the Council, less one day, to The Cardigan Centre.

**181 Eastgate Quarter: Amendment to Legal Documentation and Commercial Deal**

The Acting Director of City Development submitted a report providing an update on the Eastgate redevelopment scheme, whilst also seeking the necessary approvals to enter into deeds of variation in respect of the Compulsory Purchase Order Indemnity Agreement and the Development Agreement which were in place to facilitate the redevelopment project.

Following consideration of appendices A and B, together with plans 1 to 3 of the submitted report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report and the current position of the project be noted.
- (b) That approval be given to the proposed changes to the existing Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Indemnity Agreement and that the Acting Director of City Development request the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) to complete all necessary legal documentation to vary the existing CPO Indemnity Agreement as per the information provided within exempt appendix A to the submitted report.
- (c) That approval be given to the Heads of Terms for the changes to the existing Development Agreement containing the commercial deal, and that the Acting Director of City Development request the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) to complete all necessary legal documentation to vary the existing Development Agreement as per the information provided within exempt appendix B to the submitted report.
- (d) That if any further alterations, within the broad terms of the documentation, as set out within the exempt appendices A and B, are necessary to enable the completion of the legal documentation, approval be given for these to be dealt with under the appropriate scheme of delegation, with the concurrence of the Executive Member for Development and Regeneration.

(The matters referred to in this minute were designated as not being eligible for Call In, as a delay in the completion of the legal documentation as soon as practically possible could result in the Council losing the ability to use the existing Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) within its current timeframe, which would result in the redevelopment not being able to proceed)

**182 Future Options for Architectural Design Services**

The Acting Director of City Development submitted a report summarising the options available regarding the replacement of the Council's internal design service and which sought in principle approval to transfer the service into a joint venture arrangement with Norfolk Property Services, subject to detailed consideration and a further report being submitted to Executive Board in July 2011.

The report noted that an Equality Impact Assessment had been completed in respect of the proposals detailed within the submitted report, and that the outcomes from which were available upon request.

The report presented the following options, which had been considered in relation to the Council's internal design service:-

- Option 1: Proposal submitted by staff
- Option 2: Jacobs secondment proposal
- Option 3: Local Authority Joint Venture arrangement with Norfolk Property Services
- Option 4: Separate procurement of design services for individual jobs and/or use available frameworks (e.g. Office of Government Commerce)
- Option 5: Usage of existing framework available within Leeds City Council (e.g. the Local Education Partnership or Public Private Partnerships Unit's technical advisor contract)
- Option 6: Procurement of a new external design framework
- Option 7: Procurement of a new design partner
- Option 8: Establishment of a Joint Venture arrangement with a private sector company
- Option 9: Shared service or Joint Venture arrangement with another local authority

Following consideration of appendix 2 to the submitted report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(5), which was considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the formal consultation about ceasing the service be concluded, and that the proposal to cease the in-house Architectural Design Service in its current form be agreed.
- (b) That approval be given to beginning the process of decommissioning the service in the most appropriate way in order to optimise the current and future business needs.
- (c) That the establishment of a joint venture arrangement with Norfolk Property Services (NPS) be explored as the preferred route and subject to further detailed consideration, this matter be reported back to Executive Board in July 2011.
- (d) That further to resolution (c) above, officers also explore alongside this in more detail the option to separately procure design services using existing frameworks where appropriate e.g. Office of Government Commerce (OGC).

**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

**183 2010 Domestic Energy Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report presenting for approval the Domestic Energy Report for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2010.

The 2010 Domestic Energy report was appended to Board Members' agendas for their consideration and had also been made available to others electronically.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the content of the 2010 Domestic Energy Report be noted and approved.
- (b) That a further report be submitted to the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011 Executive Board meeting in respect of energy efficiency and carbon saving initiatives currently being developed.

**NEIGHBOURHOODS AND HOUSING**

**184 Little London and Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI Housing Project - Final Business Case and Contract Award**

Further to Minute No. 149, 9<sup>th</sup> December 2009, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the final scope of the Little London and Beeston Hill and Holbeck Housing PFI Project, proposing the submission of the 'Pre-Financial Close Final Business Case' to Communities and Local Government (CLG) through the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), detailing the anticipated affordability position for the Project and detailing proposals regarding the execution of the contract documentation for this Project.

The report noted that the Project had been the subject of an Equality Impact Assessment, which had been completed in January 2010 and subsequently reviewed in June 2010. In addition, the report provided details of the outcomes from the assessment process.

The Chair and the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and Housing thanked Members for the supportive comments which had been received from all political groups in relation to the development of this Project.

The Chief Executive updated the meeting on the current status of the approval process for the Project, with Members noting that implementation of the close arrangements contained within the submitted report were dependent upon CLG approval of the Pre-Preferred Bidder Final Business Case (PPB FBC) being received.

Following consideration of the appendix and related annexes to the submitted report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report be noted.

- (b) That the final scope of the Little London, Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI Project ('Project'), as set out within the submitted report, be confirmed.
- (c) That the submission of the Pre-Financial Close Final Business Case (PFC FBC) to the Homes and Communities Agency and Department for Communities and Local Government be approved, and that the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be authorised to approve any necessary amendments to the PFC FBC that arise.
- (d) That the financial implications for the City Council of entering into the Project be approved and that the anticipated affordability contribution for the City Council in relation to the Project in the first full year of service commencement, as set out within the exempt appendix to the submitted report, be noted.
- (e) That the financial issues covered within the exempt appendix of the submitted report, including the balance sheet treatment, be noted.
- (f) That it be noted that the proposed Preferred Bidder will be formally announced and appointed (under the terms of a preferred bidder letter) following HCA/CLG approval of the Pre-Preferred Bidder Final Business Case (PPB FBC) for the Project.
- (g) That approval be given to the arrangements to Financial Close and implementation of the Project, to include (but not by way of limitation) (following the appointment of the proposed Preferred Bidder) the award of contract to and entry into a PFI Project Agreement with a special purpose company, to be established under terms agreed between the City Council and the proposed Preferred Bidder, details of which are set out in the opening paragraph of the exempt appendix to the submitted report.
- (h) That the arrangements at section 7.0 of the submitted report be confirmed, and (for the avoidance of doubt) the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods (or delegee) be authorised to exercise the delegated powers, as set out at Part 3 Section 3E of the Constitution regarding PPP/PFI and other Major Property and Infrastructure Related projects, in relation to this Project.
- (i) That authority be delegated to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods to approve the completion of the Project should the SWAP rate increase at the time of Financial Close, subject to the Project remaining within the maximum affordability ceiling approved by Executive Board and as set out within the exempt appendix to the submitted report.
- (j) That, without prejudice to the approvals under paragraphs (a) to (i) above, should it become necessary at any time for further decisions to be taken to amend the scope and/or affordability of the Project prior to the next scheduled meeting of Executive Board, authority to take such

decisions be delegated to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, subject to Executive Board Members being consulted in the manner now discussed prior to the decisions being taken, and provided that any such decisions shall be reported back to the next scheduled meeting of the Board for information.

**185 Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber**

Given the imminent closure of the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, with the Board's agreement, the Chief Executive on behalf of the Board undertook to write to Felicity Everiss, Regional Director of the Government Office, and her staff, formally thanking them for their continued support and assistance on the development of numerous initiatives throughout the city, including the current Little London and Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI Housing Project (Minute No. 184 refers).

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**186 Ofsted Annual Unannounced Inspection of Contact, Referral and Assessment Arrangements in Children's Services**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report providing details of the Ofsted Unannounced Inspection of Children's Services' Contact, Referral and Assessment Arrangements, which took place during January 2011.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair and the Executive Member for Children's Services paid tribute to and thanked all staff within Children's Services for the work they had undertaken to help achieve such a positive outcome.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the outcomes of the Ofsted unannounced inspection be noted.
- (b) That the significant positive impact made overall since the unannounced inspection in July 2009 be acknowledged, and that the significant efforts of all those who have contributed towards this achievement be recognised.
- (c) That regular progress reports be submitted to the Board in relation to the 'Areas of Development' identified via the Unannounced Ofsted Inspection, particularly in relation to the development of a new ICT system.

**187 Children's Services Improvement Update**

Further to Minute No. 132, 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Director of Children's Services submitted a report providing an update on the improvement and development activity in respect of children's services which had been undertaken since the consideration of the last update report in December 2010.

The report noted that an equality impact assessment was being undertaken in respect of the new Children and Young People's Plan, and that the outcomes from which would inform the final content of the plan.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the stock take of progress made by the Improvement Board be noted.
- (b) That the significant positive impact made overall since the unannounced inspection in July 2009 be acknowledged.
- (c) That the use of outcomes based accountability as the central methodology to help drive the delivery of the priorities in the new Children and Young People's Plan be endorsed.
- (d) That the continuing progress made in respect of service design and transformation activity, to support better integrated working in children's services, be noted.

**188 Basic Need Programme for Primary Schools 2011**

Further to Minute No. 38, 21<sup>st</sup> July 2010, the Director of Children's Services submitted a report providing an update on the programme of approved expansions at Primary Schools in Leeds and proposing to consolidate into the programme, capital proposals which had been developed following the consideration of reports at previous Executive Board meetings. In addition, the report also sought the Board's approval regarding proposals in respect of the scheme's expenditure.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the capital proposals outlined for the schools, as scheduled within the submitted report, be approved.
- (b) That scheme expenditure of £5,102,000 from 'Basic Need Primary Expansions 2011' capital scheme number 15821 be authorised in order to allow the Basic Need programme for 2011 to be delivered.
- (c) That the Director of Resources be authorised to give delegated approval to all of the schemes detailed within the submitted report, including those with an estimated cost of over £500,000, based on individual scheme reports which are to be submitted by the Chief Executive of Education Leeds / Director of Children's Services.

(Councillor A Blackburn declared a personal interest in this item, due to being a governor of Ryecroft Primary School, which was the subject of proposals within the submitted report).

**189 Whitkirk Primary School - Basic Need and Physical Disabilities Resource Base**

Further to Minute No. 237, 19<sup>th</sup> May 2010, the Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report outlining proposals to proceed with a second phase of works at Whitkirk Primary School. In addition, the report also sought authority to incur the expenditure required to deliver the proposals.



In response to Members' comments, officers undertook to pursue enquiries regarding the inclusion of a 'pick up and drop off' point within the scheme.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That authority be given to proceed with Phase 2 of the capital works to provide Resource Provision status and create an additional 2 classrooms in order to allow for the increase in pupil numbers as part of the Basic Need programme at Whitkirk Primary School, at an estimated total scheme cost of £541,895.
- (b) That authority be given to incurring expenditure of £541,895 from capital scheme number 15821/WHI/000.

**190 Attendance and Exclusions Report 2009/2010**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report providing detailed analysis and review of data with regard to levels of attendance and persistent absence, permanent and fixed term exclusions in Leeds schools during the period September 2009 and April 2010.

As part of a wider discussion, Members highlighted the potential role of school governors and Elected Members in reducing levels of persistent absence, in addition to permanent and fixed term exclusions.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report be noted, and that the work of the range of partners, which include the Area Inclusion Partnerships, clusters, children's services and schools to promote inclusion and good attendance, be celebrated and endorsed.
- (b) That the conclusions and proposed and on-going actions detailed within the submitted report be endorsed.

**LEISURE**

**191 Long Term Burial Supply for North East Leeds: Whinmoor Grange Cemetery Design and Cost Report and Draft Whinmoor Grange Informal Planning Statement**

Further to Minute No. 153, 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2008, the Acting Director of City Development submitted a report providing an update on the progress made regarding the supply of burial space within north east Leeds, the preparation of a masterplan for the Whinmoor Grange site and the outcome of feasibility works undertaken to explore the potential to deliver a 5 acre cemetery on the site of the former Elmete Caravan Park. In addition, the report also sought approval of the Draft Planning Statement for Whinmoor Grange as a basis for public consultation, whilst also seeking approval to the incurring of related expenditure.

The report noted and provided details of an Equality Impact Assessment which had been undertaken in 2008 in respect of the proposed 50 year Burial Strategy, a matter which was considered by the Board at that time. However,

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting to be held on Wednesday, 30th March, 2011

since 2008, the report highlighted that there had been consultation with planning, legal, highways and specific faith groups, in addition to site visits with Ward Members, in relation to the proposals to develop Elmete and Whinmoor. The report also noted that the Equality Impact Assessment would be updated to reflect the ongoing consultations which were being undertaken with all faith groups in relation to the city's long term burial supply.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the current position regarding the implementation of the proposals agreed at the Executive Board meeting in December 2008 be noted.
- (b) That the Draft Informal Planning Statement for Whinmoor Grange be approved for the purposes of a public consultation exercise which is to be undertaken over 4 a week period, with the findings being reported back to Executive Board.
- (c) That approval be given to the incurring of £309,579 expenditure on the construction of a 5 acre cemetery at Whinmoor (Cemetery Exts City Wide – Green Schemes, Scheme Number 1358).
- (d) That the proposal to move forward with a planning application for a cemetery at the former Elmete caravan park be noted.

**DATE OF PUBLICATION:** 11<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2011

**LAST DATE FOR CALL IN  
OF ELIGIBLE DECISIONS:** 18<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2011 (5.00 P.M.)

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12noon on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2011)

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CENTRAL AND CORPORATE)

MONDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2011

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

Councillors S Bentley, D Blackburn,  
B Chastney, M Hamilton, A Lowe,  
N Taggart, J Hardy, K Groves, J L Carter,  
R Wood and A Gabriel

### 68 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### 69 Minutes - 10 January 2010

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 70 Void Properties

The report of the Chief Asset Management Officer provided the Board with information about the processes and issues relating to the disposal of surplus property.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting:

- Martin Farrington, Acting Director, City Development
- Chris Gomersall, Head of Property Services
- Anne Chambers, Head of Property Management
- Christine Addison, Acting Chief Asset Management Officer

It was reported that the Council was the largest property owner in the City and also owned over an eighth of the land in Leeds. The way in which this was managed had a significant impact on the economy of the city and how it looked and felt. Due to the changing priorities of the Council, there was a challenge to make sure the best use of resources and it was reported that the Council had received £410 million from the sale of surplus land and properties since 1990 which had been reinvested in meeting priorities.

When land and properties became surplus to requirements, consultation would take place with relevant Ward Members and Executive Members and the Council would consider all legally available options. Due to the diversity of the surplus properties, different options for disposal would be considered.

Further issues highlighted included the following:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 7th March, 2011

- Sale by auction – this was a quicker way than others of selling land and properties and less intensive on staff time. Disadvantages of auction sale included the lack of choice over who the land/properties were sold to but planning regulations could limit the future uses of any sold properties.
- Inevitably, the Council had some void properties – a number of factors led to this including the current economic climate and the condition of the properties concerned.
- Until 4 years ago, management of properties used to be dealt with by the individual departments concerned and this was now undertaken by Corporate Property Management. Disposal of property had always been undertaken by Development/Asset Management.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Arena development plots – these included the former Elmwood Road car park, The Brunswick Building and other surrounding vacant land
- The potential use of vacant properties for short term leases.
- Future use of school buildings – it was reported that school buildings were not always suitable for alternative use.
- Concern that properties were becoming empty before being considered for re-use – each property that became vacant had unique circumstances and issues such as the lettable condition of the building had to be taken into consideration. Improvements were being made to the system to try and re-use properties where possible and departments were encouraged to inform Property Management and Members before properties became vacant in an attempt to speed up their re-use where possible .
- West Park Centre – concern was expressed that potential users were not being allowed to hire vacant rooms at the West Park Centre. It was reported that the centre was not in a good state of repair and would require considerable investment to make it fit for purpose and for ongoing maintenance. The building had not been declared surplus, but Members would at some stage have to make a decision on its future.
- Charging organisations peppercorn rents to enable use of empty properties – a number of properties were rented out at ‘less than best’ rates under varying circumstances. Issues discussed in relation to this included the Council’s wellbeing powers and the balance of priorities between a building’s value and the provision of services.
- Registration of land and properties with HM Land Registry.
- Monitoring of leases that were due for renewal and consideration as to whether these should be renewed. These were monitored on a monthly basis and influencing factors included issues such as the costs of returning buildings to their pre-leased condition.
- Planning Issues.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report and discussion be noted
- (2) That the Scrutiny Board recommend that the functions undertaken by Corporate Property Management be brought under the management of City Development.

(Councillors M Hamilton and N Taggart joined the meeting at 10.25 a.m. and Councillor Blackburn at 10.30 a.m. during the discussion on this item)

## **71 Once Council Communications Project**

The report of the Head of Communications updated the Board on the progress of the 'One Council Communications' project, which sought to develop a new approach to the delivery of communications, marketing and PR functions at Leeds City Council.

The Chair welcomed Andy Carter, Acting Head of Communications to the meeting.

It was reported that the project would bring a corporate consistency to communications across the Council and a more co-ordinated approach. Members attention was brought to the progress update detailed in the report and the following issues were highlighted:

- An assessment of the Council's communication needs had been carried out. There were a few gaps which would require further investigation.
- A list of staff involved in communications work across the Council had been produced and trade unions had been consulted.
- A benchmarking exercise had been carried out with other local authorities and had provided a useful insight into their communication arrangements.
- The development of a model for communications and design principles.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The project would see communications across the Council led by a corporate team and with a structure of approximately 50 to 55 staff. There would still be some staff based in the individual directorates responsible for communications and they would receive dedicated support from the corporate team.
- The use of social networking sites such as facebook and twitter.
- Marketing Leeds – a piece of work would be undertaken to ensure that there is an effective relationship with Marketing Leeds to prevent duplication of activity.
- Accountability issues for Members and officers.
- Taking a proactive role in promoting success.
- Communications and marketing activity spend – the Board requested further information regarding this.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

(Councillors Groves and Blackburn left the meeting at 11.30 a.m. and 11.35 a.m. respectively during the discussion on this item)

## **72 Work Programme**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development outlined the Board's Work Programme and also included recent Executive Board Minutes and a copy of the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

The following issues were discussed:

- Request from Councillor K Wakefield to investigate the role of the Contact Centre and how queries regarding refuse collection were resolved – it was agreed to set up a Task and Finish Working Group to do this. Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board would be invited to contribute.
- There would be a future update on the One Council Communications Project
- It was requested that the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development invite The Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP, Secretary of State for Local Government and Communities to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED** –

- (1) That the report be noted and work programme be updated accordingly.
- (2) That the Forward Plan and Executive Board minutes be noted.

## **73 Date and Time of Next Meeting - 7 March 2011**

Monday, 7 March 2011 at 10.00 a.m. Pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (CENTRAL AND CORPORATE)**

**MONDAY, 7TH MARCH, 2011**

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

Councillors S Bentley, D Blackburn,  
B Chastney, M Hamilton, A Lowe,  
N Taggart, J Hardy, K Groves, J L Carter,  
R Wood and A Gabriel

### **75 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **76 Minutes - 24 January and 7 February 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 January and 7 February 2011, be confirmed as correct records.

### **77 Scrutiny of the Budget and Performance Reports**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development introduced the following papers:

- Financial Health Monitoring 2010/11 – Third Quarter Report. This set out the Council's financial health position for 2010/11 after nine months of the financial year and covered revenue expenditure and income projected to the year end. It also highlighted the position regarding other key financial indicators, including Council Tax collection and the payment of creditors.
- Council Business Plan Performance Report Quarter 3 2010/11. This presented performance information summarising progress against the Council Business Plan improvement priorities for the third quarter of 2010/11 which was the final year of delivery for the plan. A performance indicator report was included and of the indicators which could be reported, 43% were currently predicted to hit target, 30% were amber and 13% were red.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting for this item:

- Nicole Jackson, Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance)
- Doug Meeson, Chief Officer (Financial Management)
- Alex Watson, HR Manager
- Dave Almond, Head of HR
- James Rogers, Assistant Chief Executive, (Planning, Policy and Improvement)
- Julie Meakin, Chief Commercial Services Officer

With regards to the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter Financial Health Monitoring report, the Board was informed that at this stage of the year, the figures available provided a more accurate position of the Council's financial health and were also to help the formulation of the following year's budget. Members were informed of an improvement in the financial position since the last Financial Health report and the various factors that has led to this. These included savings made across directorates, the benefit of low interest rates on short term borrowings, projected savings made through the Early Leavers Initiative and changes to accounting arrangements that allowed the use of capital receipts connected with meeting credit liabilities on PFI schemes. It was noted that this accounting treatment did have implications for the funding of the capital programme, in that these capital would not be available.

It was now projected that there would be a £5.2 million underspend with reserves of £19 million for the following year.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The use of agency staff and the possibility of having an 'in house' agency – it was reported that the Council was looking at reducing the use of agency staff and currently had a full time equivalent of 280 agency staff in employment. Many of these were still required due to a variety of issues and there is a question of whether any of these should be directly employed. There was also the position of staff awaiting redeployment to be considered before it could be decided whether there was a need to internalise temporary staff arrangements or create a bank of temporary staff.
- The following years budget had been projected on the latest figures that had shown savings since the six monthly financial health report.
- PFI – in response to a question of how long the Council would be able to use capital receipts linked to PFI credit liabilities , it was reported that the programme was due to run until 2034.
- Procurement savings – the Council had targeted an overall saving of £20 million through procurement, £5 million of which had already been achieved. Efforts to achieve this include improved monitoring of contracts, re-negotiation of existing contracts (aiming for a 10% reduction), joint procurement at a regional level or with other public bodies and reduced expenditure following changes to methods of ordering and spending.
- Future planning and budget challenges – Children's and Adult Services had continual pressures and challenging targets but it was felt that plans were in place or where being developed.
- Payment of bills – the council had a target of 92% payment of undisputed bills within 30 days.

The item was deferred to later in the meeting.

(Councillors M Hamilton and N Taggart joined the meeting at 10.05 a.m. and 10.40 a.m. respectively during the discussion of this item.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Date Not Specified



## 78 New Strategic Plans 2011-15

The report of the Chief Executive presented proposals for the new set of strategic planning documents for advice and consideration before they went to Executive Board and Council for approval. They included the proposals for the long term partnership strategy for the City, the Vision for Leeds 2011 to 2030 and the first set of delivery plans for the first 4 years. These proposals had been developed in light of the current financial situation which meant that priorities had to be more focussed than in previous plans. The proposals also took into account, the results of two recent public consultations on the Vision for Leeds and the Spending Challenge.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting for this item:

- Tom Riordan, Chief Executive
- James Rogers, Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement)
- Martin Dean, Head of Leeds Initiative and International Partnerships

Members attention was brought to the appendices in the report that outlined the new City Planning Framework and the City Priority Plans 2011-15. There was an ambition to get Leeds recognised as the best City in the United Kingdom and the new values of the organisation as highlighted in the Council Business Plan were highlighted.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Staff appraisals – Members welcomed the approach to ensure that all staff had appraisals and it was reported that it was a target for all staff to have had an appraisal before the end of March 2011.
- Scrutiny of external partners – external partners had a duty to co-operate and the need to get the right relationship with partners to respond to each others concerns was stressed.
- The role of partners and turning plans into action – it was recognised that the plans would be meaningless without actions and work had to take place with all partners across the public and private sectors to achieve targets. The Board was informed of the various partners the Council was involved with and work with developers to ensure employment opportunities and apprenticeships for local people was cited as an example of how working with partners could contribute to the success of the city.
- Work with health partners and how this affected services across the Council.
- The role of Marketing Leeds – it was reported that Marketing Leeds submitted an annual report to Executive Board and had also submitted reports to Scrutiny Board (City Development)

- Transport – it was recognised that there could be improvement and that more control and influence over public transport services would be beneficial
- Population/Housing pressures – this was regarded as a major challenge and would require in depth work with planners and developers.
- Culture – it was felt that there was a lack of things to see and do in Leeds compared to other similar sized cities. It was reported that Leeds did not always promote many of its cultural achievements as well as it could such as the College of Art which had the best results in the country.
- Other issues discussed included communications, skills, foster care, use of retail space and the use of social media.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **79 Scrutiny of the Budget and Performance reports continued**

Members considered the performance information detailed in the report and were informed of the progress with those indicators that were currently classified amber and red.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- There had been a reduction in the proportion of disabled staff employed by the Council due to higher numbers of disabled staff leaving under the Early Leavers Initiative.
- There had been a high increase in the number of e-mails received by Benefits and Streetscene Services which had meant re-prioritisation of work. These areas were now back on track to meet targets.
- Recording of statistics for the call centre, criteria used to classify missed or abandoned calls and the possibility of introducing voice recognition software.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **80 Work Programme**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development outlined the Board's Work Programme and also included recent Executive Board Minutes and a copy of the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

The Board was made aware of a request on behalf of the Corporate Governance & Audit Committee regarding the spend on Legal Services. Depending on resources and time available, this would be programmed into the April meeting.

**RESOLVED** –

- (1) That the report be noted and work programme be updated accordingly.
- (2) That the Forward Plan and Executive Board minutes be noted.

**81 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday, 4 April 2011 at 10.00 a.m. Pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CHILDREN'S SERVICES)

THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Chapman in the Chair

Councillors M Coulson, G Driver, B Gettings, W Hyde,  
B Lancaster, P Latty, K Maqsood, V Morgan and  
B Selby

### CO-OPTED MEMBERS (VOTING):

Mr E A Britten	- Church Representative (Catholic)
Ms N Cox	- Parent Governor Representative (Special)
Prof P H J H Gosden	- Church Representative (Church of England)

### CO-OPTED MEMBERS (NON-VOTING):

Ms C Foote	- Teacher Representative
Ms C Johnson	- Teacher Representative
Ms T Kayani	- Leeds Youth Work Partnership

#### 81 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the March meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services).

#### 82 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made at this point, however a declaration was made at a later point in the meeting. (Minute No. 86 refers)

#### 83 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillors Lamb and James Lewis and Co-opted Members, Mr Granger and Ms Morris Boam.

#### 84 Minutes - 20th January 2011

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

#### 85 Ofsted Annual Unannounced Inspection of Contact, Referral and Assessment Arrangements in Children's Services

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which presented the findings of the Ofsted unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment arrangements that took place in January 2011.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 21st April, 2011

Appended to the report was a copy of the inspection findings reported to the Executive Board on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, Bill McCarthy, Independent Chair of the Improvement Board, and the following Executive Member and officer:

- Councillor Blake, Executive Member (Children's Services)
- Nigel Richardson, Director of Children's Services

In brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- The Scrutiny Board paid tribute to all staff that had contributed to the significant improvements that had been made since the unannounced inspection in July 2009. Members particularly highlighted Jackie Wilson and her team's work in ensuring the right systems were in place.
- Progress made in relation to case management and quality assurance.
- There was now greater staff awareness and confidence in services delivered.
- The impact of changes to management structures. The Director of Children's Services briefly discussed changes to the budget, protection of frontline social care workers and reducing the dependency on agency staff.
- Some concerns around development of the replacement electronic social care system. Members were reminded that the Scrutiny Board had established a working group, which maintained an overview of this area of work. The Director of Children's Services reported that the existing system was no longer fit for purpose. The development of a new system would assist social care workers manage their cases more effectively.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted; and
- (b) That the Scrutiny Board acknowledges the significant positive impact made overall since the unannounced inspection in July 2009 and recognises the significant efforts of all those who have contributed towards this.

#### **86 Children's Services Update**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which presented a number of update reports on Children's Services as follows:

- a) Children's Services Improvement Update – report presented to Executive Board, 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011
- b) Children's Services Improvement Plan – monitoring report – Current Developments and Next Steps
- c) Children's Services Scrutiny Board Performance Report Quarter 3 2010/11.

The following Executive Member, officers and representatives attended the meeting and responded to Members' questions and comments:

- Councillor Blake, Executive Member (Children's Services)
- Nigel Richardson, Director of Children's Services
- Simon Flowers, Strategic Leader for Education Integration, Education Leeds
- Peter Storrie, Team Leader, Education Leeds
- Bill McCarthy, Independent Chair of the Improvement Board.

The Improvement Board was maintaining an overview of 4 key areas as follows:

- improving consistency of practice across the city
- boosting the confidence of the service supported by workforce development programmes
- partnership working and development of co-ordinated approach
- narrowing the gap and supporting those who were at risk of being left behind, e.g. children in care, children in poverty, minority groups, etc.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from the Scrutiny Board and the key areas of discussion were:

- The importance of partnership working and the Children's Trust Board.
- The role of Elected Members, particularly in terms of building on local intelligence, etc.
- Challenge of greater resources needed in responding to the increased number of referrals.
- Refreshing the work of corporate carers and children's champions.
- The use of an outcomes based accountability approach.
- Concerns around NEET linked to poor attendance – it was agreed to circulate a report recently submitted to Executive Board highlighting key challenges around attendance.
- Greater focus needed on chronic absenteeism.
- Issues around child adolescent mental health and development of joint working practices.
- Concerns about the need for greater engagement with young people and the need to encourage their participation in key areas, e.g. budget setting process, establishing priorities, etc.
- Acknowledgement of family values linked to a range of strategies and interventions in place.
- Support for young people not already engaged in youth services.
- The new relationship with schools and their role in locality working and concerns around the fragmentation of schools.
- Concerns of young people and associated funding implications, e.g. ensuring young people had somewhere safe to go and access to transport.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

(Councillor Lancaster declared a personal interest in this item as LEA Governor at Carr Manor High School.)

## **87 New Strategic Plans 2011-15**

The Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services submitted a joint report which presented proposals for the new set of strategic planning documents for advice and consideration prior to Executive Board and Council for approval.

The following information was appended to the report:

- The new city planning framework
- Draft plans and priorities as relevant to the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)
- How recent consultations were reflected in the new Plans.

The following officers attended the meeting and responded to Members' questions and comments:

- Nigel Richardson, Director of Children's Services
- Heather Pinches, Performance Manager, Planning, Policy and Improvement
- Martin Dean, Head of Leeds Initiative and International Partnerships.

The Scrutiny Board discussed the consultation process, particularly involving young people. It was reported that work had been undertaken with primary schools to assist them in developing their own ideas on the vision and priorities.

Members will use the action plans that will provide further detail to monitor progress against the strategic plans.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

## **88 Recommendation Tracking**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which requested Members to confirm the status of recommendations from previous scrutiny inquiries.

Appended to the report was the recommendation tracking flowchart and draft status of recommendations.

The draft status of recommendations were agreed as follows:



- Safeguarding Interim Report – recommendation 1 – continue monitoring as transformation is implemented
- Meadowfield Primary School – recommendation 1 – legal advice to be sought in relation to pursuing an appropriate third stage review process
- Attendance Strategy – recommendation 2 – continue to monitor until new extended leave policy in place.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted; and  
 (b) That the Scrutiny Board approves the status of recommendations as set out above and that a further report on the Meadowfield recommendation be brought to the next meeting of the board.

(Councillor Driver left the meeting at 11.50 am during the consideration of this item.)

**89 Work Programme**

A report was submitted by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which detailed the Scrutiny Board's work programme for the remainder of the current municipal year.

Appended to the report for Members' information was the current version of the Board's work programme, the minutes from the Executive Board meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011, together with an extract from the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> March to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011.

In brief summary, the main highlighted points were:

- Members were informed that the first meeting of the reducing teenage conception working group was taking place on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2011. It was agreed that Councillor Coulson be added to membership of this group.
- The Scrutiny Board agreed to set a provisional date of Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011, for a further Board meeting to sign off inquiry reports.

**RESOLVED –** That the work programme, as amended, be approved.

**90 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2011 at 9.45 am with a pre-meeting for Board Members at 9.15 am.

(The meeting concluded at 12 noon.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

TUESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Procter in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Atha, J Elliott,  
G Harper, J Jarosz, V Kendall, M Rafique,  
M Robinson and S Smith

B Woroncow (Co-optee)

### 104 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the February meeting of the Scrutiny Board (City Development).

In relation to Item 7 on the agenda 'Inquiry into Leeds Markets: Eastgate and Parking – Session 3', he informed the Board that a request had been received from the Friends of Kirkgate Market to take one or two photographs of the meeting during this item for their web site. The Board agreed to this request, but did not agree to any part of the meeting being filmed.

### 105 Late Items

The Chair agreed to accept the following documents as supplementary information:-

- Inquiry into Leeds Markets: Eastgate and Parking – Session 3 – Appendix 1 (Minute 109 refers)
- Budget Information 2010/11 and Budget Proposals 2011/2012 – (i) Leeds City Council 2011/12 Budget Report – Directorate: City Development (ii) Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2011/12 (Minute 112 refers)

The documents were not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but made available on the Council's Internet site prior and after the meeting.

### 106 Declaration of Interests

The following personal interest was declared at the meeting:-

- Councillor J Procter in his capacity as Chair of the Leeds Grand Theatre Board and also as a trustee of Northern Ballet Theatre (Agenda Item 10) (Minute 112 refers)

### 107 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors D Atkinson, M Lobley and R Pryke.

Notification had been received for Councillor V Kendall to substitute for Councillor M Lobley.

**108 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

**109 Inquiry into Leeds Markets: Eastgate and Parking - Session 3**

Referring to Minute 99 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the third session of the Board's Inquiry to consider the Future of Kirkgate Market.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Scrutiny Board (City Development) – Inquiry to Consider the future of Kirkgate Market – Terms of Reference (Appendix 1 refers)
- Inquiry into Leeds Markets: Eastgate and Parking – Report of the Acting Director, City Development (Appendix 2 refers)

A copy of 'Appendix A' referred to in the report of the Acting Director, City Development was also circulated.

In addition, the Board received a paper from John Perriton, Field Support Manager, National Market Traders Federation commenting on the Acting Director of City Development's report as he was unable to attend today's meeting. A paper from "Friends of Kirkgate Market" was also tabled as further evidence to the Board.

The following representatives/witnesses were in attendance and gave evidence to the Board and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Cath Follin, Head of City Centre and Markets, City Development  
Jo Williams, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Liz Laughton, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Michele Hocken, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Lucky Singh, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Sara Gonzalez, Friends of Kirkgate Market  
Megan Waugh, Friends of Kirkgate Market  
Chris Leonard, Friends of Kirkgate Market

The Chair informed the meeting that the evidence presented to today's Board meeting would be considered in two parts; firstly concerns from the National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch) in support of their continuing concerns in relation to the future of Kirkgate Market and secondly to consider a report from the Acting Director of City Development in relation to parking and the Eastgate Development.

## The Future of Kirkgate Market

At the request of the Chair, Jo Williams, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) Kirkgate Branch circulated a copy of a set of slides from a power point presentation entitled 'Items for discussion' for the information/comment of the meeting.

The document referred to the following issues:-

- The Future of Leeds Kirkgate Market
  - Management
  - Ownership
  - Plans
- Lettings
  - Current Position
  - Plans
- Rent and Service Charges
  - Accounts breakdown current position
  - Plans moving forward

Officers responded to the concerns expressed by representatives from NMTF on each of the issues identified which had been discussed in detail at the last Board meeting.

Arising from these discussions, it was reported that the Council's Administration had recently established a Markets Forum to be chaired by Councillor G Harper in his capacity as a Deputy Executive Member and that its first meeting would be held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011 with management and market trader representatives to discuss the proposed terms of reference for the Forum and the markets future.

The Chair expressed concern that this initiative was not helpful to the Board's inquiry and that the Board should have been advised of what was being proposed much earlier in the process.

Board Members then questioned officers and witnesses on the establishment of the Markets Forum and in particular:-

- the need for traders to be provided with at least an outline of a proposed market strategy given the length of time this had taken to date  
*(On behalf of the Board, the Chair agreed to convene an urgent meeting with the Leader of Council with a view to responding to market traders by 11<sup>th</sup> February on this issue)*
- clarification of the remit of the Market Forum and whether or not market traders had been involved in preparing the terms of reference  
*(Councillor G Harper in his capacity as Deputy Executive Member confirmed that market traders had been involved with the Market Forum discussions and read out the proposed terms of reference)*

*for the information of the meeting. He also confirmed that the Market Forum would involve trader representation.*

*A number of market traders stated that whilst they had been consulted on this Market Forum sometime ago, they had not supported the proposal and considered that traders were underrepresented on it and that it would be unlikely that they would attend the meeting arranged for 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011)*

The Chair asked about progress in providing details of the service charges to market traders.

The Head of City Centre and Markets responded and confirmed that all service charge invoices were now being placed in the Markets office for inspection.

A paper providing details of the make up of the service charges which had previously been provided to the market traders and the Chair were tabled for Members information.

It was agreed that an audited copy of the 2009/10 accounts in respect of service charges at the market would be provided to the traders.

Councillor B Atha raised his concerns that the breakdown figures omitted to show officer salaries and central charges and that it was essential for the Board to receive the complete figures from a business perspective. The Acting Director of City Development clarified that the salaries of the Head of City Centre and Markets and above do not form part of a service charge.

The Chair then invited further comments in response to the above issues from Jo Williams; Liz Laughton, Michelle Hocken and Lacky Singh from the National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) Kirkgate Branch.

Arising from discussions, Councillor B Atha enquired if the Council provided long term lets in the market.

The Head of City Centre and Markets responded and confirmed that the Council did provide long term lets, but many businesses in the current climate did not want these and preferred short term flexible lets. She agreed to provide details on the type of leases approved in the last year for circulation to the Board and market traders.

In concluding discussions on the future of Kirkgate Market, the Chair invited comments from Sara Gonzalez, Friends of Kirkgate Market. In summary she briefly referred to the following issues:-

- the collection of a petition of 10,000 signatures seeking a commitment by the Council of a significant reduction in market rents, substantial investment over the next 5 years including full

repairs to the roof of the whole market and greater involvement and transparency in all aspects of markets management

*(This petition was formally accepted by Councillor J Procter on behalf of the Board, and handed to the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser who took official receipt of the petitions)*

- the fact that rent in Kirkgate Market was the highest in Northern England
- the need to ring fence income for reinvestment in the market
- the view that relationship between management and market traders needed to improve
- the need to recognise that Kirkgate Market was an important aspect of people's life and wellbeing

### Parking Issues and the Eastgate Development

The Chair invited the Acting Director of City Development and the Head of City Centre and Markets to give a brief introduction on the following key points referred to within the Acting Director of City Development 's report :-

- Background Information on Eastgate Quarters
- Proposed Highway changes (Eastgate/George Street)
- Current and Future Customer Parking Provision
- Trader Parking Provision
- Current and Future Loading/Unloading
- Management and Ownership Models

Following this, the Chair then allowed Joe Williams, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch) and Michelle Hocken, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch) and Chris Leonard Friends of Kirkgate Market to comment on the issues raised.

A number of areas were commented upon and discussed by witnesses including:-

- the concern at the potential impact of the Eastgate Quarters development on customer car parking; vehicular access for traders' deliveries/loading and unloading and trader parking
- the 1,618 additional car parking spaces that would be provided as a consequence of the Eastgate redevelopment
- Section 106 planning obligations for this development
- the fact that a new planning application in outline form had still to be submitted by Hammersons
- trader parking provision and adequacy of the proposals for loading and unloading
- reference to the high car parking charges at NCP car parks which were outside the control of the Council
- adequacy of the proposed highways changes, estimated footfall and accuracy of bus journey times. It was reported that a traffic impact assessment would be undertaken in relation to the Eastgate

development that would consider a range of issues including bus journey times

- clarification as to what discussions had been held between the market traders and Hammersons with regards to the Eastgate Development  
*(The Acting Director of City Development responded and agreed to write to the developer on this issue)*
- a requirement for the Eastgate development to be pedestrianised

In concluding, the Chair, on behalf of the Board, thanked officers and witnesses for their attendance and contribution to the Inquiry.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011, the Acting Director of City Development be requested to submit a report setting out the management and ownership models that could be applied to the future operation of the market which had been previously reported to the Board and to verbally update on the outcome of his meeting with the market traders in order to inform Scrutiny's view on their preferred management model for Kirkgate Market.

(Councillors G Harper and S Smith left the meeting at 12 noon at the conclusion of this item)

- 110 Leeds Bradford International Airport: Transport Planning Obligations**  
Referring to Minute 98 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the transport planning obligations for Leeds Bradford International Airport.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Leeds Bradford International Airport; Transport Planning Obligations – Report of the Acting Director of City Development for the information/comment of the meeting.

In addition to the above documents, a copy of an e mail received from Tim McSharry, Head of Disability and Diversity, Access Committee for Leeds dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2011 was circulated for the information/comment of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Mike Darwin, Head of Highways Development Services, City Development  
Gillian Macleod, Principal Highways Development Engineer  
Planning Adviser from the White Young Green Group

The Board noted that due to other commitments, apologies had been received from John Parkin, Chief Executive of Leeds Bradford Airport and



Carl Lapworth, Director, Operations and Engineering, Leeds Bradford International Airport.

Mike Darwin, Head of Highways and Development Services, City Development highlighted the main issues within the department's report.

The Board Members commented on a number of issues including:-

- the definition of public transport by the Department for Transport
- concerns at how the recording of journeys by car and public transport to the airport had been interpreted. The Acting Director clarified how this was interpreted within the DfT Guidance
- the fact that the surface access strategy for Leeds Bradford International Airport would be reviewed in 2011 in accordance with agreed procedures and DfT guidelines
- a view that wider consultation particularly with Elected Members needs to be undertaken in developing the airport's next Surface Access Strategy
- Taxis and disability issues

The Chair informed the meeting that in view of concerns being expressed by the Hackney Carriage trade, he was prepared to take additional evidence from them at today's meeting.

Mike Utting, representing Leeds Taxi Owners Ltd, Streamline/Telecabs made reference to a number of issues including:-

- the fact that hackney carriages provide a public service
- that the loss of the taxi contract at the Leeds Bradford International Airport some years ago had created hackney carriage congestion in the city centre
- the need to offer the public using the airport choice between private hire and hackney carriages
- the suggestion that a hackney carriage rank could be provided on Whitehouse Lane with a commitment that his Associations would part fund this venture
- the lack of disabled taxis at the airport by the current operator

The Acting Director City Development stated that he remained to be convinced about the proposal for a hackney carriage rank on Whitehouse Lane.

The Chair thanked officers and representatives from the Leeds Taxi Owners Ltd, Streamline/Telecabs for their attendance and contribution to the meeting.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser, in consultation with the Acting Director of City Development, be requested to submit a report

and recommendations on a Surface Access Strategy and proposals for a Hackney Carriage rank for consideration at a future meeting of the Board.

**111 The State of the Roads in Leeds**

Referring to Minute 102 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the state of the roads in Leeds following the snow and extended period of cold weather earlier this winter.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Gary Bartlett, Chief Officer, Highways and Transportation, City Development  
Helen Franklin, Acting Head, Highway Services, City Development

Board Members then questioned the above representatives and officers responded.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That no further scrutiny be undertaken on this issue.

(Councillor G Harper re-joined the meeting at 12.55pm during discussions of this item)

(Councillor J Akthar joined the meeting at 1.00pm during discussions of this item)

(Councillors J Elliott and M Rafique left the meeting at 1.00pm during discussions of this item)

**112 Budget Information 2010/11 and Budget Proposals 2011/2012**

Referring to Minute 100 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on budget information 2010/11 and budget proposals 2011/2012 with specific reference to the Temple Newsam estate and house and the events budget.

Appended to the report was a copy the Temple Newsam estate and house and events budget for the information/comment of the meeting.

A copy of the full revenue budget papers for 2011/12, together with the relevant budget papers for the City Development department were circulated as supplementary information. These were not considered at the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Councillor R Lewis, Executive Board Member, Development and Regeneration  
Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Ed Mylan, Chief Officer, Resources and Strategy, City Development  
Simon Criddle, Head of Finance, City Development

The Chief Officer, Resources and Strategy, City Development introduced the report.

Board Members then questioned the above representatives and commented on the specific proposals relevant to the Temple Newsam estate and house and the events budget.

Specific reference was made to the fact that the department was incurring unnecessary expenditure in relation to employing a person to staff the car park at Temple Newsam with a potential savings of £20k  
*(The Chief Officer, Resources and Strategy responded and informed the meeting that this post was established to protect cars from theft and vandalism and if the arrangement was not in place it could have a detrimental impact on wider usage of the facilities)*

There was a discussion on the application of central charges in the accounts and reference to the profit and loss accounts for the Museum shops where currently there was only a stock take undertaken annually. The Chief Officer, Resources and Strategy reported that this would be rectified later this year with the installation of an electronic stock control system.

**RESOLVED-** That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.

- 113 City Development Directorate: 2010/11 Budget - Financial Position**  
Referring to Minute 101 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report providing the Board with a financial position for the City Development Directorate at period 9.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled ' City Development Directorate; 2010/Budget – Period 9 Report for the information/comment of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Ed Mylan, Chief Officer, Resources and Strategy, City Development  
Simon Criddle, Head of Finance, City Development

Board Members then questioned the above representatives.

**RESOLVED -** That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.

**114 Work Programme, Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report providing Members with a copy of the Board's current Work Programme. The Executive Board minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> January 2011, together with the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> February 2011 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2011 were also attached to the report.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> January 2011, together with the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> February 2011 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2011 be noted.
- c) That the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to update the work programme as follows:-
  - Leeds Bradford International Airport – New Surface Access Strategy
  - Leeds Athletic Club
- d) To request a review of the Council's legal costs (Scrutiny Board Central and Corporate).

**115 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 10.00am (Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 1.45pm)

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

TUESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Procter in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Atha, J Elliott,  
P Grahame, R Grahame, G Harper,  
P Latty, R Pryke, M Rafique and  
M Robinson

B Woroncow (Co-optee)

### 116 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the March meeting of the Scrutiny Board (City Development) held in the Lord Mayor's Banqueting Hall due to a large number of people in attendance.

### 117 Late Items

The Chair agreed to accept the following documents as supplementary information:-

- E mail correspondence received from Tim Brigstocke, Executive Chairman, Rare Breeds Survival Trust; Sarah Hill and Mike Sandison, Chairman Shetland Cattle Breeders' Association (and keeper of Shetland and North Ronaldsay sheep) in relation to a request for scrutiny of the Farming Operations at Home Farm, Temple Newsam (Agenda Item 9) (Minute 122 refers)
- E mail correspondence received from Steve Grubb; Helen Cowley, Club Secretary, Kippax and District Harriers; Sue Corbally; Ian Cowie and Natalie Mitchell in relation to a request for scrutiny on the reduced hours to be introduced at Garforth Leisure Centre (Agenda Item 10) (Minute 124 refers)
- E mail correspondence received from S Leatham and E Leatham ; Pat Cooney,; Claire Haysom; Alan Scott; Gail Schuster; Debbie Beattie; David Thornton and Craig Pease in relation to a petition regarding the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 125 refers)

### 118 Declaration of Interests

The following personal interests were declared at the meeting:-

- Councillor R Grahame in his capacity as a Member on Plans Panel (East) and also a Member of the Credit Union (Agenda Item 12) (Minute 126 refers)
- Barbara Woroncow in her capacity as a Member of the Vision Steering Group (Agenda Item 13) (Minute 127 refers)

**119 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors D Atkinson, J Jarosz and M Lobley.

Notification had been received for Councillor R Grahame to substitute for Councillor D Atkinson; Councillor P Grahame to substitute for Councillor J Jarosz and Councillor P Latty to substitute for Councillor M Lobley.

**120 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED –**

(i) That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

(ii) The Chair referred to Minute 109 and confirmed that he had met with the Leader of Council concerning the request by the Market Traders to be provided with at least an outline of a market strategy by the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

**121 Outcome of Consultation on Proposed Withdrawal of Remaining Crèche Provision at Leisure Centres**

Referring to Minute 84 of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development was submitted on the outcome of consultation on the proposed withdrawal of remaining crèche provision at Leisure Centres.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Crèche Provision in Council Leisure Centres – Report of the Acting Director of City Development' for the information/comment of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance and gave evidence to the Board and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Councillor A Ogilvie, Executive Member Leisure  
Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development Directorate  
Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development Directorate  
Lisa Kitching, Spokesperson for Crèche Users

The Board noted that both Councillor M Lobley and Councillor J Matthews who had instigated the original request for scrutiny had conveyed their apologies for this item.

At the request of the Chair, Councillor A Ogilvie, Executive Member; Leisure reported on the outcome of the consultation and thanked everyone who had contributed to it. Councillor Ogilvie announced that as a consequence of users concerns he had decided to keep four crèches open at Scott Hall, Rothwell, Pudsey and Kippax Leisure Centres for a further six months. Work would continue to seek alternative provision and on assessing the viability of the crèches with the increased prices by the Early Years Services Business Advisers Team and the Managers at each Leisure Centre. However, he reported that there would be an increase in the fee charged for children

attending these crèches from £2.00 per hour to £4.00 per hour with the Leeds Card discount and Leeds Card extra continuing to apply as appropriate.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member, officers and the spokesperson for their contribution and attendance at the meeting.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Board notes and welcomes the decision of the Executive Member to keep crèche facilities open at Scott Hall, Pudsey, Rothwell and Kippax Leisure Centres for a further 6 months whilst potential alternative operators continue to be sought as now outlined.
- c) That no further action be undertaken on this matter.

**122 Request for Scrutiny of the Farming Operations at Home Farm, Temple Newsam as a Consequence of the Farming Operations - Consultation Document from Parks and Countryside**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on a request for scrutiny regarding the proposals in the farming operations consultation document issued by the City Development Directorate on the future of Home Farm at Temple Newsam and its work to promote rare breeds and the farms many conservation activities.

Appended to the report were copies of the following correspondence for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Letter from Yvonne Froehlich, Breed Secretary, White Park Cattle Society dated 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011
- Letter from Mr G L H Alderson, Founder President/Trustee Rare Breeds International dated 30<sup>th</sup> January 2011

In addition to the above correspondence, copies of e mails received from Tim Brigstocke, Sarah Hill and Mike Sandison were circulated with attachments as supplementary information.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development  
Mr P Titley, Rare Breed Survival Trust  
Mr G L H Alderson, Founder President/Trustee, Rare Breeds International  
Mr T Brigstocke, Rare Breed Survival Trust (RBST)

The Chair invited Mr Titley, Mr Alderson and Mr Brigstocke to outline the main points of their concerns regarding the proposals in the farming operations consultation document issued by the City Development Directorate on the future of Home Farm at Temple Newsam and its work to promote rare breeds and the farms many conservation activities.

The Chair then invited Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development to respond to the main points.

Board Members then questioned the representatives.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The decision to reduce the budget at Home Farm by £100,000 in 2011/12
- The fact that the reduction in the acreage at Home Farm from 257 hectares to 45 hectares and consequent reduction in livestock will reduce this farm to a visitors centre and end 30 years of cutting edge development of rare breeds
- The lack of detail provided by the Directorate in their consultation document and whether or not the RBST case had been presented to the department  
*(The Principal Scrutiny Adviser confirmed that the additional information provided by the RBST had been circulated to all Members of the Board today and that the City Development Directorate had received their submission)*
- The importance of Home Farm and the offer by the RBST and other groups to work with the Council to try and maintain Home Farm as a rare breed centre and find ways to significantly reduce the costs of the farm (use of volunteers etc)  
*(Mr Brigsocke, Rare Breeds Survival Trust offered to develop with the Council a robust business plan for Home Farm, but warned that this could take a couple of years before significant savings could be achieved. He referred to the success of other local authorities in obtaining Heritage lottery funding and support with apprenticeship schemes for their rare breed centres. He stressed that Home Farm was internationally recognised as a rare breed centre and further discussions needed to take place with all partners to identify ways of saving it)*  
*(The Chief Recreation Officer stated that the consultation was now complete and his budget for this service in 2011/12 had already been cut, but welcomed the suggestions and range of offers put forward by the various organisations and looked forward to working with them to see how costs could be reduced)*
- clarification of the timescales in relation to the cessation of rare breeds at Temple Newsam  
*(The Chief Recreation Officer responded and agreed to consult with the Head of Parks and Countryside with a view to circulating this information to the Board)*
- The need for a detailed paper setting out the income and expenditure of Home Farm and clarification as to whether all income is allowed to remain in the Farm's accounts or whether it was vired to other vote heads
- The view that this issue would also have an effect on the operations at Lineham Farm



**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the request for scrutiny regarding the future of the Rare Breed Centre at Home Farm following completion of the consultation undertaken by the City Development Directorate be approved.
- c) That a time-limited working group be established to consider the offers made by the Rare Breed Survival Trust and Rare Breeds International Trust regarding the future of Home Farm.
- d) That the Chief Recreation Officer prepare a report for consideration by the Working Group setting out the facts following the Council Budget meeting to include a balance sheet showing income and expenditure for 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12 projected and clarification as to whether all income is retained in the farming operations or whether any was vired to other vote heads.

**123 Inquiry on the Future of Kirkgate Market - Session 4**

Referring to Minute 109 of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the fourth session of the Board's Inquiry to consider the Future of Kirkgate Market.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Scrutiny Board (City Development) – Inquiry to Consider the Future of Kirkgate Market – Terms of Reference
- Inquiry on the Future of Kirkgate Market – Session 4 Evidence for Scrutiny – Report of the Acting Director of City Development

The following representatives/witnesses were in attendance and gave evidence to the Board and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Paul Stephens, Chief Economic Development Officer, City Development  
Sue Burgess, Markets Manager, City Development  
Jo Williams, Consultant, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Liz Laughton, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Michele Hocken, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
Lucky Singh, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) (Kirkgate Branch)  
John Perriton, National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF)  
Sara Gonzalez, Friends of Kirkgate Market

Prior to discussing this issue, the Chair and Councillor G Harper wished to place on record their sincere thanks and appreciation to the market traders arising from their respective roles as 'Market traders for the day' in Kirkgate Market on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

The Chair invited the Chief Economic Development Officer to give a brief introduction on the key points referred to within the Acting Director of City

Development's report. The Chief Officer also outlined the discussions undertaken at a recent a Markets Workshop (at the request of scrutiny) with the NMTF and Friends of Kirkgate Market where there was consensus on three specific areas namely; the need for major investment, the need for faster decision making processes and the potential for the market to become a major visitor destination. Whilst opinion was divided on the best ownership and management model there was no support for the market being wholly owned and managed by either the traders or the private sector, with the majority present giving an arm's length company as their first choice.

Councillor G Harper in his capacity as Chair of the Markets Forum also reported on the outcome of discussions at recent meetings of the Market Forum and on the topics to be discussed at future meetings.

The Chair then invited further comments in response to the above issues from Jo Williams; Liz Laughton, Michelle Hocken and Lacky Singh from the National Market Traders' Federation (NMTF) Kirkgate Branch, together with John Perriton, National Market Traders' Federation and Sara Gonzalez, Friends of Kirkgate Market.

The Board noted the comments made and acknowledged that many of the issues raised had been discussed at previous meetings as part of the ongoing Inquiry.

The Chair then invited the Chief Economic Development Officer and the Markets Manager to respond to the individual comments made.

Board Members then questioned officers and witnesses on the evidence presented.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- ownership and management models
- concerns of the Chair following his attendance at the market on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011
- concerns at the market rents and discounts offered
- promotion of the market as a retail outlet to attract new customers
- service charges and the number of markets' staff that this funds
- operational and management concerns at the market
- communication issues
- reference to the Eastgate development

The Chair then allowed the Chief Economic Officer and the Markets Manager, together with Joe Williams and Liz Laughton to sum up.

The Chair informed the meeting that the next stage of the Inquiry was for a number of draft recommendations to be drawn up for consideration by the Board at it's meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

In concluding, the Chair, on behalf of the Board, thanked officers and witnesses for their attendance and contribution to the Inquiry.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 5th April, 2011

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That following the conclusion of its inquiry to review the future of Kirkgate Market, a draft final report and recommendations be submitted to the Board's next pre meeting for consideration.

**124 Request for Scrutiny on the reduced hours to be implemented at Garforth Leisure Centre**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on a request for Scrutiny on the reduced hours to be implemented at Garforth Leisure Centre.

Appended to the report was a copy of an e mail received from Natalie Mitchell dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011 for the information/comment of the meeting.

The Chair also reported the receipt of a petition to keep Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre open.

A number of e mails received from residents opposed to the reduced hours were circulated as supplementary information.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development  
Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development  
Ms Natalie Mitchell who submitted the request for scrutiny, together with three regular users of Garforth Leisure Centre

The Chair invited Ms Mitchell and her colleagues to outline the main points of their concerns regarding the proposals for reduced hours to be implemented at Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre.

The Chair then invited Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer and Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development to respond to the main points.

Board Members then questioned the representatives on the issues raised.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the request for scrutiny of the reduced hours to be implemented at Garforth Leisure Centre be approved.
- c) That the Acting Director of City Development submit a report to the next Scrutiny Board meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 which sets out the facts concerning the budget position of this centre and the rationale behind the decision to reduce its operating hours.

## **125 Petition Regarding the Closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on a petition regarding the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre on 31st March 2011.

Appended to the report was a copy of the front page of a petition received from the Temple Newsam Learning Partnership Trust which set out their case for keeping the Leisure Centre open for the information/comment of the meeting.

A copy of the full petition was made available at the meeting.

Prior to discussing this issue, the Chair also referred to an additional request for scrutiny received from Mr Ardeshir Durrani in relation to the proposed closure of Middleton Pool which was not included on today's agenda. Following discussions, Board Members agreed to consider this request at today's meeting, in conjunction with the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre.

### a) Petition regarding the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development  
Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development  
Spokesperson 1  
Spokesperson 2  
Spokesperson 3

A number of e mails received from residents opposed to the closure of were circulated as supplementary information.

The Chair invited the spokespersons to outline the main points of their concerns regarding the proposals to close East Leeds Leisure Centre.

The Chair then invited Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer and Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development to respond to the main points.

Board Members then questioned the representatives on the main points.

### b) Proposed Closure of Middleton Pool

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development  
Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development  
Mr Ardeshir Durrani, Spokesperson

The Chair invited the above spokesperson to outline the main points of his concerns regarding the proposals to close Middleton Pool.

The Chair then invited Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer and Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development to respond to the main points.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the request for scrutiny in relation to the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre be approved.
- c) That the Acting Director of City Development submit a report to the next Scrutiny Board meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 which sets out the facts concerning the budget position of East Leeds Leisure Centre and the rationale behind the decision to close it.
- d) That the request for scrutiny in relation to the proposed closure of Middleton Pool be approved.
- e) That the Acting Director of City Development submit a report to the next Scrutiny Board meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 which sets out the facts concerning the budget position of Middleton pool and the rationale behind the decision to close it.

**126 City Development Scrutiny Board Performance Report Quarter 3 2010/11**  
(This item was withdrawn until the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 meeting)

**127 New Strategic Plans 2011-15**  
(This item was withdrawn until the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 meeting)

**128 Grants to Culture and Sport Related Organisations Working Group**  
Referring to Minute 54 of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on progress in relation to the Grants to Culture and Sport Related Organisations Working Group.

The Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Board Members commented on a number of issues including:-

- clarification of the process in relation to the percentage reduction of grants for the Leeds Carnival; Irish Festival and Asian Festival
- the further work being undertaken on grants will be reported to the working group
- the lack of information available on the income raised by organisations at events supported by the Council

**RESOLVED –** That the report and appendices be noted.

- 129 Cemeteries and Crematoria Horticultural Maintenance Working Group**  
Referring to Minute 88 of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a final report and recommendations of the Cemeteries and Crematoria Horticultural Maintenance Working Group following a review of this issue.

Sean Flesher, Head of Parks and Countryside, City Development was in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments.

In accordance with the scrutiny procedure rules the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser reported that the Acting Director of City Development and the Executive Board Member Leisure had been invited to comment on the proposals. Whilst they supported recommendations 1 and 3 of the report they had concerns about recommendation 2.

They believed that implementing this recommendation in full would present difficulties on grave plots already in place and therefore do not think that a retrospective approach was practical due to difficulties associated with enforcement and related costs (particularly legal) that are likely to be involved. They also believed that a preferable solution would be to implement current conditions (with a degree of sensitivity given the nature of the service) on new graves within existing cemeteries (but not re-opened graves), cemetery extensions and new cemeteries.

**RESOLVED** –That having read the comments of the Acting Director of City Development, to approve the Board's final report and recommendations as originally proposed for consideration by the Executive Board in accordance with the agreed procedures.

(Councillors P Grahame and G Harper left the meeting at 1.50pm during discussions of the above item)

- 130 Request for Scrutiny of the Events Section, City Development Directorate**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on a request for scrutiny of the Events Section of the City Development Directorate.

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Board Members' queries and comments:-

Paul Stephens, Chief Economic Development Officer, City Development  
Mark Turnbull, Head of Property, Finance and Technology, Chief Executive's Department

Board Members commented on a number of issues including:-

- advice from the legal officer concerning exempt information
- the need for the Board to consider whether there were any failings by the department in implementing recommendations of an Internal Audit report published in November 2010

- the need to discuss any weaknesses identified in the process and procedures and not individuals
- clarification as to whether Internal Audit report recommendations were monitored or tracked by audit once the report was issued to a Director

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That request for scrutiny of the Events Section of the City Development Directorate be approved.
- c) That the Acting Director of City Development be requested to submit a report to this Board on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 which sets out the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the internal audit report and attaches a copy of the internal audit report.

**131 Work Programme, Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report providing Members with a copy of the Board's current Work Programme. The Executive Board minutes of 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011, together with the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 were also attached to the report.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes of 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011, together with the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 be noted.
- c) That the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to update the work programme in accordance with the decisions taken at today's meeting.

**132 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 10.00am (Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 2.10pm)

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

MONDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Anderson in the Chair

Councillors G Driver, P Ewens,  
R Grahame, G Hyde, M Iqbal, J Marjoram,  
L Mulherin and P Wadsworth

### 89 Late Items/Supplementary Information

In accordance with his powers under Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information in respect of items already on the agenda:-

- Agenda item 9 – Dog Control Orders
  - Email from Darren and Helen Midgley dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011.
  - Email from Pam Costello, Secretary of Otley DTS Kennel Club, registered dog club, dated 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011.
  - Professional dog walkers Code of Conduct applicable to Harrogate Borough Council area, supplied by Richie Womersley, The Dog Walker Yorkshire Ltd.
  - Briefing note on dog behaviour and psychology supplied by Charlotte Hanson, professional dog walker.
  - E-petition on the subject, but bearing no signatures.

None of the documents had been available at the time of agenda despatch.

### 90 Declarations of Interest

The following personal declarations of interest were made:-

- Agenda Item 8 (Minute No. 94 refers) – Request for Scrutiny – Refuse Collection Route Rationalisation Programme – Councillor R Grahame, in his capacity as a member of the GMBATU Trade Union.
- Agenda Item 11 (Minute No. 97 refers) – Budget Analysis for Housing Revenue Account and General Fund – Period 9 2010/11 – Councillors G Driver, R Grahame, G Hyde and P Wadsworth in their capacity as ALMO Directors, and also Councillor G Driver in his capacity as a Deputy Executive Member.

### 91 Minutes - 17th January 2011

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 14th March, 2011

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

**92 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Development of a Rent to Mortgage Model (Minute No. 86 refers)

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods undertook to liaise outside the meeting with Councillor P Ewens regarding a specific case she raised.

**93 Request for Scrutiny - Decision to enter into an agreement with Curb Clean Media to place Clean Media Advertisements in the City Centre**

The Board received and considered a request for scrutiny from Councillor J Monaghan in respect of the above officer delegated decision.

In attendance at the meeting, and responding to Members' queries and comments, were:-

- Councillor J Monaghan – Headingley Ward.
- Chris Gomersall – Head of Property Services, City Development.
- Ann Briggs – Advertising Initiative Manager, City Development.
- Graham Wilson – Head of Environmental Action and Parking, Environment and Neighbourhoods.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The officer delegated decision related to an agreement entered into with Curb Clean Media company for a 12 month controlled trial period to allow the company to place 'clean media' advertisements in the city centre. These advertisements comprised basically of stencilled advertisements on paving slabs in a designated area of the city centre. This relatively new form of media advertising was not controlled by planning legislation or regulation, but as it was on the local authority controlled public highway, Highways Act rules applied, which placed a responsibility on the local authority to manage and maintain the highway.
- Curb Clean Media were one of the first national operators in this field, and had agreed to work exclusively with Leeds City Council for this 12 month controlled trial period to explore the use of this new form of advertising. The agreement gave Curb the exclusive right to place the advertisements in selected locations in Leeds City Centre. These would all be clearly marked as Curb advertisements. The Council approved, in advance, the subject and the wording of the advertisements, and this formed part of the wider advertising code

operating in Leeds. All advertisements were designed to show Leeds or the city centre in a positive light – for instance, the International Film Festival – and the Council had the power of veto over any proposed advertisements – two had already been refused. In return, the Council had control over the advertising, should receive approximately £20,000 in advertising revenue and Curb had also agreed to try to identify the source of any unauthorised advertising and assist the Council Enforcement Team in its removal. The agreement could be terminated by either side during this 12 month trial period.

- Workshops had been held in March 2010 to explore the proposal, and these had been followed later by Ward Member consultation and consultation with the City Centre Plans Panel. A list of Council Members and officers consulted as part of the process was circulated. The final decision had been taken via an officer delegated decision, as the matter related to the awarding of a contract, which fell within the remit of the officer delegated authority scheme.
- Councillor Monaghan expressed surprise at the decision, as he and Ward colleagues, in conjunction with the Council's Environmental Action Service, had been fighting this type of illegal and unauthorised advertising in Headingley Ward for a number of years. It was often used to advertise club or drink promotions which, in turn, could lead to anti-social behaviour. In his view, this form of advertising was illegal, was an environmental crime akin to graffiti, and had the same effect in terms of bringing an area down. He was therefore extremely surprised that someone thought it appropriate for the city centre, and questioned whether, in principle, the Council should, in effect, be condoning the practice in return for a share of the advertising revenue.
- In response to Members' questions, Graham Wilson indicated that he had been unaware of the agreement until November 2010, although it appeared that some Streetscene staff had been present at earlier consultation meetings. His service had been battling graffiti for years and he was concerned regarding the precedent this agreement represented.
- Board Members expressed a number of concerns and reservations regarding the issue. In summary, there was a lack of wider Member consultation, the fact that officers had regarded it as appropriate to utilise delegated powers in relation to such a sensitive issue, whether this agreement had, perhaps, created a precedent which might have unfortunate knock-on effects, control over, and lack of Member input in respect of, the nature and subjects of any proposed advertisements, and the prompt removal of any advertisements, especially, when, say, an event had passed. Some Members agreed with Councillor Monaghan's view that the decision was wrong in principle, and it was suggested that the contract should be terminated, or at least suspended, pending further consideration by the Board.

Councillor Driver, in his capacity as Chair of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee, indicated that the matter raised some issues regarding the appropriate use of the officer delegated powers, and he felt that perhaps this was an area which the Committee might wish to explore.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the request for Scrutiny be approved, and the Board receive a more detailed joint officer report, to include Legal Services input, at the next meeting, setting out the views of all the relevant Council Departments regarding all the issues involved.
- b) That, in the meantime, the City Development officers seek legal advice regarding the suggestion that the current agreement with Curb Clean Media should be suspended pending the outcome of the Board's deliberations.

(NB: Councillor M Iqbal joined the meeting at 10.40 am, during the consideration of this item.)

**94 Request for Scrutiny - Refuse Collection Route Rationalisation Programme**

The Board received and considered a request for Scrutiny from Councillor A Lamb in respect of a review of the introduction of the revised refuse collection routes across the City.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were:-

- Councillor A Lamb – Wetherby Ward.
- Neil Evans - Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- Councillor Lamb explained that he was not seeking a 'witch-hunt' or a political points scoring exercise. It was clear that this major change had not gone well, with problems being experienced across the City. In the current economic climate, when the Council was facing having to implement other cost saving proposals, he regarded that it was important for the Council to understand what had gone wrong with this exercise in order that lessons could be learned.
- The Director welcomed the proposal to conduct an inquiry on the above basis. There had been a serious crisis involving the refuse collection service, and he could fully understand Members' desire to investigate what had happened and what lessons could be learned. The only concern the Director had was regarding the timing of the suggested

Inquiry. The service was only just returning to normality and all his officers' current attention was directed at it remaining that way. From this point of view, the 2011/12 municipal year would be preferable to an immediate Inquiry.

- The Board was supportive of the request for an Inquiry, on the basis of the above comments from Councillor Lamb and the Director. Members were anxious that any such Inquiry should take into account the background and context to the recent difficulties, i.e. the 2010 industrial action precipitated by the equal pay requirements, and this was agreed.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the request for scrutiny be approved, on the basis of the comments outlined above.
- b) That a Working Group be established to progress the Inquiry, comprising the Chair and Councillors G Driver, R Grahame, G Hyde, L Mulherin and P Wadsworth, but all Board Members be invited to attend Working Group meetings of they so wish.
- c) That the proposed Inquiry terms of reference be submitted to a future meeting for agreement.

#### **95 Dog Control Orders**

Further to Minute No. 50, 8<sup>th</sup> November 2010, the Board was reminded that at that meeting it had considered the Executive Board's proposals to introduce Dog Control Orders in the City, and had recommended a reduction from 6 to 4 in respect of the maximum number of dogs which may be walked by one person. This recommendation had been accepted, and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods had subsequently taken a delegated decision to implement that reduction.

Representations against this decision had been received from various quarters in the City, including professional dog walkers, and the Board was being requested today to review its previous recommendation.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were:-

- Councillor Tom Murray – Executive Member, Environmental Services.
- Graham Wilson - Head of Environmental Action and Parking.
- Stacey Campbell – Team Leader, Health and Environmental Action Service.

- Richie Womersley, Charlotte Hanson and Anne Birdsall – Representing professional dog walking businesses.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The representatives of the professional dog walkers explained about dog behaviour and psychology, about the professional manner in which they operated their businesses and the serious financial effects on businesses of restricting the number of dogs allowed to be walked by one person to four instead of the originally proposed six, which was the figure contained in the DEFRA guidance. They were also concerned regarding the complete lack of consultation with them before the proposals had been introduced. As responsible professionals and business people, they were happy to work with the Council regarding the possible introduction of a Code of Conduct, similar to the one operating in Harrogate, or even to contemplate a dog walking licensing system and exempt areas of land if that helped to allay Members' and the public's fears.
- Members acknowledged the points made. However, they also had a duty to take into account the wider picture. Over two-thirds (68%) of the public who had responded as part of the public consultation exercise had indicated that they felt that 4 or less dogs was the maximum number any one person could safely walk, keep under control and clean up after. The orders also applied to members of the public and unofficial dog walkers. There was real fear, not perceived or misplaced, amongst the public when confronted by a large number of dogs which may be out of control. Education of dog owners was an issue, and no-one could legislate for all irresponsible dog owners or walkers, no matter what the number of dogs contained in the orders. A code of conduct and the licensing of dog walkers, linked to a public campaign, might have some merit. Reference was made to houses in multiple occupation, which commenced as a voluntary code and then evolved into a licensing system with the support of local landlords.
- Graham Wilson stated that currently local authorities had no legislative powers to introduce a licensed dog walkers scheme. If it was proposed that a voluntary scheme should be looked at, then obviously there would be staffing implications and administrative costs, which would have to be passed on to the licence holder, in the same way that the current dog-boarding scheme operated. He suggested that if Members were minded for him to explore this option, then, in the interim, the number contained in the current Order, no more than 4 dogs per person, should remain, with officers retaining the current discretion to allow up to 6 dogs, providing they were being walked responsibly.

If a voluntary licensing scheme was progressed then anyone, for example, professional dog walkers, but the public too, wishing to walk more than 4 dogs would be licensed. Such licenses would be subject to review, renewal and possible revocation.

Consultation was about to commence on Phase 2 of the Order, which related to dogs being kept on leads whenever the owner was requested to do so by an authorised officer and dogs being excluded from prescribed areas, e.g. children's play areas, football pitches. A report would be going to all Area Committees in March/April to help identify these proposed exclusion zones, following which the public and professional groups would be consulted – including professional dog walkers. The intention was then to report back to the Scrutiny Board and the Executive Board with a view to the new regulations being introduced early in 2012.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the status quo be maintained pending consultation over the introduction of Phase 2 of the Order and a report back to this Board.
- b) That the officers, in consultation with the dog walkers, investigate the possible benefits and practicalities of introducing a voluntary licensing scheme for dog walkers, allied to a code of conduct and a public campaign, and include their findings in the above report back to the Board.

(NB: Councillor P Wadsworth left the meeting at 12.12 pm at the conclusion of this item.)

**96 Safer Leeds Executive - Proposed Inquiry on how Local Authorities and Other Agencies Gather, Use and Share Information**

Further to Minute No. 72, 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Board was reminded that at that meeting, it had agreed to undertake an Inquiry in respect of acquisitive crime, with the focus on domestic burglary. The results of the November 2010 follow-up inspection by the Audit Commission and HM Inspector of Constabulary, referred to at that meeting, were imminent, and would be circulated to Board Members, as requested.

However, it had been suggested by the Executive Member, Neighbourhoods and Housing, in consultation with the Safer Leeds Executive, that a more relevant and helpful inquiry might instead be conducted into information gathering, use and sharing by the Council and other agencies, and the proposed terms of reference for such an Inquiry had been circulated with the agenda.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods and Housing, and Marcus Beacham, Head of Community Safety and Partnerships.

**RESOLVED –**

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 14th March, 2011

- a) That the suggestion be accepted, and the proposed Inquiry terms of reference be approved.
- b) That a Working Group be established to progress the Inquiry, all Board Members welcome to attend, and the Principal Scrutiny Adviser notify Members of Working Group meeting arrangements.

## **97 Budget Analysis for Housing Revenue Account and General Fund - Period 9 2010/11**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods updated the Board regarding the key variances and outturn figures for 2010/11 in respect of both the HRA and the General Fund for period 9 (end of December 2010).

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments was Richard Ellis, Head of Finance, Environment and Neighbourhoods.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- Members sought assurance that measures were in place to recover anticipated overspends, or to reduce them.

Richard Ellis indicated that he was satisfied that the picture presented represented a realistic assessment of the likely year-end position. Everything possible was being done to maintain a cap on expenditure. However, there were a number of variables over which the Department had little control, such as car parking income and waste disposal fees, which may have an effect on the final outcome.

- Richard Ellis explained the paragraph relating to staff being placed on the internal re-deployment register.
- Councillor R Grahame requested to be supplied with details of the recent repairs to compactors and containers which had led to an estimated overspend of £33k (which had been off-set by savings elsewhere).
- Councillor Marjoram raised an issue regarding alleged senior staff salary increases at the ALMOs. Councillor P Gruen indicated that he was aware of the situation and was investigating.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

## **98 Work Programme**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted the Board's current work programme, updated to reflect decisions taken at previous meetings, together with the minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 14th March, 2011



5<sup>th</sup> January 2011, and a relevant extract from the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1<sup>st</sup> February to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2011.

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

**99 Dates and Times of Future Meetings**

Monday, 14<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

Both at 10.00 am (pre-meetings 9.30 am).

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Anderson in the Chair

Councillors G Driver, P Ewens,  
R Grahame, G Hyde, M Iqbal and  
L Mulherin

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor J Marjoram

### 100 Declarations of Interest

The following personal declarations of interest were made:-

- Agenda Item 10 (Minute No. 106 refers) – Budget Analysis for Housing Revenue Account and General Fund – Period 10, 2010/11 – Councillors G Driver, R Grahame and G Hyde in their capacity as ALMO Directors.

### 101 Minutes - 14th February 2011

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 102 Matters Arising from the Minutes

- a) Curb Clean Media Advertising in the City Centre (Minute No. 93 refers)

Further to Minute No. 93, 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011, the Chair read out a statement from Chris Gomersall, Head of Property Services, City Development, updating the Board on developments subsequent to the Board's last meeting.

The Executive Member, Development and Regeneration, had been made aware of the Board's views and comments made at the 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011 meeting, and regarded that the trial period should continue, pending a report back to the Board on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2011, after which the situation would again be reviewed.

**RESOLVED** – That the position be noted.

- b) Dog Control Orders (Minute No. 95 refers)

In response to a Member's query, the Chair stated that 'status quo', as referred to in part (a) of the Board's resolution last time, in this instance meant that the existing Order, limiting the number of dogs which an individual could walk at any one time to no more than four, would

remain unaltered, pending consultation on the introduction of Phase 2 and a report back to the Scrutiny Board. However, as minuted, officers would continue to exercise discretion to allow up to 6 dogs to be walked, providing that they were being walked responsibly, pending the final outcome of the consultation and a report back to the Board, which would include consideration of the possible voluntary licensing scheme for dog walkers discussed at the last meeting ( Min. No. 95, resolution (b) refers).

### **103 Scrutiny Inquiry - Intelligence Gathering and Sharing**

**RESOLVED** – That the item be deferred to 11<sup>th</sup> April 2011 meeting.

### **104 New Strategic Plans 2011 - 2015**

The Chief Executive and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a joint report outlining proposals for a new strategic planning structure, which encompassed the Vision for Leeds document, the Council's Business Plan and also a review and re-shaping of partnership arrangements across the City and the Leeds Initiative.

In attendance at the meeting, and responding to Members' queries and comments, were:-

- Neil Evans, Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods.
- Martin Dean, Head of Leeds Initiative and International Partnerships.
- Heather Pinches, Performance Manager.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The need for ALMOs to be on board as a partner in delivering the strategic plans. The Director indicated that this was in hand;
- Action Plans – the next stage of the process would be to draw up action plans regarding how the various priorities would be achieved, and these would be submitted in due course to Scrutiny Boards. It was suggested that Members needed base-line information in order to be able to measure eventual improvement;
- 'Leeds' economy will be prosperous and sustainable' – Care needed to be taken to ensure that Leeds residents benefited directly from any increased job or training opportunities, especially those residents from a BME or deprived background, and that the City was not just creating opportunities for non-Leeds people. The Council itself needed to do more to ensure that the make up of its own work force better reflected the ethnic make up of the City;

- Transport – Concerns were expressed regarding communities being left isolated by lack of proper public transport provision and lack of services after 10.00 pm. Reference was made to the Bus Quality Contract initiative which hopefully would address the issues;
- Health and Wellbeing – Anti-smoking measures needed targeting at children just as much, if not more, than adults, and teenage pregnancy rates also needed tackling more efficiently;
- Housing – The desperate need for more affordable housing needed to be addressed, and tackling current empty property levels was regarded as part of the possible solution. New homes were only part of the issue – there were also infrastructure concerns too.
- The Council should, it was suggested, explore gas plasma technology in relation to reclaiming landfill sites and job creation;
- Local residents needed greater encouragement and involvement in civic affairs;
- Education achievement levels, school attendance issues and school transport matters were touched upon;
- The Government’s current review of the benefits system and its effects on people in receipt of the Disability Living Allowance, and on single parents in terms of training opportunities, was discussed. Members felt that a training seminar on this topic for Council Members would be useful;
- It was accepted that, against a backdrop of world recession and vastly reduced resources, the Council was limited regarding what realistic effect it could have on some of the above issues. However, it needed to be identifying ‘gaps’ and opportunities where perhaps it could play a significant role in improving the lives of Leeds’ residents.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That, subject to the above comments and suggestions, the report be received and noted.
- b) That the Board receive further reports as and when action plans are developed.

(NB: Councillors P Gruen and M Iqbal joined the meeting at 10:03 am, at the commencement of this item.)

**105 Environment and Neighbourhoods Performance Report - Quarter 3 2010/11**

The Board received and considered a report submitted by the Head of Policy and Performance relating to performance information in respect of a raft of national and local performance indicators which fell within the remit of the Board to monitor.

Neil Evans, Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, responded to Members' queries and comments. In brief summary, the main areas of discussion were:-

- Gully cleansing, York Road – Councillor R Grahame requested that these be cleaned at the earliest opportunity and properly maintained thereafter. He also requested a copy of the current cleansing rota for this area.
- Refuse collection – Members requested that the Director supply them separately with an update regarding the latest situation;
- Worklessness- The Board requested an update report in the new municipal year on progress in implementing the recommendations contained in its Inquiry report. Members also regarded that the Council could and should be taking the lead in terms of job training initiatives, perhaps in partnership with local colleges and Job Centre Plus. Councillor Gruen suggested that there was scope for an Inquiry, perhaps a joint one with the Scrutiny Board (City Development), into the Council's role in this area, how the landscape had changed, etc.
- Further statistical information was requested regarding the numbers of people on Job Seekers Allowance and Disability Living Allowance.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

#### **106 Budget Analysis for Housing Revenue Account and General Fund - Period 10 2010/11**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods updated the Board regarding the key variances and outturn figures for 2010/11 in respect of both the HRA and the General Fund for period 10 (end of January 2011).

In attendance at the meeting, and responding to Members' queries and comments, were Neil Evans, Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, and Richard Ellis, Head of Finance, Environment and Neighbourhoods,

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The projected 2010/11 overspend on staffing should reduce significantly next year as the restructuring plans come to fruition and as the managing workforce change effects worked their way through;

- Car Parking – Charges and the balance of long stay/short stay parking provision were currently under review. As part of this, the former Primrose Hill School site was being considered, as previously suggested by a Board Member.

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

#### **107 Scrutiny Inquiry - Gypsy and Traveller Site Provision in Leeds**

Further to Minute No. 85, 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011, the Board received and considered the formal response of the Executive Board to the Scrutiny Board's Inquiry recommendations.

- P.57, Paragraph 2.1(ii) – It was clarified that it was, in fact, Leeds GATE which was opposed to any suggested expansion of the current Cottingley Springs site.

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods stated that he had profound concerns regarding any possible expansion of Cottingley Springs, in view of the previous problems experienced.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

#### **108 Japanese Disaster**

It was agreed that it appeared to be appropriate for the Council to formally express its deepest sympathy for, and solidarity with, the people of Japan at this time, and the Principal Scrutiny Adviser undertook to follow this up.

#### **109 Mike Earle, Democratic Services**

This being his last Board meeting prior to his retirement on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011, on behalf of the Board the Chair thanked Mike Earle for all his work on behalf of the Board and the City Council, and wished him a long and happy retirement.

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

Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2011, at 10.00 am (Pre-Meeting 9.30 am).

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL CARE)

WEDNESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor T Hanley in the Chair

Councillors B Cleasby, J Fisher,  
P Grahame, S Hamilton, A Hussain,  
V Kendall, M Lyons, Morgan, R Pryke,  
K Renshaw, D Schofield, B Smithson and  
S Varley

### 65 **Declarations of Interest**

Joy Fisher declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 11, Request for Scrutiny of the Proposal to Decommission the Crisis Centre due to her position with the Local Involvement Network (LINK). Minute 68 refers.

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

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Chapman and Davey. Councillor P Grahame was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Davey.

### 67 **Minutes - 12 January 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 68 **Request for Scrutiny of the Proposal to Decommission the Crisis Centre**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development informed the Board of a request for scrutiny that had been received from Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK) concerning the proposal to decommission the Crisis Centre.

The Chair welcomed Mr Paul Truswell to the meeting and he addressed the meeting on behalf of the LINK. He reported that the issue had been referred to the LINK following the campaign to save the centre and whilst it was acknowledged that it would be difficult to retain the centre and services provided in their current form, there were serious concerns regarding the proposals for complete closure and the process involved in reaching the decision.

He also raised the following issues:

- The Crisis Centre played a vital referral role and support for approximately 500 individuals per year.
- Concern regarding claims that the Crisis Centre provided services that were available elsewhere.
- Suggestion that reduced services could be provided which would give efficiency savings or capital raised through sale of the current property used could be made available.
- The request from LINK that a full formal consultation should have been carried out.

Members discussed the request for scrutiny and reiterated the concerns over consultation and that services weren't duplicated and there was support to have an inquiry. It was reported that the decision of the Executive Board to decommission the Crisis Centre had been taken at its meeting of 11 February and that decision would be implemented unless called in.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report and discussion be noted.
- (2) That the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development produce draft terms of reference for an Inquiry into the Proposals to Decommission the Crisis Centre

#### **69 Adaptations and Major Adaptations for Disabled Adults - Performance on Completion Time of Adaptations Schemes - April to December 2010**

The Board received the following two reports:

- Report of the Chief Executives of all Arms Length Management Organisations (ALMOs), Belle Isle Tenants Management Organisation (BITMO) and Strategic Landlord which provided information regarding the process for the allocation of capital resources for major adaptations within the respective organisations and a context of historical expenditure and outcomes over the period 2008/09 – 2011/12.
- Report of the Chief Officer for Health and Environmental Action Services which provided performance information on completion time for adaptations.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting:

- Claire Warren, Chief Executive, West North West Homes
- Simon Hale, Head of Housing Management, BITMO
- Steve Hunt, Chief Executive, East North East Homes
- John Clark, Chief Executive, Aire Valley Homes
- Simeon Perry, Housing Policy Monitoring Manager
- Andy Beattie, Head of Service, Housing & Pollution Control

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- East North East Homes reported that savings on adaptations had been made through a new procurement exercise.
- Issues relating to the provision of private sector adaptations:
  - Financial assessment of applicants
  - There was a continued increase in the demand for adaptations
  - Negotiations with suppliers to ensure best cost and quality
- Concern regarding the instance of a 562 day period to install a stairlift – it was reported that this was an exceptional case which included building extension and problems with access to the property.
- Issues relating to the sometimes lengthy periods to complete adaptations – these included delays due to the complex nature of some assessments, planning requirements and prioritisation of cases.
- Targets for the completion of adaptations were set by the Department of Communities and Local Government.
- Working with NHS and other health partners to enable people to return home and prevent bed blocking in hospitals or the requirement for other respite care.
- The referral process for adaptations – preliminary assessments were carried out by Occupational Therapists.
- The use of temporary adaptations and pre-adapted temporary buildings.
- Adaptations were prioritised by Occupational Therapists within their guidelines.
- Certain adaptations could be more costly in the private sector. Factors affecting this included design and procurement issues.
- Capital allocations for the ALMOs and the BITMO.

**RESOLVED** – That the reports and discussion be noted.

(Councillor P Grahame declared a personal interest during the discussion on this item due to her position as a Trustee of Crossgates Good Neighbours)

## **70 Inquiry into the Future of Residential and Day Care Provision for Older People in Leeds**

The report of the Director of Adult Social Services updated the Board on the programme of work developed to progress and implement the recommendations of the Executive Board in relation to future options for long-term residential and day care for older people. It also outlined the findings from the city wide public consultation on the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review and set out the focus for the inquiry in relation to day care services.

The Chair welcomed Dennis Homes – Deputy Director, Commissioning to the meeting.

Members were reminded that the inquiry had been widened to take account of Day Centre provision and were given a progress update. It was reported that

options were still under development for each individual establishment. These would be shared with all stakeholders when ready and it was hoped to report these to the next meeting of the Board. Area Committee's had been consulted to get local views and it was reported that a low response to the corporate consultation did not give a conclusive picture. There would be further engagement with Town and Parish Councils. Members attention was brought to the details of consultation events as outlined in the report.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Provision of Extra Care Housing – reference was made to a bid to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) for Extra Care Housing. It was hoped that at least 300 additional Extra Care Housing units could be provided across the City.
- It was reported that the consultation period had been extended and it was hoped that a report would be submitted to Executive Board in July 2011.
- The consultation process – this had been available to all stakeholders including staff. The inclusion of other groups and organisations such as Neighbourhood Networks was also discussed.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report and discussion be noted
- (2) That the focus for the inquiry in relation to day care services as outlined in the report be agreed.
- (3) That future reports to the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) and progress monitoring of this Inquiry as outlined in the paragraph 32 be agreed.

(Councillor S Hamilton left the meeting at 11.30 during the discussion on this item)

#### **71 Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Six Monthly Progress Report**

The report of the Director of Adult Social Services provided the Board with a six monthly progress report on the work of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board.

Dennis Holmes, Deputy Director – Commissioning presented the report to the Board. Issues highlighted included the following:

- The annual report of the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board would be published in July.
- A continued increase in the number of referrals to the partnership.
- The appointment of Professor Paul Kingston as Chair of the partnership.
- Progress in respect of requirements to the Mental Capacity Act and associated Deprivation of Liberty safeguards.

- The creation of a Communications and Community Engagement sub group and the adoption of a safeguarding charter.
- Revised procedures for serious case reviews.
- Updates on previous recommendations made by the Board and actions following the independent Wellbeing and Choice Inquiry.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The partnership had representatives from a wide range of organisations including West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, West Yorkshire Metropolitan Ambulance Service, West Yorkshire Police, Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust, Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust and Adult Social Care. The partnership aimed to be as inclusive as possible.
- The Care Quality Commissioning rated safeguarding in Leeds as good which recognised that significant progress had been made.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the progress made by the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board be noted and that a further progress report be received in 6 months together with the annual report for 2010/11.
- (2) That the actions of the three recommendations of the Independent Wellbeing and Choice Inquiry and the successful conclusion of action against these actions be noted.
- (3) That the Directorate be congratulated on the significant improvement on Safeguarding Issues in Leeds.

## **72 Draft Scrutiny Inquiry Statement - Future Provision of Domiciliary Care and Reablement Services**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development presented the conclusions and recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Board's work on Domiciliary Care and Reablement Services.

A draft report of the inquiry had been prepared and Members were asked to agree this report and request that a formal response to the recommendations be provided from the Director of Adult Social Care.

In relation to the domiciliary care, concern was raised that where had been contract/staff changes people had been left with fewer choices and less support and whether there was opportunity to appeal against decisions taken. It was reported that this would be built into the system for all those who required a full community care assessment.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be agreed.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Friday, 4th March, 2011

- (2) That it be requested that a formal response to the recommendations be produced in line with normal procedures for scrutiny inquiry reports.

### **73 Work Programme**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development detailed the Board's Work Programme and also contained the Council's Forward Plan and recent Executive Board minutes.

It was reported that terms of a reference for a proposed inquiry into the Decommissioning of the Crisis Centre would be drafted following the earlier request and Members were reminded of call-in arrangements.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan be noted.
- (2) That the Board's Work Programme be agreed and amended as appropriate.

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

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 at 10.00 a.m. Pre-meeting at 9.30 a.m. for all Board Members.

**The meeting concluded at 12.20 p.m.**

## SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL CARE)

FRIDAY, 4TH MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor T Hanley in the Chair

Councillors J Chapman, B Cleasby,  
P Grahame, R Grahame, S Hamilton,  
V Kendall, J Lewis, M Lyons, R Pryke,  
D Schofield and S Varley

**CO-OPTEES:** J Fisher– Alliance Service Users and  
Carers  
S Morgan – Equality Issues

### 75 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the call-in meeting.

### 76 Declarations of Interest

The following personal interests were declared:-

- Councillor J Chapman in view of the fact that she has a relative who works in the Independent Sector (Agenda Item 7) (Minute 79 refers)
- Councillor S Hamilton in her capacity as an employee of the Leeds NHS Trust (Agenda Item 7) (Minute 79 refers)
- Joy Fisher in her LINK capacity (Agenda Item 7) (Minute 79 refers)

### 77 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors P Davey, A Hussain , K Renshaw and B Smithson (Co-optee).

Notification had been received for Councillor P Grahame to substitute for Councillor P Davey; Councillor R Grahame to substitute for Councillor A Hussain and for Councillor J Lewis to substitute for Councillor K Renshaw.

### 78 Call-In of Decision - Briefing Paper

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report regarding the procedural aspects of the call-in process.

Members were advised that the options available to the Board in respect of this particular called-in decision were:-

Option 1 – **Release the decision for implementation.** Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) could decide to release it for implementation. If this option was chosen, the decision would be released for immediate implementation and the decision could not be called-in again.

Option 2 – **Recommend that the decision be reconsidered.** Having

reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) may decide to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered. If the Scrutiny Board chooses this option a report will be submitted to the Executive Board.

In the case of an Executive Board decision, the report of the Scrutiny Board will be presented to the next available meeting. The Executive Board will reconsider its decision and will publish the outcome of its deliberations within the minutes of the meeting. The decision may not be Called In again whether or not it was varied.

**RESOLVED** – That the report outlining the call-in procedures be noted.

**79 Call-In - Proposal to Decommission a Non-Statutory Mental Health Counselling Service, known as the Crisis Centre**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report, together with background papers, relating to a review of a decision made by the Executive Board on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011 in relation to a proposal to decommission a Non-Statutory Mental Health Counselling Service known as the Leeds Crisis Centre.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Copy of completed Call-In request form
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services
- Copy of the Equality Impact Assessment – Leeds Crisis Centre
- Relevant extract of Executive Board Minutes of 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011

The decision had been called-in for review by Councillors G Latty, P Latty, M Lobley, J Matthews, M Robinson and R Wood on the grounds that consultation had not been as wide or through as it should have been and whether or not all options were considered.

Councillors G Latty and J Matthews attended the meeting and gave evidence to the Board as to why they had called this item in and responded to Members' questions and comments.

The following representatives were also in attendance:-

Paul Truswell, representing Leeds LINK  
Jeremy Pritlove representing Save Leeds Crisis Centre  
Philomena Corrigan (Executive Director of Strategy and Commissioning) – NHS Leeds  
Councillor L Yeadon, Executive Member, Adult Health and Social Care  
Sandie Keene, Director of Adult Social Services  
John Lennon, Chief Officer (Access and Inclusion), Adult Social Services

In summary, the main points raised by Councillor G Latty, Councillor J Matthews, Paul Truswell and Jeremy Pritlove were:-

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> April, 2011



- The need to reconsider the Executive Board decision to close the Leeds Crisis Centre
- The concerns expressed regarding the inadequate consultation and the need to give Adult Social Care more time to consult and engage with service users and staff
- The proposed timeline for closure and the seemingly absence of alternative provision
- The 'unique' status of the Leeds Crisis Centre and the model of care provided at the Crisis Centre which was a social model rather than a medical model
- The need for a clear defined pathway for referrals to be introduced to avoid closure
- Clarification of the details contained within the Impact Assessment report
- The absence of any consideration of a reduced service within the Centre

In explaining the reasons for the Executive Board decision, the Executive Member, Adult Health and Social Care; Director of Adult Social Services and the Chief Officer (Access and Inclusion), Adult Social Services made specific reference to the following main comments:-

- Statistical evidence regarding patient throughput, referral routes and outcomes
- The need to make severe financial cuts within Adult Social Services resulting from the agreed 2011/12 Budget
- The view expressed that service users would have access to alternative provision should the Centre be disbanded

The Chair also invited Philomenia Corrigan, (Executive Director of Strategy and Commissioning) – NHS Leeds to comment on the proposals from the NHS Leeds perspective.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Board Members to; Philomenia Corrigan; Councillor L Yeadon and officers.

Following this process, the Chair allowed the Call-In signatories, Paul Truswell and Jeremy Pritlove to sum up.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked Councillors G Latty, J Matthews, together with Paul Truswell Jeremy Pritlove, Philomenia Corrigan, Councillor L Yeadon and officers for their attendance and contribution to the call in meeting.

**RESOLVED-** That the report and information provided be noted.

(Councillor V Kendall joined the meeting at 10.10am during discussions of the above item)

**80 Outcome of Call-In**

Following consideration of evidence presented to them, the Board passed the following resolution:-

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the Executive Board decision taken on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011 in relation to this matter be immediately released for implementation (i.e. Option 1).
- b) That the Board's Inquiry into this matter be continued with further work to be undertaken in relation to an exit strategy being implemented for the Leeds Crisis Centre.

**81 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 10.00am (Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 12.10pm)

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL CARE)**

**WEDNESDAY, 16TH MARCH, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor T Hanley in the Chair

Councillors B Cleasby, M Coulson,  
P Grahame, R Grahame, S Hamilton,  
V Kendall, M Lyons, R Pryke, D Schofield  
and S Varley

**CO-OPTED MEMBERS** J Fisher, S Morgan and B Smithson

### **82 Declarations of Interest**

The following personal declarations of interest were made in regard of Agenda Item 7, Request for Scrutiny from UNISON and others – Closure of Mental Health Services (Minute No. 85 refers).

- Councillor S Hamilton as a UNISON Member and Branch Secretary.
- Councillor J Chapman as she has a family member who was employed in the provision of Mental Health services.
- Joy Fisher and Sally Morgan due to their positions with the Alliance of Service Users and Carers.

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

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors P Davey, A Hussain and K Renshaw. Councillors P Grahame, R Grahame and M Coulson were in attendance as substitutes.

### **84 Minutes - 16 February 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2011, be confirmed as a correct record.

### **85 Request for Scrutiny from UNISON and others - Closure of Mental Health Services**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development informed the Board of a request for scrutiny that had been received from UNISON concerning the two mental health day centres. Reference was also made to the proposals to close the Crisis Centre which had been previously considered by the Board. The matters of issue raised by UNISON included the following:

- Potential failures of the Executive Board process with regards to the day centre report

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Date Not Specified

- Failure to properly equality impact assess the proposals to decommission two mental health day centres.

In addition, the Scrutiny Unit had received 29 individual requests for Scrutiny from members of the public. The following reasons were cited for the request for scrutiny:

- That the i3 document used by Adult Social Care in the deliberations to close the day centres states that there should be no closures
- The lack of appropriate consultation

The Chair welcomed Tony Pearson, Regional Organiser for Leeds UNISON and Alex Offer, Barrister acting on behalf of the Tri-centre Group to the meeting.

Tony Pearson gave the following reasons in support of UNISON's request for scrutiny:

- Confusion caused at the Executive Board meeting which initially considered the closure of Mental Health Services due to the introduction of revised information which was not available to all attendee as there were insufficient copies.
- A failure by the Council to carry out its 'duty to consult'.
- Reliance on the i3 report.
- Closure of the centres would not be a qualitative measure.
- Risk assessments for current service users had not been undertaken.
- Lack of proper consultation with stakeholders – without this the shape of future services could not be determined.
- Lack of dialogue with other groups that use the centres including the physically disabled.

In summary, he reported that the situation was causing a great deal of distress to service users and asked the Board to give further consideration to the issues raised before referring the issue back to Executive Board.

Alex Offer addressed the Board on behalf of the Tri-centre Group. He highlighted the following points of concern and reasons to support the request for scrutiny over the proposals to close Mental Health services:

- Most users of the day centres felt unable to cope with having to access services at other locations
- Should two of the existing centres close, there would not be enough capacity to carry out the required services.
- The proposals had caused a great deal of anxiety and stress to service users and there were humanitarian and medical reasons to reconsider the proposals.
- The Tri-Centre Group was willing to work in partnership with the Council in an attempt to identify alternative solutions.
- The full views of service users had not been taken into account.

- The decision in principle was flawed and it was irrational to carry out consultation after the decision.
- It was requested that the proposals be given further scrutiny with an option for service users to participate.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Lack of an option to retain services as presently delivered.
- Discussion with Executive Board Members did not take place until the decision was made.
- Further consideration regarding the Equality Impact Assessment
- What were the timescales for the proposals?
- Concern regarding the consultation process.
- Safeguarding issues for the vulnerable individuals concerned.

It was proposed that the Board should request a written response from the Director of Adult Social Care regarding the Equality Impact Assessment and also to the written submission of the Tri-Centre Group. It was also suggested that a report on consultation for service reconfiguration in Adult Social Care be submitted to the Board.

Following a vote by Members of the Board, it was:

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the Director of Adult Social Services be requested to provide a written response to the Equality Impact Assessment and the submission of the Tri-Centre Group
- (b) That a report on consultation for reconfiguration of services within Adult Social Care be requested.

**86 New Strategic Plans 2011-15**

The report of the Chief Executive presented proposals for the new set of strategic planning documents for advice and consideration before they went to Executive Board and Council for approval. They included the proposals for the long term partnership strategy for the City, the Vision for Leeds 2011 to 2030 and the first set of delivery plans for the first 4 years. These proposals had been developed in light of the current financial situation which meant that priorities had to be more focussed than in previous plans. The proposals also took into account, the results of two recent public consultations on the Vision for Leeds and the Spending Challenge.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting for this item:

- Dennis Holmes, Chief Officer – Commissioning
- Stuart Cameron-Strickland, Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement

- Steve Clough – Head of Corporate Policy and Performance

Members attention was brought to the new city planning framework which would focus on the Council's key priorities. This would be supported by 5 priority plans, the Council's Business Plan and other arrangements. Attention was also brought to the outline framework for the Vision for Leeds 2011 to 2030 and appendices that showed the city priority plans in greater detail. It was reported that the most relevant areas for the Board were those priorities that focussed in Health and Wellbeing issues and the Adult Social Care Directorate priorities as detailed in the Council Business Plan were highlighted.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Partnership Board representation – final arrangements were still to be confirmed but would involve both officers and Elected Members as well as representatives from other organisations including the NHS and GPs consortia.
- The City Priority Plans had been developed over a period of time through various consultations and had taken account of issues such as the Council's spending challenge.
- Although there was not a specific priority plan aimed at older people, the Health and Wellbeing Priority Plan had a very strong focus. Other priorities also included the needs of older people.
- Increasing personalisation and concerns regarding safeguarding – it was reported that personalisation of services only progressed following thorough assessment by social care professionals and that there was satisfaction that safeguarding issues would not be a concern.
- Equality Issues – these were covered across all the priorities particularly those related to Safer and Stronger Communities.
- Key performance indicators – in relation to the indicator for service users having control over their daily life, it was reported that the information was gathered over an eighteen month to two year period to get a balanced result. Sample surveys were carried out on a quarterly basis.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **87 Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board Performance Report Quarter 3 2010/11**

The report of the Head of Policy and Performance summarised progress against the Leeds Strategic Plan relevant to Adult Social Care for the third quarter of 2010/11 which was the final year of the pla. The report included a Performance Indicator report and of the indicators that could be reported, 33% were on track to hit target.

In brief summary, the following issues were discussed:

- The performance indicators related to the old performance management framework and there would be changes to the indicators in future in line with the new priorities.
- Concern with the indicator that relates to the timeliness of social care assessments (Adults). It was reported that this was affected by a new assessment process and increased safeguarding concerns. An action plan was being developed to deal with any backlogs.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **88 Work Programme**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development detailed the Board's Work Programme and also contained the Council's Forward Plan and recent Executive Board minutes.

It was reported that Recommendation Tracking and an update on Domiciliary Care and Reablement would be on the Board's next agenda.

**RESOLVED** –

- (1) That the Executive Board Minutes and Forward Plan be noted.
- (2) That the Board's Work Programme be agreed and amended as appropriate.

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

Wednesday, 13 April 2011 at 10.00 a.m. (Pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.)

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY BOARD (HEALTH)

TUESDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Dobson in the Chair

Councillors S Armitage, P Ewens,  
P Harrand, A Hussain, J Illingworth,  
G Kirkland, G Latty, J Matthews and  
E Taylor

**CO-OPTEE** Ms E Stewart Leeds Local Involvement  
Network

### 78 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the February meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Health).

### 79 Late Items

The Chair agreed to accept the following document as supplementary information:-

- The Leeds Sexual Health Commissioning Strategy 2010-2012- Appendix 1 (Agenda Item 8) (Minute 84 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but made available on the Council's Internet site prior to the meeting.

### 80 Declarations of Interest

Councillor E Taylor made a general declaration of personal interest in respect of today's agenda, in her capacity as an NHS employee.

### 81 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Arthur Giles.

### 82 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 83 Mental Health Partnership Integration Project

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report presenting to the Board details/proposals associated with the Mental Health Integration Project.

Appended to the report was a copy of document entitled 'NHS Leeds – Proposals for Change – Health Scrutiny Board' for the information/comment of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance to present the key issues highlighted in the report and to address any specific questions identified by the Scrutiny Board:

- Michelle Moran (Director of Service Delivery and Chief Nurse) – Leeds Partnerships NHS Foundation Trust (LPFT)
- James Houlst (Project Manager) – Leeds Partnerships NHS Foundation Trust (LPFT)
- John Lennon (Chief Officer (Access and Inclusion)) – Leeds City Council, Adult Social Services

The Director of Service Delivery and Chief Nurse, together with the Project Manager briefly outlined the main proposals associated with the Mental Health Partnership Integration Project. In addition, the Chief Officer (Access and Inclusion), Adult Social Services provided the Board with an update on relevant issues within Adult Social Care.

In summary, it was outlined that the main aim of the project was the integration of care management teams (from LPFT and Leeds City Council) for the benefit of patients. With clearer accountability as an underlying principle, the benefits would include better:

- Management and flow of information to and from patients;
- Use of resources; and,
- Reflection on service user involvement and experience.

It was outlined that, on completion of the project, it was expected that LPFT would provide mental health service on behalf of the Council. While the Council would remain statutorily responsible for such services / functions, this would be achieved through a formal (Section 75) agreement, secondment of staff and transfer of a budget in the region of £7.9M.

There was a wide ranging discussion where a number of points were raised and addressed, including:

- Concerns that too much jargon was contained within the document and the need for more clarity regarding the proposals
- Commissioning arrangements in relation to the new IT system and anticipated completion date
- The process for establishing a the single management structure and joint outcome/ accountability framework
- How the proposals would work in practice, including whether or not the Section 75 agreement and secondments were time limited and around the appointment process / accountability of the Head of Service post
- How the proposals would benefit service users and whether or not services would improve in the short/long term
- The need for stability for those people who go through the service transformation process

- Decision-making processes and the timescales in relation to reporting back proposals to the Council's Executive Board

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That further reports on this issue be presented to the Board for discussion in due course.

(Councillor J Illingworth joined the meeting at 10.15am during discussions of the above item)

(Councillor G Latty left the meeting at 11.00am during discussions of the above item)

**84 Leeds Sexual Health Strategy**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report presenting to the Board details/proposals associated with the Leeds Sexual Health Strategy.

Appended to the report was a copy of the 'Leeds Sexual Health Commissioning Strategy 2010-2012' for the information/comment of the meeting.

The following representatives were in attendance to present the key issues highlighted in the report and to address any specific questions identified by the Scrutiny Board:

- Victoria Womack (Drugs and Sexual Health Lead) – NHS Leeds
- Ruth Middleton (Head of Commissioning, Staying Healthy) – NHS Leeds

The Drugs and Sexual Health Lead Officer, together with the Head of Commissioning, Staying Healthy outlined the main points within the Leeds Sexual Health Commissioning Strategy 2010-2012.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:

- Sexual Health remained a significant issue for some areas of the community, with an increase risk to people under 25 years old
- The focus of the strategy being on:
  - Early access to sexual health assessment and treatment services;
  - Early access to contraception services
  - Prevention
- The HPV vaccine within the context of the Leeds Sexual Health Strategy  
*(The Drugs and Sexual Health Lead Officer responded and informed the meeting that HPV did not specifically relate to the strategy; but agreed to supply information of the percentage rates of HPV immunisation to the Board via the Principal Scrutiny Adviser)*

- Links with the Student Union in helping to deliver the key messages of the strategy, with reference made to the successful campaigns undertaken in Leeds Colleges around Chlamydia screening
- Consistency of Sex and Relationship Education within Leeds schools.
- How the strategy contributed to the delivery of locality based services

**RESOLVED-** That the contents of the report and appendices be noted and welcomed.

#### **85 Quality Accounts 2011**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report seeking the Board's view on a range of options for commenting on the Quality Accounts of local health care providers for 2011.

Arising from discussions, the Board agreed to take a practical and pragmatic approach considering and, where appropriate, commenting on the Quality Accounts produced by the full list of NHS healthcare service providers identified in the report: That is:

- Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust
- Leeds Partnerships Foundation Trust
- Leeds Community Healthcare
- Spire Hospital Leeds
- Nuffield Hospital Leeds
- Fountain Diagnostics
- Commuter Walk-In Centre Leeds

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That approval be given to pursuing Option 2b (a devolved working group, with an open membership arrangement) for commenting on the Quality Accounts of local NHS healthcare providers for 2011.

#### **86 Updated Work Programme 2010/11**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report outlining the Scrutiny Board's work programme for the remainder of the current municipal year.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Scrutiny Board (Health) – Work Programme 2010/11 (Appendix 1 refers)
- NHS Leeds Board – Notes of a Meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2011 (Appendix 2 refers)
- Leeds NHS - Pharmacy Needs Assessment – Briefing Note (Appendix 3)

The Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser presented the key issues highlighted in the report and addressed specific points of clarification identified by the Scrutiny Board.

Specific reference was made to the national review of Children's Cardiac Surgery Services and the future delivery options recently agreed for consultation.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That approval be given to the outline work programme in accordance with the report now submitted.
- c) That in relation to Children's Cardiac Surgery Services – national review, consideration be given to raising the profile of this issue via a White Paper Motion to Council and to request the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser to write to Area Committee Chair's with a request that this issue be debated at Area Committee meetings in March/April 2011.
- d) That in relation to the provision of playing fields in Leeds and the public health implications, this issue be incorporated within the Board's work programme in the new Municipal Year.
- e) That in relation to Workforce Planning and the associated problems of city-wide pupils obtaining a place at Medical School, this issue be incorporated within the Board's work programme in the new Municipal Year.

**87 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

To note that the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board will be held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2011 at 10.00am (Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 12 noon)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Plans Panel (East)**

**Thursday, 17th March, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors R Finnigan, J Hardy, G Latty,  
M Lyons, K Parker, J Procter, A Taylor and  
D Wilson

### **156 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **157 Late Items**

There were no formal late items but the Panel was in receipt of the following additional information for consideration:

Layout plans in respect of the five items on the agenda (minutes 162 to 166 refer). Copies of these had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting

### **158 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Applications 10/05639/FU and 10/04987/FU – 36 Victoria Road Morley and Prospect Garage Church Street Morley – Councillor Finnigan declared personal interests through being a member of Morley Town Council which had commented on the applications (minutes 162 and 163 refer)

Application 10/03984/FU – Scott Hall Square LS7 – Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest as a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the application (minute 164 refers)

Application 10/05745/LA – Middleton Park Visitors Centre – Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest through being a member of Wades Charities which had undertaken regeneration work in Middleton Park (minute 166 refers)

(A further declaration of interest was made later in the meeting – minute 166 refers)

### **159 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gruen who was substituted for by Councillor Hardy and from Councillor Grahame and Mr Sellens, the Head of Planning Services

## **160 Recent appeal decisions**

The Chair asked the Panel's Lead Officer to advise Members on the outcome of two high profile appeals

Members were informed that the application for five wind turbines at Hook Moor, Mickfield, which Panel had refused in line with the Officer's recommendation had been appealed by the applicant. Whilst the Inspector had dismissed the appeal, this decision had been challenged in relation to the status of the RSS as a material consideration at the time the decision had been made. This challenge had been upheld and the appeal decision remitted to the Planning Inspector for reconsideration

In relation to a major residential development at Churchfields, Boston Spa which was refused under delegated powers, Members were informed that the appeal had been allowed and that a report on this would be presented to Panel at the next meeting

Members expressed their concerns at the situation in respect of both applications

In terms of the Hook Moor application, Members queried the evidence provided by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) in respect of the impact of the proposals on radar at RAF Leeming and RAF Church Fenton. The Panel was informed that further discussions had taken place between the MOD and the applicant and that an agreement had been reached that the proposals would not have an effect on the MOD's operation

In relation to the appeal decision at Churchfields Boston Spa, there was a call for these concerns to be raised with the Secretary of State, with the Chair suggesting Members dealt with this via the Chief Executive's office

## **161 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be approved subject to recording Councillor Latty's apologies which were tendered for that meeting

## **162 Application 10/05639/FU - Alterations to roof including increase in overall height and addition of three dormer windows to front and two dormer windows to rear - 36 Victoria Road Churwell Morley LS27**

Plans, drawings, photographs and an historic image were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which was recommending that the application for extensions and alterations to the roof at 36 Victoria Road Morley be refused on the grounds of inappropriate design and scale resulting in a form of development which was detrimental to the character of the host dwelling and the wider street scene

Comments from the Council's Conservation Officer were read out at the meeting as these had been received after the agenda had been despatched. Members were informed that the site was not currently in a Conservation Area but that the proposed alterations to the boundary of the Morley Conservation Area which were due to be confirmed this year, would most likely mean the site would fall within that revised boundary



The Panel heard representations from the applicant who addressed the Panel Members discussed the following matters:

- the existing headroom of the property
- the conflicting information from Planning Services which the applicant had received
- that the decision in this case was a finely balanced one
- that the existing roof was too shallow and that the proposals were acceptable, particularly if the chimney features were retained
- the need for consistent advice to be provided on Conservation Area applications

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application be not agreed and that the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to appropriate conditions

**163 Application 10/04987/FU -Demolition of existing buildings and construction of new vehicle servicing building, car sales area and parking - Prospect Garage Church Street Morley LS27**

Plans, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for redevelopment proposals, including some demolition of an existing car showroom and forecourt/MOT servicing workshop and storage buildings

Members were informed that the main concerns in respect of the application related to the impact of the proposals on neighbours' amenity with particular concern at noise, disturbance and views of parked vans from nearby homes

If minded to approve the application, Officers proposed additional conditions relating to site accesses and details of the scheme of footway improvement at the nearby junction

The Panel heard representations from the applicant and an objector who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the impact of the proposals on the levels of light available to the properties at 6 and 8 Croft House and whether a light test had been undertaken by Officers
- highways issues and the need to ensure appropriate conditions were included
- the landscaping and the need for the maintenance of this to be controlled by condition
- the retaining wall to the adjacent gardens and whether the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the condition of this

Officers informed the Panel that a specific light test had not been undertaken as it was not felt to be necessary as the proposals represented an improvement on the existing situation. A noise survey had been carried out by Environmental Health and an appropriate condition had been included

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, plus additional conditions relating to:

- details of site accesses to be submitted and approved

- details of scheme of footway improvement at the Croft House Road/Church Street junction to be submitted and approved
- provision of a method statement for carrying out the works and the maintenance of the integrity of the retaining wall to adjacent gardens

and an amendment to condition 7 to require a scheme of management and maintenance of landscaping to be submitted and agreed with the LPA and for local residents to be consulted on the details pursuant to this condition and for Ward Members to be kept informed

**164 Application 10/03984/FU - 7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open space at Scott Hall Square Chapeltown LS7**

Further to minute 85 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2010 where Panel agreed to defer and delegate approval of a residential development providing 100% affordable housing at Scott Hall Square LS7, subject to further negotiations taking place on several matters, Members considered a further report

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and informed Panel that the scheme had been further revised with the deletion of 5 houses from the proposals, with this area now providing public open space

Further consultation had taken place with the community and the applicant had revised the scheme in view of this

Members discussed the images shown and were of the view that dormers should be re-instated to the front of plots 23 and 24

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate), consultation with local residents on details of the proposed public open space; re-introduction of dormers to the front of plots 23 and 24 and the completion of a legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer, to include the following obligations:

- 1 That all housing on the site shall remain affordable
- 2 Fee of £600 for management of the obligation

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

**165 Application 10/04815/FU - Part single, part two storey retail store with car parking to former garage/petrol filling station site - 700-702 King Lane Moortown LS17**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a retail store with car parking on the site of a vacant garage/petrol filling station on an existing shopping parade at King Lane LS17

Members were informed that this brownfield site was outside the retail centre and would serve a local retail function

A new pedestrian crossing on King Lane to the south of the site would be provided and measures to prevent rat running would be addressed through the provision of bollards

The existence of flats above the proposed retail premises and the close proximity of a house to the rear of site had led to colleagues from Environmental Health suggesting appropriate conditions

A flood risk assessment had been carried out and appropriate conditions included. A bat survey had revealed no evidence of bats, with the premises being assessed as having limited bat roost potential. The necessary remediation works from the previous petrol/garage use would require some work to the watercourse. The presence of White Clawed Crayfish had been recorded in Meanwood Beck and whilst the works could have an impact, this would be temporary and would in the long term create a better environment

If minded to approve the application, Officers requested an amendment to the condition concerning opening hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays with these being extended to allow operating hours of 08.00 – 22.00

Due to the small scale of the development a S106 Legal agreement was not required

Officers reported receipt of a further letter from Alwoodley Parish Council

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's agent and from a representative of Alwoodley Parish Council who had been registered as an objector to the proposals

The Panel's legal adviser was asked to comment on the issue of a S106 Agreement, particularly in view of the comments made by Alwoodley Parish Council who, rather than objecting to the application appeared to be seeking funding to benefit an area beyond the development site (including replacing bollards along the parade)

Members were informed that with effect from April 2010, the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 had introduced a legal test governing the lawfulness of planning obligations relating to developments such as this. A planning obligation could only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation was necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. In other words the obligations had to directly relate to the development proposals; be proportionate and address issues associated with that development. In terms of this application, it was the opinion of the legal adviser that the matters requested by Alwoodley Parish Council to be dealt with in a S106 Agreement were beyond the scope of the legal test for planning obligations

The Panel discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the applicant's lack of consultation with neighbouring traders
- whether any work had been carried out in terms of a cumulative impact study of the proposals on existing shops
- the provision of an additional pedestrian crossing and the reasons for this. The Panel's Highways representative stated that the provision of the pedestrian crossing had come from the applicant and was not seen as planning gain as this would help mitigate the servicing and parking concerns which had been raised through this application
- car parking provision, with Members being advised that a TRO was being considered to deal with any overspill parking

- that a condition requiring local employment should be included

The Panel's Lead Officer informed Members that in terms of an impact assessment, the Government had placed a limit on the need for such an assessment to be carried out, this being 2500sqm

Further discussion ensued in respect of:

- the nature of the representations by the Parish Council. On this matter the Chair accepted that Alwoodley Parish Council was a relatively new Parish Council and had not previously made representations to Panel
- that the development could not be considered to be small scale and was larger than the surrounding retail premises
- that there was insufficient car parking, this being 50% under the UDP maximum
- that the impact of the proposals on traffic and local businesses had not been considered

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, with an amendment to condition 20 to allow opening on Sundays and Bank Holidays from 08.00 – 22.00 hours and an additional condition requiring details of the scheme for local employment during and post construction to be submitted and agreed by the LPA

### **166 Application 10/05745/LA - Middleton Park Visitors Centre Town Street Middleton LS10**

(Councillor Hardy declared a personal interest through his links with the Friends of Middleton Park)

Plans, photographs, drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting  
Officers presented the report which sought permission for a replacement Visitor Centre at Middleton Park LS10 with a bandstand and associated landscaping works

The application was required to be considered by Panel as the applicant was the Council and the site was within the Green Belt

Funding for the development had been obtained from the Heritage Lottery Fund which had also set out design requirements

The Visitor Centre would include an education centre, café, ancillary store and office. The site was within the Green Belt and as such was regarded as being inappropriate development. Although the uses were not regarded as being essential, it was considered that they would enhance the park and in terms of the Visitor Centre it would replace an existing, disused facility so Officers were of the view that the proposals did not conflict with Green Belt Policy in this case

An amendment to the proposed opening hours of the café and Visitor Centre was requested, this being up to 19.00 hours daily and 21.00hrs on 10 occasions per year to cater for events. Officers considered that limiting the number of times late opening could occur would protect residential amenity

Enhancements to the main park entrance off Town Street would be provided as well as alterations to the pedestrian access situated opposite 261 Town Street

Security had been carefully considered with hydraulic shutters and safety glass being proposed as well as CCTV. No computers or large equipment would be

kept at the site overnight and although fencing around the Visitor Centre had been suggested, the funding could not be obtained to provide this

Members welcomed the proposals and commented on the following matters:

- whether anti-vandal paint should be considered for the shutters etc
- the need for the timber cladding to be treated to ensure its longevity
- whether solar panels would be provided. Officers agreed to consult with the applicant on this matter
- the hope that the proposed materials were sufficiently robust as it was unlikely that further funding would be forthcoming
- that some reference in the Visitor Centre should be made to the Middleton Railway and John Blenkinsop who designed the first practical locomotive railway and lived at Middleton Hall on Town Street

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, subject to the following amendments:

- condition 13 to include reference to steps
- condition 18 to allow opening until 19.00 hours daily and 21.00 hours on 10 occasions during a calendar year
- condition 23 to require an additional bat survey

plus additional conditions in respect of details of door widths and lobby area to be submitted and agreed and details of the scheme to seek to protect the building from vandalism to be submitted and agreed and that the applicant be informed of the comments made around the provision of information/display in the Visitor Centre in respect of John Blenkinsop and the historic Middleton Railway

#### **167 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 3RD MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Chastney,  
M Coulson, J Hardy, J Harper, G Latty,  
T Leadley, J Matthews and R Wood

### 106 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda, however revised reasons to refuse Application 10/05520/FU (St Bartholomew's) were tabled at the meeting (minute 117 refers)

### 107 Declarations of Interest

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Councillor Akhtar - Little London PFI redevelopment scheme – declared a personal interest as he had previously received a briefing on the scheme in his capacity as local ward Councillor (minute 118 refers)

Councillor Chastney - Little London PFI redevelopment scheme – declared a personal interest as a director of West North West Homes ALMO (minute 118 refers)

Councillor Coulson – Application 10/05134/FU Sunnybank Lane Thornbury – declared a personal interest as he had previously attended a site visit with planning officers, but had not formed a view on the application (minute 116 refers)

Councillor J Harper – Application 10/05520/FU St Bartholomew's – declared a prejudicial interest as she stated she had spoken at a public meeting on the scheme (minute 117 refers)

Councillor G Latty – Application 10/05674/FU Kirk Lane – declared a prejudicial interest as he had objected to the scheme, prior to acting as a substitute Member on the Panel (minute 114 refers)

Councillor Matthews - Application 10/04068/OT Clariant Site and Application 10/04261/OT Riverside Mills residential developments – declared personal interests in both matters as a local authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as METRO had commented on both schemes (minute 112 refers)

Councillor Taggart – Application 10/04261/OT Riverside Mills – declared a personal interest as a Local Authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Joint Services - the umbrella organisation which includes West Yorkshire

Archaeological Service – as WYAS had submitted comments on the scheme (minute 112 refers)

Additionally Councillor Coulson stated that with regard to the Clariant and Riverside Mills residential developments; although he was a local authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and METRO had commented on both schemes; he did not have an interest as he had not been present at any WYITA meetings when the schemes had been discussed

**108 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wadsworth and the Panel welcomed Councillor Latty as his substitute

**109 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011 be agreed as a correct record

**110 Matters Arising**

Pizza Express - Councillor Matthews reported on an instance of apparent non compliance with planning conditions (lighting, access and unauthorised takeaway use) following approval of an application by Panel. Officers noted the comments and agreed to raise the matter with the Enforcement Team to pursue

**111 Application 09/00856/FU - Former Glassworks Cardigan Road Headingley LS6**

The Panel considered a report on the outcome of an appeal against refusal of permission for a development of student flats on the former Glasswork sites, Headingley. It was the decision of the Inspector to allow the appeal, subject to conditions, in a letter dated 1 February 2011. Members noted the comments of the Inspector

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the report

**112 Application 10/04068/OT - residential development proposals for Clariant site, Calverley Lane, Horsforth LS18 AND Application 10/04261/OT residential development proposals for Riverside Mills, Horsforth**

Further to minutes 94 and 95 of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011 when Panel considered progress reports on both schemes; the Chief Planning Officer submitted reports for determination of outline applications (including access) for residential developments at the Clariant site and the Riverside Mills site, Horsforth.

Members had previously received a presentation at pre-application stage and undertaken site visits. Site plans, photographs, indicative plans and highways plans were displayed at the meeting. The Panel agreed to consider both applications together given the substantive joint issues.



The Clariant scheme would provide up to of 400 dwellings, a shop, open space, allotments, retention of a sports & recreation ground in community use and off-site highways works. The Riverside Mills scheme would provide up to 150 dwellings, open space and off-site highway works.

Both developers had offered Section 106 and Section 278 Agreements to cover off-site highways improvements including Horsforth And Rodley roundabouts, new bus service to Horsforth, 25% Affordable Housing, footpath and cyclepath link improvements, free metrocards for residents and contributions to primary education.

Officers reported the following necessary amendments to the Riverside Mills report:

- Conditions 30 to 32 be removed from the proposed conditions
- Reference to BREAM be removed from condition 35 to be attached to the permission if granted
- Developer now offered to fund two bus stops.

Officers also provided the following updates on the latest consultation responses/representations:

- revised Travel Plan submitted 2 March 2011 (both applications) but there had been insufficient time to assess it prior to the meeting. This could be dealt with under a defer and delegate decision
- Environment Agency confirmed no objection (Riverside Mills application) subject to standard conditions
- Natural England commented the proposed mitigation measures were acceptable (both applications)
- more information on the proposed 2m widening of Calverley Lane North footpath had been requested, but could be dealt with under a defer and delegate decision
- Nature Conservation Officer – commented that Calverley North had acceptable ecological improvements and had provided proposed conditions accordingly
- receipt of 10 further letters of objection which raised no new issues and 1 letter of support (from Turner & Townsend) re Clariant
- receipt of 2 further letters of objection which raised no new issues and 1 letter of support (from Turner & Townsend) re Riverside Mills
- additional comments of Councillor Marjoram seeking provision of a school on protected playing pitch area.

A concept master plan for both schemes had been submitted to ensure the schemes integrated with each other and the wider locality. Heights were shown as being 2 to 2½ storeys at the site boundaries, with up to 3 storeys to the centre. Densities were indicated as being 25-35 dwellings per hectare at the periphery of the sites and 36-45 dwellings per hectare to the centre.

#### Principle of Residential Use

- Officers highlighted the key considerations as being the fact that these are brownfield sites (although outside the main urban area); whether the sites were demonstrably sustainable and whether the package of

sustainability measures was sufficient; balanced with the benefits brought by the schemes contribution to the five year housing land supply

- Officers outlined the Sustainability package in relation to the following issues: brownfield, new housing, public transport, education, amenities, heritage retention, landscape, ecology and flooding
- An assessment of employment provision concluded that there was a surplus of employment land in the development plan period. If these sites were retained for employment there would be other difficult issues.

Officers concluded that on balance these factors supported the principle of residential use and that the sustainability package was acceptable.

### Highways

- The Highways Officer provided details of the proposed highways works. Slides showing the proposed works to Calverley Lane North & South, the A6120; the A65, Horsforth Roundabout and Rodley Roundabout were displayed for reference
- Means of access works included widening of the carriageway to the access point of Riverside Mills to provide 2 way access and footpath
- Off-site highway works for both schemes comprised improved pedestrian facilities along the A6120 and A65 and extensive treatment to both Horsforth and Rodley roundabouts to increase capacity
- A slide showing LCC proposals to signalise Horsforth roundabout was displayed. It was reported that the developers were willing to offer to fund this scheme but the additional costs incurred would negate their ability to provide affordable housing
- Plans were displayed showing an indicative bus route from the Clariant site via Calverley Lane North to Horsforth schools and Train station and also details of the improved pedestrian footpaths and sites for pedestrian crossings. It was reported that the proposed half hourly bus service would not meet the SPD but would be funded; and was regarded as viable by METRO but required further negotiations with a bus operator
- The Highways Officer provided the previously requested detail on the number, nature and location of reported accidents during the 2001-06 and 2006-10 time frame. Officers stated that not all the reported accidents at the Calverley Lane South junction related to the right turn into the Clariant site and some could have resulted from shunts in traffic stacking for the roundabouts
- The proposed third lane would provide a length of road for stacking traffic waiting to make the right turn into Calverley Lane South; and would not stretch as far back as the railway bridge
- Planning officers noted that the plans for Calverley Lane North did not provide adequate provision for cyclists and that this could not be provided without unacceptable loss of vegetation
- Planning Officers confirmed that the applications before Panel today included the non-signalised works to Horsforth and Rodley

roundabouts. If Panel wished to pursue an approval with the full signalised works to Horsforth roundabout the developer considered that affordable housing would not be viable.

### Education

- The applicant offered a full primary education contribution as requested by Education Leeds, but no secondary contribution was required
- Ward Councillors had requested further investigation of the possibility of providing a school on site. Officers reported that the schemes would not result in the need for a new school to be built, however the developers had identified an area of playing field within the site that could be dedicated for a new school if other contributions reduced
- Planning officers confirmed that this was Green Belt land and therefore would result in policy issues. Education Leeds also confirmed no funding was available to build a school. Officers acknowledged that these applications could not solve existing issues relating to availability of school places in the area.

### **Speakers**

The Panel then heard representation from objectors to the scheme:

Mr Martin Hughes of Horsforth Civic Society addressed the Panel on concerns relating to the impact of these isolated developments on the community infrastructure. He referred to the findings of a 2005 survey of the A65 and stated matters were unlikely to have changed. He noted that issues relating to education, highways and public transport were raised by both the community and the Panel and predicted 1000 cars could be generated by 550 homes.

Mrs Kate Arbuckle a local resident, Horsforth Town Clerk and Chair of Horsforth Town Council Planning Committee expressed concern over the traffic management plan, the current traffic problems in the area and the comments of an Inspector on a previous appeal on the nature of the routes and proposed distances to amenities. She suggested that residents were more likely to use private vehicles than walk or cycle.

Councillor A Carter Calverley and Farsley ward Member urged the Panel to consider the sites in the context of the highways network and education and whether they would be demonstrably sustainable. He noted future residents would live within either the Horsforth or Calverley & Farsley wards and reported the subsequent increased demand for school places would have far reaching impact on all local schools, some of which were already at capacity. Councillor Carter stated the proposed works to Rodley roundabout were insufficient and this roundabout should be signalised. Further residential developments along the A65 should not be allowed until both roundabouts were improved.

(Councillor Leadley withdrew from the meeting at this point)

Having regard to objector's comments Panel discussed the concerns expressed regarding impact of the school run on the highways network and the proposed pedestrian route to Newlathes School which was currently impassable due to flooding. Members also noted the comment made by

Councillor Carter that none of the residents who had attended the public consultation were opposed to the principle of residential development but that residents did not believe the two schemes could be sustainable.

(Councillor Leadley rejoined the meeting)

The Panel then heard representation from supporters of the scheme: Mrs S Ansbro on behalf of both developers who stated the sites could not be left undeveloped and the only alternative would be to seek to reintroduce permitted low grade industrial use if the proposals were not approved. The developers believed that sustainable measures on the sites could be delivered and be compliant with Policy H4. The submitted traffic analysis had taken into account the Woodside Mills and Kirkstall Forge developments which also access onto the A65. Mrs Ansbro confirmed the developers commitment to highways works totalling £2m and acknowledged the debate regarding education provision but commented that the local schools Admissions Policy was a separate issue.

Mrs A Reeves of the Riverside Mills team then addressed the Panel on the planning history of the site and emphasised that there were no outstanding objections from statutory consultees.

Mr M Lunn of Turner & Townsend then addressed the Panel in support of the scheme and the benefits of regeneration in the area.

The Panel discussed the following matters with the developers representatives:

- Could not see how the sites could be sustainable
- Choice of provision of Affordable Housing or highways works
- The residential usage could generate a large carbon footprint however vehicles would be on site through industrial usage
- The highways scheme could mitigate the impact of these developments but would not address existing problems on the local highways network. Some Members saw signalisation of Horsforth roundabout as imperative as the A65 was at capacity noting the developers were prepared to address this but at a cost to the overall scheme
- Traffic generated by the proposed residential scheme would be different to the previous industrial use as the peak time flows would be different, but the developers suggested the overall vehicular movements would not differ greatly
- Extending the bus link to Pudsey would benefit the residents
- Problems of education as all local schools were full or nearly full, but acknowledged the applicant could not influence Council's admission policy
- The intended low grade industrial use fall back position
- Noted that Network Rail would not support a halt at this location due to its proximity to the proposed Apperley Bridge and Kirkstall Forge sites
- Whether a smaller scheme had been considered bearing in mind the physical constraints on the sites and the issue of viability

- The level of public consultation with local residents and ward Councillors.

The Panel noted that the developer had worked with Education Leeds who had calculated that a contribution to primary provision was required, not a new school. Furthermore, there was currently spare capacity within some local secondary schools which was why no secondary education contributions were required.

(Councillor Akhtar withdrew from the meeting)

The Panel then went onto discuss education provision in detail with Mr Peter Storrie of Education Leeds as follows:

- Projected numbers of pupils and capacity of the schools nearest to the developments
- Education Leeds was aware of the concerns raised by Panel that local schools were already full to capacity and would look to spend the contribution in Horsforth and Calverley in the first instance
- It was reported that there were 9300 primary school places in 2010/11, but last years birth-rate stood at 10,200. Members were concerned that there would be a 900 space shortfall in Leeds in 3 to 4 years time, just as residents moved into the proposed developments. Members sought reassurance that Education Leeds could quickly provide solutions and local schools could absorb children from the developments
- Creative use of school buildings could accommodate increased numbers, such as “through schools” providing education from 3yrs to 18yrs, but adding on to existing buildings would be dependant on capital and space available
- These developments would only provide for a half form entry and LCC could not currently fund the remainder, plus there were issues regarding delivery of a full curriculum

(Councillor Akhtar rejoined the meeting)

Officers reported the likely difficulties of marketing the sites for employment use, due to the significant distances from the motorway network, and that any new industrial development would also result in increased traffic and would be likely to be piecemeal.

Members received further details from the highways officer regarding the difference between the previous industrial use in terms of nature of trips, vehicles and peak times, and the proposed residential use. The Highways Officer stated further negotiation was required over the provision of a 2.5m wide cycle lane along Calverley Lane North which would provide for 2 way cycle use and prevent the need for cyclists to access and egress the site at the same access point as motorists. The Panel expressed concern that cyclists would have to make the same right hand turn at Calverley Lane South as motorists. Panel queried traffic levels on A65 compared to the site in full operation and whether accident statistics were under-estimated.

The Panel took a short comfort break at this point. Members reconvened and discussed the following:

- This would not really be a sustainable site and would be highly car dependant
- Whether the report conclusions were reasonable given that local schools and highways networks were at capacity already
- The sites would not be attractive to people eligible for Affordable Housing as there was no infrastructure – such as shops, doctors and the site was not easily accessible. Members also considered the practicalities of living on the sites
- Whether the developers had demonstrated that the predicted amount of traffic could be safely accommodated on the highways network
- The public transport offer was regarded as inadequate; cyclists would not be able to use Calverley Lane North; and something more radical was required
- Some Members felt the signalisation of Horsforth roundabout was essential but found it difficult to reconcile it with the loss of Affordable Housing
- One Member felt that the development of a brownfield site should be supported to reduce pressure on greenfield and green belt sites and noted the previous use as a chemical site would have resulted in significant traffic generation
- Suggested the schemes would provide a planned village but queried whether this was the right location bearing in mind Members' ongoing concerns
- Welcomed the retention of the mill buildings but would require a management plan for both the Mill Pond and the Beck and more information on the proposed future maintenance of the pavilion and pitches
- Questioned the usefulness of the proposed bus, the estate would be highly car dependant and crucially would feed directly onto the Ring Road rather than a gentle dispersal through a network of street.

The Chair directed the Panel to consider the applicant's alternative offer to signalise Horsforth roundabout, which would result in the loss of Affordable Housing provision; and following a vote in which the Chair made a casting vote, the Panel agreed that if the applications were to progress toward an approval, then Panel would seek the signalisation of Horsforth roundabout instead of Affordable Housing.

The Chair then requested the Panel consider each application in turn with regards to the recommendation:

**RESOLVED –**

**(1) Application 10/04068/OT Clariant Site**

- (a) That the officer recommendation to defer and delegate approval of the application to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions not be agreed,

(b) That Officers are requested to present a report to the next meeting setting out proposed reasons for refusal of the application based on the Panel's strongly held concerns regarding the following:

- sustainability of the site in terms of remoteness, access, proximity to services,
- impact of traffic generated by the site on highway safety at Calverley Lane South

**(2) Application 10/04261/OT Riverside Mills**

a) That the officer recommendation to defer and delegate approval of the application to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions not be agreed,

b) That Officers are requested to present a report to the next Panel meeting setting out proposed reasons for refusal of the application based on Panels' strongly held concerns regarding the following:

- sustainability of the site in terms of remoteness, access, proximity to services,
- impact of traffic generated by the site on highway safety at Calverley Lane South

(Councillor Wood left the meeting)

**113 Application 09/05553/OT - Land off Royds Lane Lower Wortley LS12**

Further to minute 102 of the meeting held 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011 when the application was deferred to allow time for further negotiation on issues of affordable housing, public transport and public safety, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out the response of the applicant. The Panel was asked to consider the principle of residential development on the site and the proposed access.

Plans and aerial photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting. The Panel discussed the revised offer to upgrade 2 bus stops along Whitehall Road and improvements to the footpath from the site to Geldard Road, with lighting

Officers commented that the site integrated well into existing urban fabric. The Panel welcomed the revisions made to the scheme and

**RESOLVED** – To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the specified conditions contained in the report (and any others deemed appropriate) and subject to the completion of a legal agreement to cover the matters detailed in the report

**114 Application 10/05674/FU - 28 Kirk Lane Yeadon LS19**

The Panel considered proposals to convert a former showroom to four flats. Plans and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting along with plans of previously refused scheme for 6 flats on the site for comparison. Members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The Panel heard representation from Mr T Moran, a local resident who expressed concern over car parking and noise from heavy machinery during the development phase. The Panel then considered the representation made by Ms V Sykes on behalf of the applicant

Members noted that the hours of construction/servicing were conditioned. The Panel requested further consideration of the disabled parking space which was currently proposed furthest away from the entrance to the building and the inclusion of one further condition to control levels

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject further negotiation on the location of the disabled parking space and the conditions contained within the report (and such other conditions and directions the Chief Planning Officer may deem appropriate) plus one further condition to cover levels.

**115 Applications 10/05725/FU and 10/05726/LI - 3 Ivegate Yeadon LS19**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report on applications seeking the change of use of a former shop (Use Class A1) to a hot food take away (Use Class A5) and listed building alterations to premises at 3 Ivegate, Yeadon. Plans and photographs of the site were displayed and Members had visited prior to the meeting.

The Panel noted the comments of the Inspector at an appeal against refusal of a similar site in 2010 and that those comments had been addressed in this new application. The comments made on parking issues and location of the site within a residential area were also noted.

**RESOLVED** – That Application 10/0572/FU for the change of use and Application 10/05726/LI for the listed building alterations be granted subject to the specified conditions (and any other conditions/directions deemed appropriate by the Chief Planning Officer

Councillor Leadley voted against, Councillor G Latty abstained

**116 Application 10/05134/FU - 13 Sunnybank Lane Thornbury Bradford BD3**

The Panel considered an application for part two storey and part single storey side extensions to 13 Sunnybank, Thornbury. Plans and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting. Officers reported receipt of a revised plan showing an additional window within the rear elevation.

The Panel considered the distances between the proposed extension and the site boundaries and the amount of development which could be achieved under Permitted Development Rights

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the specified conditions contained within the report

Councillor Leadley voted against

Councillor J Harper, having earlier declared a prejudicial interest in the following item withdrew from the meeting. Councillor Coulson also withdrew.

**117 Application 10/05520/FU - St Bartholomew's Wesley Road Armley LS12**

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 31st March, 2011



The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out proposed reasons to refuse an application for a 2 storey community centre with link to existing church and an outline residential development of 33 houses on land at St Bartholomew's, Armley. A revised list of the reasons to refuse the application was tabled at the meeting. Plans, photographs and architects drawings of the site and proposals were displayed.

Officers outlined the planning history of the site and the Policies relevant to the development proposals, plus the receipt of one additional letter of representation. The Panel considered the representation made by Father I Wright on behalf of the applicant regarding remedial works undertaken at the site and likely future users and maintenance of the new facility.

Members noted local support for the community centre and commented on the length of time the scheme had been in the application process. Officers reported the applicant did not propose any Section 106 contributions normally applicable to a scheme of this nature as the proposals were intended only to provide funding for the new community centre. Members noted the applicant had not provided sufficient evidence of the special circumstances of the scheme to set aside planning policies.

Members were minded to defer the application to allow the applicant time to address the relevant policies and noted that Father Wright indicated he would prefer the application to be determined; however the Panel did not feel able to determine the application in its present form and

**RESOLVED** – To defer determination of the application to allow time for a site visit to take place

(Councillor Hardy left the meeting at this point)

## **118 Little London Regeneration Programme**

Further to minute 93 of the meeting held 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011 when the Panel provided comments on a position statement on the redevelopment proposals for the Little London Area, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a further report on a total of 8 applications for new build and refurbishment. The report set out the revisions made to the scheme in response to those comments.

### Carlton Gate

- A review of the space around dwellings had been undertaken and the issue of overlooking would now be addressed through the inclusion of oriel windows and the arrangement of secondary kitchen windows overlooking non-garden areas was felt to be acceptable
- Use of render to be restricted to first floor level
- Central public space will incorporate a 1m high rail to prevent misuse of the space
- Mono-pitch rooves remained the preferred design solution

Oatlands Community Hub – now incorporated a perforated shutter design

Refurbishment and Public Realm – reconfigured greenspace around the tower blocks would provide a defensible space and formality to the car park

Refurbishment of elevations to the existing maisonettes. The Panel discussed the possible impact of privately owned dwellings on the overall appearance of the refurbished scheme and sought to ensure that owners of the properties were contacted to see if they could participate in the scheme.

(Councillor Akhtar withdrew from the meeting for a short time at this point)

Officers reported receipt of revised minor design and highways details – which had been conditioned in the proposed recommendations – therefore the conditions requiring submission of these details could be removed from the proposed recommendation

**RESOLVED** – That the applications listed below be approved in principle and be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for final approval subject to receipt of revised plans as referred to in the appraisal section of the submitted report and subject to the specified conditions contained within the report

Carlton Gate 10/05212/RM

Oatland Lane Community Hub 10/05213/RM

Refurbishment sites at Carlton 1 (10/05208/FU) Carlton 2 (10/05209/FU), Lovell Park (10/05209/FU), Servias (10/05221/FU), Oatlands 1 (10/05228/FU) and Oatlands 2 (10/05226/FU)

**119 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 at 1.30 pm

## **Plans Panel (City Centre)**

**Thursday, 10th February, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,  
G Driver, Mrs R Feldman, M Hamilton,  
S Hamilton, G Latty, J Monaghan and  
E Nash

### **72 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **73 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct

Applications 10/05607/FU/10/05608/FU and 10/0509/LI – The Majestic City Square LS1:

Councillor Monaghan declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had commented on the application

Councillors Campbell, Nash and Selby declared personal interests through being members of English Heritage which had been consulted on the application (minute 77 refers)

Application 10/05541/FU – Leeds Metropolitan University City Campus – Councillor Monaghan declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had commented on the application (minute 78 refers)

### **74 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Castle who was substituted for by Councillor Ruth Feldman

### **75 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be approved

### **76 Matters arising**

The Head of Planning Services updated Members on the following matters:  
Southern entrance at Leeds Railway Station

The Secretary of State for Transport had agreed to the provision of the southern entrance to the railway station at Leeds, with £12.4m of DfT funding being provided towards the total cost of approximately £14.4m

#### Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme

Reference was made to recent media reports regarding the future of the flood defence scheme for Leeds and a fact sheet was tabled for Members' information. It was disappointing that the scheme had been put on hold by DEFRA but further discussions were to take place with the Secretary of State and other funding options were being investigated

#### **77 Applications 10/05607/FU, 10/05608/FU and 10/05609/LI - Change of use of basement bar to live music venue with ancillary bar, restaurant, nightclub use; change of use of ground floor and upper levels from nightclub to bar, restaurant and a range of assembly and leisure uses with associated external and internal alterations in association with the changes of use including new window openings - Majestic - City Square LS1**

Plans, photographs, drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for change of use, alterations and refurbishment of the prestigious Grade II Listed Building known as the Majestic which was situated in City Square

Members were informed that the proposed uses could also include uses within the D2 class, ie gym, exhibition space or cinema

The proposed works were outlined for Members which included:

- new windows along Quebec Street and Wellington Street to create greater activity and enlarged openings to windows to upper floors
- new glass doors to main entrances and creation of a new entrance on Quebec Street
- refurbishment of the Marmo faience facades
- reintroduced art panels at ground floor level and reinstatement of the original glazing bar patterns to windows fronting City Square
- new service entrance on Wellington Street with any necessary extensions to TROs relating to use of the nearby on-street loading bay by the proposed development being funded by the applicant
- opening up of roof terrace for public use
- slate screening of the rooftop plant
- reinstatement of the proscenium arch
- reinstatement of the external statuary
- internal paint scheme which would be consistent with the 1921 building and would help reinstate the detail to the decorative plaster work

Receipt of two further representations were reported these being from WYAAS, requesting recording after the soft strip out and prior to internal alterations, with a condition to this effect being added, and from the Victorian Society who had commented, although the period of the building was outside their remit. They were supportive in principle but had made some detailed comments which were reported to Panel

Members commented on the following matters:

- the proposed statues and whether the style of these could be related to the Alfred Drury statues of maidens which were situated in City Square
- that the statues should be of a style close to the originals
- disabled toilet facilities and whether these would be provided on each level
- that the sympathetic reinstatement of this historic building was welcomed as was the fact that it would be reopened to the public
- that the signage should be of a style in keeping with the 1920s
- that the applicant should be encouraged to retain the name of the building as 'The Majestic' and for it to be spelled correctly
- the street lamps outside the building; that these were not sympathetic to it and that Conservation Area lamps might be more appropriate in this location

Officers provided the following responses:

- that archive footage had been examined with a view to replicating the original statues, with this detail being controlled by condition
- that a condition requiring the provision of disabled toilet facilities on each public level would be added to the permission

Members voiced their support for the scheme and expressed the hope that work on it would commence as soon as possible

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, additional conditions relating to archaeological recording of the interior of the building following the initial strip out and provision of disabled toilet facilities on each public level and any others which in the opinion of the Chief Planning Officer are required

### **78 Application 10/05541/FU - Proposed student accommodation, retail unit and landscaping at Leeds Metropolitan University City Campus - Calverley Street, Willow Terrace Road and Woodhouse Lane LS1**

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for the major regeneration of part of the Leeds Metropolitan University city campus site, these being blocks F, G and H, which would provide student residential accommodation comprising 568 bedrooms; a new retail unit; public square with enhanced pedestrian connectivity across the site and the enhancement of existing greenspace

A pre-application presentation on the proposals had been made to Members on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and a site visit had taken place. Details of the issues raised in that presentation were included in the submitted report

The proposals would see the removal of some of the existing buildings on the site, the retention, cleaning and repairing of the remaining buildings with some re-cladding in glass reinforced concrete at ground level to blocks F and H1

The landscaping proposals would include a new tree-lined pedestrian route from Woodhouse Lane into the site and the provision of a public space to be known as Campus Square which would be on the site of block G which would be demolished. Whilst some limited loss of trees would be necessary to provide accessibility, there would be re-provision of 32 new trees across the site

Members were informed that the site was in a highly accessible location and that walking and cycling would be promoted as the means of transport. The level of car parking would be rationalised, this being from 73 spaces to 44 spaces

Officers were of the view that the proposals addressed the challenges posed by the site, particularly the changes in levels; that the scheme would provide new and refurbished buildings, new and enhanced greenspace together with improved connectivity and therefore recommended approval of the application to Panel

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether the proposals before Members represented the long-term vision for the site
- whether the Section 106 money could be used to fund the free city bus which could lose funding due to the necessary cutbacks in expenditure by the Authority
- the amount of greenspace being provided with concerns being raised that it might not be sufficient for the numbers wishing to use the area
- the status in the UDPR (2006) of the area of greenspace outside the boundary of the site
- the proximity of the Inner Ring Road to the site and the need to be satisfied that people were protected from unacceptable levels of pollution, especially when using the open area
- that additional planting to screen the Inner Ring Road was required
- that consideration should be given to having sedum roofs on the buildings
- that the route into the site from the south on Woodhouse Lane was well used and that the desire line should be formalised with a path
- the reduction in car parking and where the parking would be displaced to

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the developer retained long-term aspirations for the site
- that public transport contributions were set aside for major transport works such as the southern entrance to the railway station; that there was a list of schemes which did not include funding the free city bus service as this scheme already existed
- that the scheme provided an extensive amount of greenspace compared to many other student residential developments, including a significant new public area
- that the green area beyond the site boundary was designated as protected greenspace in the UDPR (2006)
- that the issue of air quality had been considered and that Environmental Health Officers had undertaken an assessment which concluded that there were no further requirements to introduce additional measures into the buildings to improve air quality. The Head of Planning Services stated there would be less buildings on the site with different uses and lower numbers of cars which should help with issues relating to air quality/pollution levels
- regarding access to the site from the south, there already existed a narrow path and this would be looked at to see if opportunities existed for its enhancement

In respect of levels of car parking provision, Members were informed

that the reduced number of spaces from 73 to 44 would be restricted for use to staff and residents on the city campus only. However, some additional parking, ie 40 spaces – had been agreed for LMU staff use in the Rosebowl car park

Concerns were raised at this arrangement which was viewed as amounting to a net loss of car parking spaces; that the original agreement for the Rosebowl car park was that it would provide public, short stay parking; that an agreement had been reached to vary this without Members being informed; that the scheme lent itself by the differing uses, to lower levels of car parking and with that, the hope there would be fewer car parking permits, but this was not the case as re-provision was being offered and £26,000 was being sought towards pay and display parking

Reference was also made to the extant permission for a hotel on Portland Crescent – currently the site of 'D' car park - and when that scheme came forward, it would lead to further pressure on car parking space in the area

The Panel's Highways representative stated that people were being encouraged not to use their cars for work and that where restrictions on parking were being introduced it could, and did lead to people reconsidering whether they still wished to use their car for the daily commute

The Central Area Planning Manager stated that the matter of car parking provision for LMU in the Rosebowl was not linked to this application and that whilst the intention had been for the Rosebowl to be for short stay parking, it was being under-utilised

In terms of the contribution towards pay and display parking, this was to compensate the Council for lost revenue from the loss of pay and display space which was needed for the creation of a loading bay

The Panel considered how to proceed

A suggestion for further information to be reported back on the car parking issues was not supported

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement, to include the following obligations:

- public transport contribution - £29780
- travel plan and monitoring fee - £2625
- management and accessibility to public areas
- protection of a landing point for Inner Ring Road bridge
- contribution of £26,000 towards loss of pay and display parking space on Calverley Street
- employment and training initiatives
- occupation of residential accommodation by full time students only
- Section 106 management fee

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

## **79 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds





## **Plans Panel (City Centre)**

**Thursday, 10th March, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,  
G Driver, M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,  
J Monaghan, E Nash, N Taggart and  
R Wood

### **80 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **81 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct

Application 10/04792/FU – 62-64 Sheepscar Street North LS2 – Councillor Monaghan declared personal and prejudicial interests through being a resident of Merchants House which was located above the subject premises and having objected to the proposals (minute 85 refers)

Application 10/04792/FU – 62-64 Sheepscar Street North LS2 – Councillor Martin Hamilton declared a personal interest through being a Ward colleague of Councillor Monaghan who had objected to the proposals (minute 85 refers)

### **82 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Castle who was substituted for by Councillor Wood and from Mr Sellens, Head of Planning Services

### **83 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be approved

### **84 Application 11/00755//RM -New Pedestrian Crossing adjacent to Leeds Arena - Clay Pit Lane LS2**

Further to minute 51 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2010 where Panel considered reserved matters in respect of the Arena development, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking approval in principle to proposals for the design of the Clay Pit Lane pedestrian crossing

Plans, graphics, photographs and a precedent image were displayed at the meeting

Members were informed that the statutory advertising period for the application would expire on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2011

Officers presented the report and informed Members that due to the significant difference in land levels across Claypit Lane, this had limited the opportunities for siting the crossing where it had been indicated at the time of the outline planning application. Therefore other possibilities had been considered

The proposed crossing would be located in a similar position to that existing, immediately north of the junction of Providence Place and Clay Pit Lane, to the front of Hepworth House. The crossing would be the maximum width permitted by the Secretary of State, this being 10 metres. The outbound carriageway would need to be reduced in width by approximately 1.5 metres to enable the central reservation and the northern footway outside Hepworth House to be widened. To help define the crossing and relate it to the Arena development, green granite chippings were proposed in the carriageway, with new paving being provided throughout the Clay Pit Lane corridor

Members' comments on guard rails had been taken into account. Due to the design of the crossing (which although technically being two crossings, would operate like a single one), guard rails were not necessary

In event mode, timings for the crossing would be pre-programmed and would take account of the size of the arena event; for all other times the crossing would operate similar to other signalised pedestrian crossings

An adjustment to the size of the southern development plot would be necessary to provide sufficient space for movement to/from the arena. To compensate for this reduction, the northern development plot would be increased in scale, although the final form of these would be determined at the detailed planning application stage

Members were informed that the arena operator had requested the Council to decide quickly on the treatment of these plots as, perhaps understandably, the operator did not wish for these to begin to be developed within months of the arena opening

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether there were proposals to amend the design of the zig-zag pedestrian crossing at Woodhouse Lane which would also be used by people going to/from the arena
- the innovative design of the arena and disappointment that views of it would be blocked to drivers and pedestrians by the development plots along Clay Pit Lane
- that the colouration of the granite chippings should be considered in relation to the colours to be used on the arena
- the likely numbers using the crossing; that on arrival, the numbers would be staggered over a period of time but once an event had ended there could be 5000 people needing to cross Clay Pit Lane and whether it was possible to stop traffic for 2-3 minutes to manage the numbers
- the need to clarify what had been agreed in respect of the landscaping including the development plots

- the impact of pedestrian movement on residents of Queen Square and that people going to/from Woodhouse Lane car park should be encouraged to use Providence Place
- that the absence of guard rails in the proposal was welcomed

Officers provided the following responses

- that improvements to the Woodhouse Lane pedestrian crossing would be considered although it was uncertain that a single crossing could be achieved for this site
- in terms of the number of people using the pedestrian crossing, research indicated that for a 60 second green time, it was possible for 720 people to cross per minute and on that estimate, Officers were satisfied that the proposals would cater for the amount of movement likely to be generated by the arena use. However, as part of the traffic management plan there would be a separate signals timing plan for events and this would be closely monitored for the first few events, with adjustments being made if necessary
- concerning the landscaping, Officers outlined the overall scope of what had been agreed as part of the Reserved Matters application (the areas that would be hard and soft landscaped and the design concept for these), but stated that the exact details of the street furniture, material samples and soft planting remained outstanding. In terms of the development plots, it was likely that a decision would be made by December 2011 on whether development would take place on those plots in time for the arena opening. If development was going to be delayed then the areas would be temporarily landscaped
- in relation to pedestrian movement, there would be directional signs provided to discourage people from cutting across Queen Square

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and subject to no new issues being raised prior to the expiry of the statutory notification period

### **85 Application 10/04792/FU - Change of use of vacant building to Church (Use Class D1) at 62-64 North Street Leeds LS2**

(Having declared personal and prejudicial interests on this matter, Councillor Monaghan withdrew from the meeting)

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which related to a change of use of two former retail units to a church with ancillary café and book shop at 62-64 North Street which formed part of a residential building known as Merchants House

The proposed opening hours were 06.30 – 22.30, with 4 services being held each day. Whilst current congregation numbers stood at 80, the building could accommodate approximately 176 people

The recommendation to Members was to refuse the application with a possible reason for this being included in the submitted report

The Panel heard representations from an objector and a representative of the applicant who attended the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- the number and type of services being held at the church and the likely numbers attending the services throughout the day
- the existing levels of noise due to the current ground floor uses which included a bar
- whether on-street parking would be an issue
- whether a disused church might be more appropriate for use by the applicant
- that consideration should be given to including the impact of non-retail uses on the area in the reason for refusal
- the impact of the proposal on residential amenity
- the concerns regarding noise transference and that despite the applicant including floor insulation, that the effectiveness of this had not been proven
- whether there was adequate egress in the event of a fire and concerns that the proposals as presented did not suggest this was the case

The Panel considered how to proceed

The Central Area Planning Manager stated that a reason for refusal based upon the impact on the retail frontage could be difficult to sustain as even if the application was approved there would be over 50% retail use of the properties along that frontage which would be acceptable in policy terms

The Panel's Highways Officer informed Members that car parking had been carefully considered and that the site had been inspected on a Sunday morning, the day when the largest number of users of the church could reasonably be expected. Whilst there was some on-street parking, it was felt there was sufficient parking around the site, including a multi-storey car park and because of this, it was felt that a reason for refusal based on car parking could not be sustained

**RESOLVED** - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed change of use to a church would result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby premises, particularly the residents in Merchants House. The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated there will be no adverse impact from structural borne noise transference whilst the hours of use and potential number of people visiting the premises could adversely impact upon the general amenity of the area. For the reasons outlined above, the application is considered contrary to policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006

(Councillor Taggart joined the meeting during consideration of this matter)

(Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Monaghan resumed his seat in the meeting)

## **86 Draft Planning Statement - Sovereign Street LS1**

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on the Sovereign Street Draft Planning Statement which set out development potential for the site of the former Queen's Hall, which was currently operating as a car park. A copy of the Draft Planning Statement was appended to the report

Plans, photographs, architect's drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and provided some background information on the area which had been the site of a proposal known as 'The Kissing Towers' which had been withdrawn by the developer in 2008. Executive Board had twice considered the future of the site and had resolved that the site had the potential to integrate the first element of a high quality green space in the City Centre in line with the aspirations for the area which had emerged from the Leeds City Centre Vision Conference in 2008. On this basis a draft Planning Statement had been prepared which was currently out for consultation, with Plans Panel City Centre Members' comments being sought as part of this process which ended on 18<sup>th</sup> March

Three plots had been identified for development with some indication of the scale of buildings being included, with these plots being set around a central area of green space to realise the key aspiration of improving connections into the South Bank and the proposed city centre park. A connection northwards towards City Square was envisaged through opening up a disused railway arch as a pedestrian route. A further connection from a bridge link across the river was envisaged, although the land in question was not owned by the Council

Members commented on the following matters:

- that the land was a development site, not a park
- that the site was in close proximity to a high proportion of office development in Leeds and that car parking was needed as evidenced by the reaction to the Inspector's decisions last year on unauthorised long-term parking around Holbeck Urban Village
- that too much of the site was proposed for buildings, leaving insufficient space for city centre residents and workers to enjoy an open, green area
- the possibility of deleting block C, increasing the height of block B to compensate, so long as what was built was something special and then increasing the amount of open space
- that a bridge over the river was crucial to what was done on the site as the bridge link to a possible city centre park on the Tetley's site would provide an appropriate avenue to take people to the park
- that the existing car park use was not tenable
- the importance of the site particularly in view of the funding which had been secured for the southern entrance to the railway station and the need for the right impression of the city to be created on that site
- that the site would never be a park in the way one was envisaged but it would be a significant attraction to those in the area and that the site would be better without buildings
- that a decision was needed on the Brewery site which had been considered as a potential city centre park site, although there were drawbacks with that site due to its relatively isolated position from offices and residential development. Sovereign Street was closer to residential development and employment uses and if this was

developed as a green area, the Brewery site could be considered for different forms of redevelopment

- that if buildings were to be sited there they should respect the historic buildings surrounding the area, especially those on Swinegate
- the need to make connections to the south of the city to maintain interest in that area
- the need to consider how the site linked into the Waterfront Strategy and for access to the river to be improved to provide facilities for water sports

The Civic Architect informed Members that the announcement by Carlsberg Tetley of their withdrawal from Leeds had provided the opportunity for discussions with adjacent landowners and had led to the draft South Bank Planning Statement being drawn up which included at its heart, proposals for a city centre park. The draft South Bank Planning Statement which complemented the Sovereign Street Draft Planning Statement. In relation to the Sovereign Street site, it was felt that a 'soft green space' would better describe this area rather than a park

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**87 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

## Licensing Committee

Tuesday, 15th February, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor S Armitage in the Chair

Councillors R Downes, J Dunn,  
Mrs R Feldman, R D Feldman, G Hussain,  
G Hyde, V Morgan, C Townsley, D Wilson  
and G Wilkinson

**IN ATTENDANCE** Mr T McSharry – Access Committee for Leeds  
Mr P Gleeson – Access Committee for Leeds  
Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Trade Representatives

**55 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**56 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dobson, Grayshon, Hanley and Selby

**57 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011 be agreed as a correct record

**58 Report on the Programme of Review on Consultation process of policies, conditions and Byelaws affecting Taxi and Private Hire Licensing**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report on the rolling programme of the review of the policies, conditions and Byelaws affecting Taxi and Private Hire licensing.

Members noted that both the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire trades had been consulted and the responses were included within the report. Additionally the Section had written to all drivers. Reports on each policy, set of conditions or Byelaw would be presented in due course once the review process had been completed. Members also discussed issues relating to the Licensing Newsletter; the grounds for Medical Exemptions; and the usual course of action should a private hire driver be found to be plying for hire.

It was reported that a report on the NVQ/VRQ qualifications for drivers would be presented to the next meeting and Members noted the request that a full equality impact assessment be submitted in relation to the implementation of that policy. In addition it was agreed that information be supplied directly to Mr McSharry of the Access Committee on whether a specific disability impact assessment had been undertaken.

Members acknowledged that many people were dependant on the HC or PH trade as their preferred transport and, noting that representatives of the trade

were present, urged all members of the trade to get involved in the consultation. Furthermore, the Chair took the opportunity to remind the trade that issues relating to hackney carriage access and facilities at Leeds Bradford Airport were a matter for the Development Department and all correspondence should be directed to the appropriate Councillor and officers, not to Licensing Committee

**RESOLVED** – That the timetable for the review be agreed

**59 Large Casino Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) providing an update on the progress on the Large Casino application process and noted the intention to present a draft application pack to the April Committee meeting

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the report and the work undertaken so far

**60 Sexual Entertainment Venues - Update. Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982**

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) on the progress made so far on the drafting and implementation of a Statement of Licensing Policy for the licensing of Sex Establishments. Members noted that discussions had been held with Operators, and the draft Policy would be open to public consultation from 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and the progress made so far be noted

**61 Variation of Premises Licence for Leeds Festival, Grounds of Bramham Park, Bramham, Leeds LS23 6ND**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report on the outcome of an application received to vary the Premises Licence associated with the Leeds Festival, held within the grounds of Bramham Park, Bramham. Members noted that no representations had been received to the application and the Licence had subsequently been granted to allow the capacity of the Festival to increase to 89,999. It was noted the festival organisers intended to increase the capacity at a rate of 5000 patrons per year until the limit was met.

Officers reported that multi agency meetings had already commenced in readiness for the 2011 Festival

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

**62 Licensing Work Programme**

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the Licensing Work Programme for the remainder of the 2010/11 Municipal Year

**63 Date of the Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 10.00 am



## Licensing Committee

Tuesday, 15th March, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor S Armitage in the Chair

Councillors R Downes, J Dunn,  
R D Feldman, T Hanley, G Hussain,  
G Hyde, V Morgan and B Selby

### IN ATTENDANCE

Ms B Fullard – Public Health Consultant, Leeds Primary Care Trust  
Mr B Chard – GMB  
Mr J Akhtar – GMB  
Mr N Aram – GMB  
Mr J Akhtar – LTO Streamline  
Mr M Utting – LTO Streamline  
Mr K Ahmed – City Cabs

- 64 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**  
**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of that part of the agenda designated as exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:-  
Appendix 1 of the report referred to in minute 69 in terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3) on the grounds that the documents contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of external organisations which if disclosed to the public could disadvantage the future business of those organisations.
- 65 Late Items**  
No formal late items of business were added to the agenda although an additional document was tabled at the meeting containing slides of a power point presentation in support of Item 7 “the economic and social cost of alcohol in Leeds”. (minute 70 refers)
- 66 Declarations of Interest**  
There were no declarations of interest
- 67 Apologies for Absence**  
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dobson, Mrs Feldman, Grayshon, Townsley, Wilson and Wilkinson
- 68 Minutes**  
**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 15<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be agreed as a correct record

**69 NVQ & VRQ Qualifications - Officer Response to Licensing Committee - Request to Consider Alternative Training Delivery**

Further to minute 39 of the meeting held 16<sup>th</sup> November 2011 when the Committee deferred determination of the report on the future of mandatory NVQ and VRQ qualifications for Hackney Carriage (HC) and Private Hire (PH) drivers, the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a further report setting out responses to the concerns previously raised by Members.

The November Committee had considered the deadlines given for completion of the qualifications in the face of limited Government funding and having regard to the statistical analysis of the uptake and success of the scheme. Officers referred to the report and responded to the Committees' key concern regarding the number and nature of complaints received since the implementation of the training in particular as follows:

Complaint	2009	2010
Disability	18	5
Race		5
Parking	107	63
Non Compliance	25	14
Criminal complaint	27	51
PH drivers	29	20
HC drivers	2	8

Officers were keen to put the number and nature of complaints into context with the volume of work undertaken by the trades and noted that no link could be proved between the reduction in complaints and the uptake of training. It was suggested that this type of monitoring could be undertaken in the future.

The Committee noted the options to consider, including the consequences of retaining the NVQ VRQ requirement or removing that requirement; and whether to reconsider the options originally presented in 2008. Members discussed:

- whether a review of the number of historical complaints was beneficial to future delivery of the service to the public
- the benefits of continued monitoring of the number and nature of complaints to review the success of the qualifications and positive impact on the service to the public
- whether the volume of trips had decreased during 2009/10 which could have an impact on the number of public complaints received
- a request for monitoring by ethnicity statistics to be submitted as it was stated that some drivers from some cultures felt they were treated less favourably. The Committee considered whether these statistics would be beneficial to the decision and requested that a copy of the TPHL Section Equality Impact Assessment be submitted in the first instance to enable Members to take a collective opinion on whether ethnicity statistics were required
- Members were concerned that funding would cease soon in the Leeds area but training may still be available from a Midlands based firm and felt

- this should be investigated. Members were unhappy at the prospect of part of the contingent of licence holders remaining untrained
- Members welcomed the fact that both the HC and PH trades in recent years had worked collaboratively with the TPHL Section to improve all aspects of the service they provided to the public
  - The fact that no enforcement had taken place between September 2008 and September 2009 of the condition requiring new applicants to undertake the qualification.

(Councillor Selby joined the meeting at this point)

The Committee broadly welcomed the report but felt there was a great deal of information which required further consideration. The Chair suggested a small Working Group be established to consider the possibility of creating a programme of in-house training and testing provided by TPHL Section to drivers. Members considered the recommendations and the options available and

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That, having regard to the costs detailed in the outcome of the market testing exercise, the procurement of external training providers be discounted at the present time
- b) To note there is no facility for non-Council employees (i.e. members of the HC/PH trade) to obtain accredited vocational training programmes through the Councils' own Corporate Training Programme
- c) That officers be requested to carry out further feasibility work on the design of a training and testing system that would mirror as far as possible the elements and benefits of the existing NVQ and VRQ qualifications
- d) That a small Working Group of Members and relevant officers be established to discuss the feasibility work and training/testing system outlined in c) above and report back
- e) That Members support the approach that there will be no enforcement of the original NVQ/VRQ requirements whilst the feasibility work and training/testing system is investigated
- f) That the Committee continues to encourage drivers to take advantage of the current qualifications whilst they are still free.
- g) To request a copy of the TPHL Section Equality Impact Assessment be sent to Members of the Committee.

**70 Economic and Social Cost of Alcohol in Leeds 2008/09**

The Committee considered a report previously presented to Scrutiny Board (Health) on the wider economic and social costs of alcohol related harm in Leeds. The Chair of the Scrutiny Board and Chair of Licensing Committee had felt the contents to be pertinent to the work of the Committee and its Sub Committees.

Ms Brenda Fullard, Leeds PCT provided an overview of the documents highlighting the issues which were relevant to the Licensing Committee. It was noted that the Entertainment Licensing Section was a stakeholder in the Alcohol Action Plan 2011-15 which was due to be launched in Leeds on 21 March 2011. Members were also aware that the Public Reform and Social

Responsibility Bill contained proposals to make local health authorities a “responsible authority” under the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 which would afford PCTs the opportunity to make representations to licensing applications. Ms Fullard highlighted the following key issues:

- 2008/09 saw a 14% increase in the number of alcohol related accident & emergency hospital admissions
- The wider cost of alcohol totalled £438m in that period – in terms of health and social care, criminal justice system, lost productivity.
- That cost needed to be balanced against the benefits (£1.6m in the same period) of Leeds’ strong night time economy
- The Leeds Alcohol Action Plan looked to increase the involvement of all stakeholders in the licensing trade and influence public attitude, to support those who sought to change their drinking behaviour, improve treatment for dependant and hazardous drinkers and tackle child drinkers.

(Councillor Hussain left the meeting at this point)

Members commented on the following matters:

- The report revealed that the increase in alcohol related problems had been building up over a number of years and was not as a result of the implementation of the Licensing Act 2003
- Alcohol was more affordable in real terms now than in 1980
- Commented on the prominent display of alcohol promotions in supermarkets
- Many people now drank cheaply bought alcohol from supermarkets at home prior to going out into town. Alcohol appeared to be embedded in British culture with wide popular media coverage and perhaps a radical sea change of thinking was required to make binge drinking as socially unacceptable as smoking
- Alcohol promotions in nightclubs linked to entry fees were also regarded as an issue by some Members.

Members suggested the report needed a wide distribution to Area Committees and community groups; the Committee also discussed the role of education in showing young people the long term harm to health caused by alcohol and suggested the additional power point documentation should be available to schools.

**RESOLVED** – To thank Ms Fullard for her presentation and to note the contents of the report and the comments made by Members.

## **71 Sexual Entertainment Venues Update Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report on the progress made by the SEV Working Group established by the Committee to develop a Policy and standard conditions relating to sex establishments - including sex shops; sex cinemas and lap dancing clubs. A copy of the draft Policy and Consultation Report was included for approval prior to the start of the public consultation on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

The Committee noted the main concerns of the WG at the outset had been dancer's welfare and the daytime appearance of establishments. Discussion followed on:

- The benefits of having met with representatives of the trade and interested parties during the pre-consultation process
- The policy proposal to deal with each application on its own merit, rather than set a definitive number of establishments for the city
- The grounds a Sub Committee could consider as reasons to refuse an application
- The comments that
  - sports/recreational attractions should be listed within para 4:4 of the Policy as well as City Varieties within the arts/heritage attractions
  - para 8:33 to clarify which body an appeal should be made to
  - condition 51 to read "type of misdemeanour" not "fine"

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted
- b) That approval be given to the consultation methodology and the draft Policy (with the minor amendments outlined above)
- c) That officers be authorised to commence the public consultation period on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011.

**72 Sex Establishment Fees and Charges - Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982**

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) seeking approval in principal of the proposed fees for Sex Establishments having regard to recent changes in the law brought about by the European Services Directive. Any changes to the fees would require consultation with the relevant trade operators.

The report provided a breakdown of the service provided by the Entertainment Licensing Section as part of the application and administration process and comparative costs with other local authorities. Officers reiterated that only aspects of the administration process could be reflected in the fee. The Committee was keen to ensure that all aspects; including Members' time deliberating on applications and legal advice were provided for. Members were not convinced the proposed fees would achieve this and requested that officers recalculate the costs to include a proportion of Members Allowances.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That Committee agree to the revision of the fee to include Members Allowances
- b) That Entertainment Licensing be authorised to consult with members of the industry alongside the wider consultation for the Statement of Licensing Policy which is due to commence in early April 2011
- c) That following consultation, a delegated decision be taken to approve new fees with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011 to coincide with the new provisions relating to the licensing of sex establishments adopted by Council in January 2011 which also take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011

**73 Licensing Work Programme**

The Committee noted that the Working Group established at this meeting would be included in the Work Programme and further considered membership of the WG

**RESOLVED –**

- a) To note the contents of the Licensing Work Programme for the remainder of the 2010/11 Municipal Year
- b) To note the membership of the “driver qualifications Working Group as Councillors Armitage, G Hyde and R D Feldman

**74 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED -** To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 10.00 am

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 7th February, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Townsley in the Chair

Councillors G Wilkinson and D Wilson

**189 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Townsley was elected Chair of the meeting

**190 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**191 "AM Kitchen & Bar" - Application for the Grant of a premises Licence for A M Kitchen & Bar, Clock Buildings, 24 - 26 Briggate, Leeds LS1 6HD**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting as the applicants and all interested parties had reached agreements on measures suggested in order to promote the licensing objectives of the city. The Premise Licence will therefore be issued by the Licensing Officer in accordance with the agreed conditions

**192 "The Olive Branch" - Application for the grant of a premises licence for The Olive Branch, Unit 2, 139 Street Lane, Leeds LS8 1AA**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting as the applicants and all interested parties had reached agreements on measures suggested in order to promote the licensing objectives of the city. The Premise Licence will therefore be issued by the Licensing Officer in accordance with the agreed conditions

**193 "The George" - Application to vary a Premises Licence for George Hotel, Great George Street, Leeds LS1 3DL**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting as the applicants and all interested parties had reached agreements on measures suggested in order to promote the licensing objectives of the city. The Premise Licence will therefore be issued by the Licensing Officer in accordance with the agreed conditions

**194 "Naeem's Tandoori"- Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Naeem's Tandoori, 62 Stainbeck Road, Leeds LS7 2PW**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy, considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence for the premises known as "Naeem's Tandoori", 62 Stainbeck Road, Leeds LS7

Representations had been received from West Yorkshire Police (WYP). Both LCC Environmental Protection Team (LCC EPT) and LCC Department of Development (Planning Services) had submitted representations relating to the hours of operation requested. Prior to the hearing, the applicant had agreed to the measures set out in the submission from Planning Services

which essentially curtailed the hours of operation requested. As such the representations from LCC EPT and Planning Services were withdrawn.

Present at the hearing were:

Mr A Khaled – the applicant

PC L Dobson – WYP

The Sub Committee heard first from PC Dobson who stated the premises did not lie within the Chapel Allerton Cumulative Impact Area however late night refreshment venues such as this could be flashpoints for anti social behaviour. At the hearing PC Dobson referred to three recorded crimes at the premises. PC Dobson outlined the discussions previously held with the applicant regarding the existing CCTV system at the premises, which she had not been aware of but she stated it was likely to be inadequate. WYP would still require the measures outlined in the written submission being added to the premises licence as conditions, including a new CCTV system, if the application was granted

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Khaled who described the CCTV system already installed at the premises. Mr Khaled confirmed he had owned the business since 2002 and that there had been 3 crimes associated with the premises since then, but that to his knowledge, WYP had not taken any action.

Members carefully considered the written representations and the verbal submissions made at the hearing. The Sub Committee also noted that the applicant had agreed to amend the requested hours of operation. Members however also considered whether the proposed measures suggested by WYP were necessary and proportionate to this application for this premises in this location but did not feel able to make a decision on the application today based on the submissions before them. The Sub Committee therefore

**RESOLVED** – To adjourn the application to a hearing on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

Members would expect to receive the following information to assist with their deliberations

- the exact capabilities of the existing CCTV system at the premises
- the works required to bring the system up to the capabilities required by WYP
- the time and nature of crimes recorded within the vicinity of the premises in the last 12 months

**195 "Gildersome Little Club" - Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Gildersome Little Club, The Nooks, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds LS27 7DU**

This application was withdrawn prior to the hearing by the applicant



## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 14th February, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor S Armitage in the Chair

Councillors M Dobson and R D Feldman

### 196 Election of the Chair

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Armitage was elected Chair of the meeting

### 197 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Sub Committee was in receipt of additional documentation just prior to the hearing which in the view of Members and the parties themselves, should not be discussed in the public domain. The Sub Committee considered the request that those matters be discussed in private and

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of that part of the agenda designated as exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:-

- (a) Appendix F of the report referred to in minutes 200 and 201 both in terms of Regulation 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearing) Regulations 2005 and the Licensing Procedure Rules, and on the grounds that it is not in the public interest to disclose the contents as the information therein pertains to an individual and that person would not reasonably expect their personal information or discussions thereon to be in the public domain.
- (b) Information disclosed just prior to the hearing referred to in minutes 198 and 201 both in terms of Regulation 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearing) Regulations 2005 and the Licensing Procedure Rules, and on the grounds that it is not in the public interest to disclose the information as it relates to ongoing and unresolved legal issues regarding the professional relationship between former staff and existing management of the premises. Discussions held in public on such matters could jeopardise the resolution of the issues.
- (c) To note that the press and public will also be excluded from that part of the hearing where Members deliberate the application as it is in the public interest to allow the Members to have full and frank debate on the matter, as allowed under the provisions of the Licensing Procedure Rules

### 198 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda. Additional documents had been received after the despatch of the agenda however and had been sent to all parties prior to the hearing, including:

- Statement of PC A J Stokes dated 4 February 2011
- Statement of Sgt A Brooksbank dated 9 February 2011
- Copy of emails dated 10 February 2011 between the solicitor for the Premise Licence Holder and West Yorkshire Police
- Statement of Mr S Raine dated 9 February 2011

- Copy of text messages dated 23 and 24 January 2011 stated to be between Mr G Lamb and Mr S Raine
- Statement of Mr J Wood dated 10 February 2011
- Copy of text messages stated to be between Mr G Lamb and Ms L Sharp
- Copy contract of employment of Mr G Lamb

The following additional documents were submitted just prior to the hearing and were considered during the hearing with the agreement of all parties:

- Copy of text messages stated to be between Mr G Lamb and Mr S Raine
- Copy of a letter from PSB Law to Mr G Lamb dated 14 February 2011

#### 199 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

#### 200 **"Gatecrasher 2" - Summary review of a premises licence in respect of Gatecrasher 2, 54 New Briggate, Leeds LS1 6NU**

The Sub-Committee considered an application made by West Yorkshire Police under section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003 for the Review of a Premises Licence held at the premises known as "Gatecrasher 2", 54 New Briggate, Leeds LS1 6NU. Present at the hearing:

##### **West Yorkshire Police – the applicant (WYP)**

Ms M Falciano-Padron - solicitor  
 PC C Arkle  
 Mr B Patterson  
 Acting Supt V Francis  
 Sgt M Mynard  
 Sgt R Fullilove  
 Mr G Lamb – former Head Doorman  
 Mr G Cawood (observing)

Ms A Bellamy (observing)

##### **Gatecrasher 2 - Premise Licence Holder (PLH)**

Mr A Horne – solicitor  
 Mr A Swaine – Area Manager  
 Mr S Raine – Managing Director  
 Ms L Sharp – former DPS  
 Mr S Moore – manager  
 Ms M Murray – press officer (observing)  
 Mr J Wood – National Security  
 Mr C Nurse – National Security  
 Mr S Cox - National Security

The Sub Committee, noting the sensitive and confidential nature of some of the information to be discussed, varied the usual procedure for Review hearings and agreed to consider the exempt information in its entirety first, in order that the hearing could resume to deal with all remaining evidence in public

**RESOLVED** – To exclude members of the public and to enter into closed session

#### 201 **Closed Session**

The Sub Committee dealt purely with the contents of Appendix F of the submitted report and those matters raised just prior to the start of the hearing by the Premises Licence Holder. Once that information had been heard and discussed the Sub Committee resumed open session with members of the public present and reverted to normal procedure for Review hearings.

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the information discussed and to consider that information at the appropriate time during deliberations.

## **202 Open Session - Gatecrasher 2 Review of Premises Licence**

The Sub-Committee then considered representations from Ms Feliciano-Padron on behalf of WYP who provided the background of recent events leading up to the Review application and details of previous incidents dating from 2009 directly related to Gatecrasher which included serious assaults, incidents of disorder, under age drinking and drug use. Verbal submissions were also made by PC Arkle; Sgt Mynard and Acting Supt Francis.

WYP held concerns over the failure of the venue management team to report or deal effectively with incidents or address concerns over the type of event and promotions held at the club which attracted increased levels of crime and disorder. Information was also supplied on the level of WYP resources directed to the new Briggate area of the city to deal with the increased number of incidents. WYP highlighted the measures already within the Premises Licence to prevent crime and disorder which were not adhered to by the Club. WYP suggested their evidence showed the premises management put profit before public safety.

WYP suggested that the inability or unwillingness of the premises management team to accept responsibility for the link between the activities at the premises and the rise in crime and disorder was a contributing factor to the stabbing incident at the premises on 15 January 2011 which triggered the application for the Review.

WYP had serious concerns regarding public safety and the level of crime and disorder associated with the Club. WYP did not feel that modification or suspension of the licence or removal of a licensable activity or the DPS would be sufficient to deal with the problems associated with the Club given their experience of the management of the Club. WYP maintained that revocation of the Premises Licence was the only effective course of action to take to uphold the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective in this case.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Horne on behalf of the PLH who responded in detail to the evidence of WYP contained within the incident log and set the incidents in the context of the night time economy in the New Briggate location. Mr Horne directed Members attention to those incidents he stated were not attributed to Gatecrasher. He acknowledged WYP comments about the premises management; stating that there had been a breakdown in communication, not only between the local and national Gatecrasher management but also between WYP and the premises management.

Mr Horne stated that the performance of the local management team had deteriorated recently and the DPS at the time of the incident on 15 January 2011 had now been removed. He suggested that Gatecrasher had reacted to WYP advice, and had cancelled events when serious concerns had been raised. The Sub Committee also heard submissions from Mr Wood; Mr Swain and Mr Raine.

Mr Horne outlined the following measures to be considered as action to take in the matter of the review:

- Monthly meetings at Director level (including the managing director and operations Director of Gatecrasher) with WYP
- To undertake a risk assessment of each event to be submitted to WYP 28 days in advance of the event
- Polycarbonate “glasses” and PET (plastic) bottles to be used throughout any event deemed medium or high risk
- A face recognition camera to be installed within the reception area
- Improvement to the dispersal policy

Mr Raine additionally outlined the measures implemented since the Interim Steps Hearing on 21 January 2011. In conclusion Mr Horne stated that the local management policies had failed, but reiterated that the senior management had now taken action and had changed both the door team and the local management team. He maintained that this Review application was the first intervention from WYP and revocation on the first instance was not necessary, as the concerns raised in the application could be addressed with the introduction of the new DPS and the measures offered.

Following full and lengthy consideration of the options open to the Sub-Committee in the determination of Review applications; Members were satisfied by the evidence of WYP. Members concluded that the Gatecrasher premises had consistently undermined both the prevention of crime and disorder and the promotion of public safety licensing objectives for at least 13 months.

The Sub Committee considered the causes of this, having regard to the Section 182 Guidance and the Councils’ own Licensing Policy. They considered whether Miss Sharp the previous Designated Premises Supervisor or the wider management team were at fault.

Members concluded that the blame lay with the Company’s approach to the management of the Leeds Gatecrasher premises. They gave weight to the following matters that Members found as a fact, based on the evidence submitted and the failings admitted by the Premises Licence Holder:

- The problems associated with the premises span the life of two Designated Premises Supervisors
- The Operations Director had been present at meetings with WYP and the DPS
- That senior management failed to deal with incidents in a manner which promoted the prevention of crime and disorder objective
- That the decision to host the “We Play Vinyl” Friday night event had been taken with the knowledge of senior management and contrary to the advice of WYP
- That management failed to act on WYP advice
- That the premises operated contrary to its’ own policies

The Sub Committee considered the measures offered by the PLH at the hearing, but Members were not convinced that these would be sufficient or that the management team could adhere to them. Members further noted that

the DPS had been changed by the management team on 11 February 2011, but noted that the DPS had changed in 2010 to little effect.

The Sub Committee therefore concluded that it was necessary and proportionate in the circumstances of this case to take the following action in order to promote the licensing objectives

**RESOLVED** – To revoke the Premises Licence

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 21st February, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Hyde in the Chair

Councillors J Dunn and C Townsley

### 203 Election of the Chair

Councillor Hyde was elected Chair for the meeting.

### 204 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### 205 Certification of films - Leeds Young People's Film Festival

The Sub-Committee considered an application for the certification of films to be shown at the Leeds Young People's Film Festival between 28 March and the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at Hyde Park Picture House, 71-73 Brudenell Road, Leeds, LS6 1JD.

Members were in receipt of the guidance issued by the BBFC in respect of the certification of films and details of the films and the proposed certification of each film which had been suggested by the applicant.

The Sub-Committee was satisfied that the proposed certification of the films was in line with the BBFC guidance and was appropriate for each film, and resolved to certify the films as proposed by the applicant.

**RESOLVED:** That the films be certified in the following manner:

Ploddy the Police Car Makes a Splash – U

Twigson Ties the Knot – U

The Ugly Duckling – U

The Magic Tree – U

Listen to This – U

Tutu Much – PG

Little White Lies – PG

The Retaliators – 12A

Superbrother – PG

East End Angels – 12A

My Grandpa the Bank Robber – 12A

The Crocodiles Strike Back – 12A

Trigun Badlands Rumble – 12A

The Secret Letter – 15

### 206 Application to Variation of Premises Licence for the Three Legs Hotel, 9 The Headrow, Leeds LS1 6PU

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance, and Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy and Cumulative Impact Policy considered an application to vary an existing Premises License held at Three Legs Hotel, 9 The Headrow, Leeds, LS1 6PU.

The applicant sought to open the premises at 08:00am (Monday to Saturday) and 09:00 am (Sundays) and to change the start time for the sale of alcohol and provision of recorded music to commence at 08:00am Monday to Saturday and 09:00am on a Sunday. The applicant further wished to remove conditions on the licence, and reword the condition on the licence relating to provision of door staff.

A representation had been received from West Yorkshire Police (WYP) regarding the application.

Present at the hearing were:

Mr David Watson – the applicant (Punch Taverns)

Mr Nigel Hardcastle – the DPS

Mr John Coen- the solicitor for the applicant

Ms Catherine Clerk- trainee solicitor

PC Cath Arkle – West Yorkshire Police

Mr Bob Patterson – West Yorkshire Police

The Sub-Committee heard from Mr Bob Patterson, WYP, who informed them that they had submitted two letters of objection which included objections to the increase in opening hours and specified that the Three Legs falls under the Cumulative Impact Policy Area.

The Sub-Committee heard from PC Cath Arkle, WYP, who outlined her concerns with respect to the variation of licence sought by the applicant and the effect this could have on the area around the Three Legs during the daytime.

The Sub-Committee then heard from Mr Coen who was representing the applicant. He stated that Three Legs is a member of the Check 21 scheme, has CCTV and has a zero tolerance policy to drugs. Three Legs reports all crime and disorder to the police and is recorded in a book. He informed the Sub-Committee that the additional conditions suggested by WYP in their first letter of objection were agreed.

Mr Coen outlined the applicant's extensive experience in managing public houses and informed of the significant level of investment into the Three Legs which had been made by the applicant and by Punch Taverns. He stated that the change in opening hours had been requested as the applicant hoped to attract shift workers finishing work to the Three Legs.

Mr Coen provided an explanation regarding the application to change the condition in the licence relating to door staff so that they would not be required on a Thursday night. He stated that the number of clientele on a Thursday night would not justify the presence of door staff, and outlined the client group the Three Legs wishes to cater for.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the representations from the Applicant and WYP. They also considered the law, and in particular the



Cumulative Impact Policy. Members were of the opinion that granting some elements of the application with conditions would uphold the licensing objectives. However, Members did not grant the request to reword the condition relating to the provision of door staff on Thursdays. Members felt that some of the conditions which the applicant had requested to be removed were necessary and proportional and therefore the request to remove these was not granted.

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted in part as follows:

**Hours/Activities** - The variation request to open for additional hours in the morning be granted –

Opening hours:

Monday to Saturday at 08:00am

Sunday at 09:00am

Sale of Alcohol and Recorded Music :

Monday to Saturday to commence at 08:00am

Sunday to commence at 09:00am

Conditions -

- Conditions 23 – 29, 30 – 40, 82, 87, 91 and 100 (in Annex 1 of the premises licence) be retained
- Conditions 13 – 22, 41 – 81, 83 – 86, 88 – 89 and 101 – 103 (in Annex 1 of the premises licence) be removed
- Conditions 106 – 109 be amended as requested
- Condition 114 (in Annex 2 of the premises licence) be removed
- Condition 144 (in Annex 3 of the premises licence) be retained
- That the measures proposed by WYP and previously agreed by the applicant be imposed as conditions on the premises licence in order to address the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 28th February, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor S Armitage in the Chair

Councillors G Hussain and V Morgan

### 207 Election of the Chair

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Armitage was elected Chair for the meeting

### 208 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda for the meeting, however the Sub Committee was in receipt of the following additional documents relating to “World Foods” (minute 211 refers)

- Photographic evidence supplied by West Yorkshire Police in support of their representation supplied just prior to the hearing and tabled with the agreement of the applicant
- Letter tabled at the hearing by the solicitor for the applicant in response to the statement made by West Yorkshire Police

### 209 Declarations of Interest

The following Member declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Councillor G Hussain – World Foods, Harehills Lane – declared a personal interest as he stated that members of his family owned buildings near to the premises; that he owned a building on the parade of shops but leased it to another user who operated that as a hot food take away; and that he knew the solicitor for the applicant on a professional basis although he had not had any dealings with him recently (minute 211 refers)

### 210 "Tesco" - Application for the grant of a Premises Licence for Tesco, Elland Road, Churwell, Morley, Leeds LS27 7TB

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy, considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of a new Tesco store, Elland Road, Churwell.

A representation had been received from LCC Department of Development (Planning) relating to the hours of operation requested. Present at the hearing were:

Mr P Whur – solicitor for the applicant

Mr G Bartley - Licensing Manager for Tesco Stores

Mr C Sanderson – LCC Department of Development

The Sub Committee heard first from Mr Sanderson who described the residential nature of the locality. The site had only recently gained planning permission for change of use from a former public house to a supermarket in

2010 following negotiations over the hours of operation. Mr Sanderson clarified that the Sunday opening hours requested were longer than those permitted under the planning permission and stated that this would have a detrimental impact on local residents. As such the department sought to prevent public nuisance and had lodged the representation.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Whur on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd who stated the applicant had instructed agents to lodge a planning application to vary the hours of operation for Sundays and that the store was scheduled to open in 8 weeks time. Mr Whur stated the applicant would operate to the existing permitted hours until the planning application had been determined. Mr Bartley provided information on the nature of the store, the reason for the application and servicing arrangements to the store.

Members considered the written representations and the verbal submissions made at the hearing. The Sub Committee noted the previous use of the premises as a public house and that this premises was located within a residential area, but further noted that no representations had been received from local residents or the LCC Environmental Protection Team. Members were satisfied by the representation made by the applicant that they would not operate beyond the currently permitted hours, therefore  
**RESOLVED** – To grant the application as requested

**211 "World Foods" - Application for the grant of a premises licence in respect of World Foods, 272 Harehills Lane, Harehills Leeds LS9 7BD**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy, considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence for the premises trading as World Foods, 272 Harehills Lane, LS9.

A representation had been received from West Yorkshire Police (WYP) which included a statement from HM Revenues & Customs (HMRC). Present at the hearing were:

Mr R Digwa – solicitor for the applicant

Mr S Mohamed – the applicant

PC L Dobson – WYP

Mr J Vantoch-Wood – HMRC

The Sub Committee heard first from PC Dobson who stated that the applicant was known to WYP through investigations conducted by HMRC at this location and another premises on Harehills Lane. WYP believed this application had been made purely to legitimise the World Foods premises whilst the sale of illegal products continued.

Mr Vantoch-Wood provided further information on the investigations undertaken by HMRC. The officers referred to photographs tabled just prior to the hearing which showed the quantity of tobacco goods seized on 29 October 2010 and they provided details on goods seized both at the premises and from vehicles used by the applicant. The Sub Committee also gathered information on the nature of concealment of the goods within the premises

and the vehicles and ascertained that the illegal goods were sold from World Foods.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Digwa, solicitor for the applicant, who stated that no criminal charges were pending against Mr Mohamed. In response to questions from Mr Digwa, the applicant clarified that he would not be the Designated Premises Supervisor of World Foods, but the leaseholder. He stated he had been in Poland on 29 October 2010 when goods had been seized from a vehicle insured by him and in fact, he had cancelled the business insurance for that vehicle on 25 October 2010, but that it had not come into effect. Mr Mohamed confirmed that he also bought and sold cars/vans as a business and often insured vehicles simply to test drive them. Mr Digwa stated that a CCTV system was already installed at the premises, and furthermore Mr Mohamed confirmed that he would be happy to implement the measures outlined in the WYP written representation proposed to address the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective if the application was granted.

Through responses to questions from the Sub Committee and the Legal Adviser to the Sub Committee, the applicant clarified that the premises had changed ownership but was now his. He stated he owned a Ford van and a BMW, but did not own any of the other vehicles mentioned within the HMRC statement. Mr Mohamed further explained his use of various vehicles under trade insurance, but that he did not keep vehicles for long, he also explained that he bought and sold vehicles from the World Foods premises through word of mouth. Mr Mohamed could not explain why World Foods staff had suggested to HMCR that the Ford Mondeo car seized by HMCR belonged to the shop, and in answer to a direct question Mr Mohamed could not explain how the illegal tobacco came to be in the shop other than to state that he could not check what his customers brought into the premises.

Members carefully considered the written representations and the verbal submissions made at the hearing. The Sub Committee acknowledged that there were no criminal proceedings ongoing against Mr Mohamed in relation to the 29 October 2010 investigation, but they also noted that Mr Mohamed had confirmed that he was on bail arising from goods seized on 31 October 2010.

The Sub Committee was satisfied by the evidence of WYP and HMRC that illegally imported cigarettes had been found and seized at World Foods; and that the premises were used for the illegal sale and supply of cigarettes. Members were not satisfied by the submissions of the applicant and felt that Mr Mohamed had been very evasive when questioned and had often contradicted himself. The Sub Committee therefore felt that granting the licence to this applicant would not uphold the licensing objective intended to prevent crime and disorder. The Sub Committee therefore  
**RESOLVED** – To refuse the application

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 7th March, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors T Hanley and G Wilkinson

**212 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** - Councillor Selby was elected Chair of the meeting

**213 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of that part of the agenda designated as exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information both in terms of Regulation 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearing Regulations 2005) and the Licensing Procedure Rules, and on the grounds that it is not in the public interest to disclose the contents as the information therein pertains to an individual and that person would not reasonably expect their personal information or discussions thereon to be in the public domain. (Appendix A of the report referred to in minute 218)

**214 Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda. Supplementary information had been supplied in relation to the following:

**Item 6 Naeem's Tandoori** – Email statement dated 4 March 2011 submitted by West Yorkshire Police

**Item 8 Starlight Bar**

- Letter dated 1 March 2011 submitted by the applicants' representative
- Email response dated 1 March 2011 in response submitted by West Yorkshire Police
- Witness statement dated 3 March 2011 from an officer of HM Revenue & Customs submitted by West Yorkshire Police
- Statement by the applicant dated 4 March 2011 submitted on the morning of the hearing.

**215 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**216 Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Naeem's Tandoori, 62 Stainbeck Road, Leeds, LS7 2PW**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of Naeem's Tandoori, Meanwood. An initial hearing to determine the application had been adjourned on 7 February 2011 pending receipt of further information on whether the measures sought by West Yorkshire Police (WYP) in their representation were necessary and proportionate to this application.

Additional information setting out that response was supplied to the Sub Committee prior to the hearing.

Representations had also been received from LCC Environmental Protection Team (LCC EPT) and LCC Department of Development (Planning). The applicant had agreed to the measures proposed, which effectively curtailed the proposed hours of operation and those representations had been withdrawn.

Present at the hearing were Mr A Khaled – the applicant and PC L Dobson – WYP

The Sub Committee heard from PC Dobson regarding the existing CCTV system at the premises and with regard to the statistics showing the nature of reported crimes within the locality. The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Khaled regarding the capabilities of the CCTV system he had purchased since the previous hearing.

The Sub Committee carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions and noted the revised hours of operation now proposed for the premises. Members were satisfied that the purchased CCTV system was appropriate and

**RESOLVED** – That the application as amended be granted, for the following hours as agreed by the applicant

Provision of Late Night Refreshment

Monday to Saturday            23:00 hours to 00:00 hours (midnight)

Hours the premises are open to the public

Monday to Friday            18:00 hours until 00:00 hours (midnight)

Saturday                        08:00 hours to 00:00 (midnight)

Sundays                         18:00 hours to 23:00 hours

Conditions

- Those measures proposed by LCC EPT to address the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective and the measures proposed by LCC Planning agreed by the applicant prior to the hearing were deemed necessary and proportionate to the grant of the licence and will be included within the Premises Licence as conditions
- Those measures proposed by WYP were felt to be necessary to uphold the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective and were imposed as conditions on the Premises Licence

**217 Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Cattlegrid, Unit , Waterloo House, Assembly Street, Leeds, LS2 7DE**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence for premises to be known as "Cattle Grid" Waterloo House, Leeds LS1.

Representations had been received from LCC Environmental Protection Team (LCC EPT), LCC Health & Safety Team (LCC H&S) and West



Yorkshire Police (WYP) which included measures proposed by them to address the licensing objectives. The measures proposed by LCC EPT and LCC H&S had been agreed by the applicant prior to the hearing and those representations had subsequently been withdrawn on the understanding the measures would be imposed on the Premises Licence, should it be granted. Present at the hearing were Mr S Kovak & Mr S Gray - the applicants; and Sgt R Fullilove – WYP

The Sub Committee heard from Sgt Fullilove for WYP regarding the location of the premises within the Cumulative Impact Policy (Area 1) and highlighted the area was a hotspot for crime & disorder and anti social behaviour. WYP suggested there was insufficient information in the application to evidence how the operation of this premises would not add to the problems in the area. WYP sought clarity on whether the applicant proposed both on and off sales of alcohol and would seek to ensure the proposed restaurant did not operate as nightclub in the future and sought 12 conditions including measures to control the future use of the premises

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Gray and Mr Kovak regarding the intended use of the premises as a branded family restaurant, the likely food offer and price range, possible number of patrons and the existing businesses run by the restaurant chain in London. The applicants assured the hearing the premises would not be a nightclub and that alcohol would only be available to patrons dining in the restaurant. Furthermore, measures suggested by WYP would have been agreed prior to the hearing if the applicants had been aware of the opportunity to do so however they did not believe that CCTV was necessary for a restaurant establishment.

All parties discussed the licensing history of the locality; the CCTV suggested by WYP as an effective tool to combat crime & disorder and cost implications to the applicants.

The Sub Committee carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions and was satisfied that the Cumulative Impact Policy did apply in this instance. Members were however satisfied that the proposed branded restaurant nature of the premises intended to attract families; the food offer and proposed layout, meant that this style of operation was not likely to attract incidents of crime and disorder. Members were happy to grant the application subject to conditions and felt that, given the location, it was necessary for the premises to install a suitable CCTV system.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted, subject to the following conditions which were deemed to be necessary and proportionate to this premises in this location

Conditions

- Sale of alcohol ON the premises only
- Covers – a minimum of 22 covers to the lower ground floor, 38 to the upper ground floor and 50 to the first floor, to be maintained at all time
- The measures proposed by LCC EPT and LCC H&S and agreed prior to the hearing by the applicant shall be included within the Premises Licence as conditions

- The measures proposed by WYP, including installation of CCTV, were deemed to be necessary and appropriate to this premises and will be included within the Premises Licence as conditions (with the exception of Conditions 8 & 10 relating to the DPPO and consumption of alcohol within any external area)

**218 Application for a Licence Transfer for The Starlight Bar, Shaftesbury Parade, Harehills Lane, Leeds, LS9 6TA**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application made under Section 42 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the transfer of a Premises Licence from Mr N Khan to Mr C M Ferguson and Mr H J Rafik.

Representations had been received West Yorkshire Police (WYP) who were represented at the hearing by PC L Dobson accompanied by Mr O Lack of HM Revenues & Customs (HMRC). The applicants did not attend the hearing but were represented by Mr Y Sina. All parties present were in receipt of additional documents (listed in minute 214 above)

The Sub Committee heard from PC Dobson regarding the licensing history of the premises itself and the nature of WYP dealings with the current premises licence holder and Mr Rafik – one of the applicants. Mr Lack provided further detail on the matters contained within his witness statement relating to seizures of cigarettes and tobacco made at premises by HMRC associated with Mr Rafik, the last being made on 1 March 2011.

Members were aware that issues relating to the building itself had been raised previously and discussed whether those matters had been resolved with all parties.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Sina on behalf of the applicants who supplied certificates relating to a Fire Detection & Alarm system; a Fire Certificate annual service and responded to comments regarding Mr Rafik's employment by producing wage slips. WYP responded that as of 4 March 2011, West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service had not been supplied with the required paperwork. The Sub Committee also noted the statement submitted by Mr Rafik dated 4 March and that he would not attend the hearing due to ill health.

Members did not feel able to proceed in the absence of the applicants, particularly Mr Rafik, as they indicated they had many questions which would require a direct response. Members noted the contents of a medical certificate supplied by Mr Sina, and having regard to the date of the certificate, agreed Mr Rafik should be given the opportunity to attend a future hearing  
**RESOLVED** – To adjourn the hearing to Monday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

Members offered direction to the parties regarding Mr Rafik's attendance and indicated that all documentation should be received by the Licensing Authority 10 days prior to the 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011 hearing. Furthermore, the future hearing should be supplied with further information on the following:

- Dates; times and nature of the seizures made by HMRC
- Copies of any warning letters sent to Mr Rafik by HMRC
- Receipts

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 14th March, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor S Armitage in the Chair

Councillors R Downes and D Wilson

**219 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Armitage was elected Chair of the meeting

**220 Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda. The Sub Committee had however received the following additional submissions:

**Minute 223 Miss Browns Coffee Shop** - Letter dated 17 February 2011 submitted by local ward councillors in support of the public objections.

**Minute 224 Ask** – Copies of the agreement reached between the applicant and LCC Environmental Protection Team and sample menus.

**221 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**222 "Hope House Gallery" - Application for the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of Hope House Gallery, Hope House, 65 Mabgate, Leeds LS9 7DR**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting as the applicants and all interested parties had reached agreements on measures suggested in order to promote the licensing objectives of the city. The Premise Licence will therefore be issued by the Licensing Officer in accordance with the agreed conditions

**223 "Miss Brown's Coffee Shop" - Application for the Variation of a Premises Licence for Miss Brown's Coffee Shop, 152 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown, Leeds LS7 4EE**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application to vary an existing Premises Licence held at Miss Brown's Coffees Shop, Chapeltown Road LS7.

Representations had been received from LCC Environmental Protection Team (LCC EPT) and several local residents. Local ward Councillors had also written in support of the residents. Not all of the residents attended the hearing and the Sub Committee resolved to take their written representations into account and proceed in their absence. Present at the hearing were:

Mr P Maguire – representative for the applicant

Miss A Brown the applicant and Miss C Walker the DPS

Mr H Mardani and Mr T Hussain – owners of adjacent property

Mr Ibrahim on behalf of Ms Suleman – local residents

Mr R Bilsborough – LCC EPT

The Sub Committee heard from Mr Bilsborough who described the residential nature of the local area. The adjacent property shared a party wall with the application premises and was currently being refurbished to create flats. LCC EPT was concerned that future residents would experience public nuisance through noise travelling through the fabric of the building. The request for live music also caused concern as noise levels generated by live music and audiences were not controlled by a sound limiter.

He reported that the planning permission granted in 2010 for change of use from residence to café permitted the premises to open until 22:30 hours and he noted that this variation application sought 23:00 closing hours. Furthermore, the grant of planning permission had been dependant on the discharge of a condition for the submission of a satisfactory Noise Report; which he stated had not been complied with. Mr Bilsborough concluded that LCC EPT did not wish to see the application granted. However should Members be minded to grant, he urged them to attach the measures proposed by LCC EPT.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr T Husain and Mr H Mardani, the owners of the adjacent property who provided information on the likely impact of the Coffee Shop on residents of their property, litter problems already experienced in the area which they attributed to this premises; parking and the outcome of a recent meeting arranged by the applicant with local residents. Concern was expressed over the likelihood of patrons remaining in the area after closing time causing noise and disturbance and use of the outside area for external seating.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr P Maguire on behalf of the applicant who stated the premises currently operated as a community café with internal seating for 24 patrons. The applicant had no intention of operating a pub or nightclub at this premises. Miss Brown stated that the conditions attached to the planning permission had been complied with and sound insulation measures had been completed; she anticipated full grant of the permission within the next week.

Mr Maguire confirmed the applicant had agreed to measures 1,3,4 and 5 of the submitted LCC EPT representation but not No.2 (no regulated entertainment involving live music) as they sought to introduce music to the venue for functions, themed nights or to encourage the community. The applicant did not envisage full bands, rather two/three persons with instruments. Mr Maguire stated that events had been held until 01:00 hours at the premises under the provisions of temporary Event Notices, with no issues being raised.

Miss Brown reported that there were off-licences and a nightclub close to her premises and suggested the litter and broken bottles could therefore not all be attributed to her premises.

Members remained concerned about the proposed provision of live music within such a small venue in proximity to dwellings and sought confirmation

that necessary sound insulation scheme had been submitted and agreed by the planning authority. Miss Brown indicated the document was available at the hearing, but Members took the view that at this late stage, there was insufficient time for them to consider it, whether or not it had been approved by the planning authority.

The Sub Committee carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions; particularly the comments regarding the sound attenuation works and impact of live music on local residents. The Sub Committee was not satisfied that the applicant had addressed the noise issues. However Members felt that there were steps which could be taken which could address the prevention of public nuisance objective and

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application in the following terms:

Licensable activities

all activities requested are granted, but the provision of activities will cease at 22:00 hours every day

Hours the premises open to the public

Monday to Sunday 07:00 hours until 22:30 hours

Non standard timings

Not Granted

Conditions

- The 3 measures (1, 3 and 4) proposed by LCC EPT to address the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective and agreed by the applicant prior to the hearing were deemed necessary and proportionate to the grant of the licence and will be included within the Premises Licence as conditions
- Measure No 2 “There shall be no Regulated Entertainment on the premises involving live music/playing of musical instruments by performers” WILL TAKE EFFECT until the applicant has received written approval from LCC EPT that the sound insulation measures are satisfactory

**224 "Ask" - Application for the grant of a Premises Licence for Ask, 46 North Lane, Headingley, Leeds LS6 3HU**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority’s own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application for the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of premises known as “Ask” situated within the former Lounge Cinema building, 46 North Lane, Headingley. Members noted the premises lay within Cumulative Impact Policy Area 2.

A representation had been received from LCC Department of Development (LCC Planning) and the applicant had agreed adhere to the hours of operation permitted under the planning permission for the premises – this effectively curtailed the closing hour to 00:00 hours midnight every day. LCC Environmental Protection Team (LCC EPT) had also submitted a representation.

Representations had also been received from several local residents and local ward Councillor J Monaghan, none of whom attended the hearing. The Sub Committee resolved to take their written representations into account and proceed in their absence. Present at the hearing were:

Mr G Cushion and Miss N Beck – solicitors for the applicant

Mr R Powell – Operations Manager for Ask

Mr R Bilsborough – LCC EPT

The Sub Committee heard from Mr Bilsborough that LCC EPT had made a qualified objection to the application due to concerns over the impact of noise on local residents and the requested hours being beyond the permitted planning hours. He confirmed that the applicant had now agreed to curtail the hours and to a condition that noise should be inaudible at the “nearest noise sensitive premises”. All parties then discussed the outcome of a recent Judicial Review which deemed that condition to be unenforceable as it did not specify which premises were to be protected by the condition. The applicant confirmed that the refurbished cinema premises would include residential units to the upper floors, with retail to the ground floor. Mr Cushion indicated the applicant would accept revised wording which identified the addresses of those residents the inaudibility clause proposed to protect.

The Sub Committee then heard from Mr Cushion on behalf of the applicant who indicated that the applicant would agree to amend the hours in order that all licensable activities ceased at 00:00 hours with the exception of the sale of the alcohol which would cease at 23:30 hours. He reported that Ask operated 126 other restaurants nationwide and sales were typically 70% food, 14% soft drinks, 6% coffee/tea and 10% alcohol. The premises therefore was clearly intended as a restaurant. He noted residents concerns regarding the closing hour but reported that another chain restaurant close to this premises already operated to midnight. In conclusion, he stated he was not aware of any of the Ask branches having caused significant problems in their localities and urged the Sub Committee to consider the premises as a restaurant and not a bar/nightclub venue which would be subject to the CIP.

Mr Cushion clarified that there was a bar within the restaurant for patrons as it was intended that alcohol would primarily be sold with meals although acknowledged that patrons waiting to be seated could also be served at the bar. Members were concerned particularly with the final hour the premises were open. Mr Powell stated that he had previously worked at Ask, LS1 and generally patrons leaving Ask premises at later hours tended not to be disorderly as they had consumed a meal, plus the pricing structure influenced the clientele the restaurants attracted. Members discussed whether the applicant would accept restricting the time at which new patrons would be admitted to the premises having regard to the 23:00 trigger within the CIP.

During deliberations, the Sub Committee noted the agreement already reached with West Yorkshire Police (WYP), but sought to clarify the term “substantial menu” and the number of covers the applicant intended. Mr Cushion suggested the premises could maintain 100 covers at all times, and still retain enough flexibility for the restaurant to operate successfully.



The Sub Committee carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions before them. The Sub Committee was satisfied that this premise would not be a drink led premises and would be operated as a restaurant. Members noted agreements offered by the applicant at the hearing and that the applicant had confirmed that consumption of alcohol would be restricted to within the premises. Members were therefore satisfied that the applicant had demonstrated that this operator would not add to the cumulative impact of such premises within CIP Area 2.

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application as amended in the following terms:

Licensable activities

Provision of Recorded Music

Monday to Sunday 11:00 until 00:00 hours (midnight)

Provision of Late Night Refreshment

Monday to Sunday 23:00 until 00:00 hours (midnight)

Supply of alcohol

Monday to Sunday 11:00 until 23:30 hours

Hours the premises open to the public

Monday to Sunday 07:00 hours until 00:00 hours (midnight)

Conditions

The Sub Committee imposed the following measures as conditions on the licence which they felt were appropriate to this premises in this location

- Noise shall be inaudible at the nearest noise sensitive premises – in this case those included within the development at 46 North Lane and specifically immediately above this premises - at all times that the premises licence is in operation
- A minimum of 100 covers to be maintained at all times
- No patrons to admitted after 23:00 hours Monday to Saturday or after 22:00 hours Sunday
- Those measures previously agreed between WYP and the applicant are now imposed as conditions on the licence.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Standards Committee

Wednesday, 16th February, 2011

### PRESENT:

#### Independent Members

Gordon Tollefson (Chair)  
Joanne Austin  
Rosemary Greaves  
Philip Turnpenny

#### Councillors

C Campbell	B Selby	E Nash
B Gettings	J L Carter	

#### Parish Members

Councillor P Cook	Morley Town Council
Councillor Mrs P Walker	Pool in Wharfedale Parish Council

### APOLOGIES:

Councillors J Priestley, J Harper and R D Feldman

#### **19 Appeals against refusal of inspection of documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents in accordance with Procedure Rule 25 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules.

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

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

#### **21 Late items**

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

#### **22 Declaration of interests**

There were no declarations of personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members' Code of Conduct.

## **23 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the Standards Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 were approved as a correct record.

Further to Minute 5, the Chair informed the Committee that he had attended the Whips meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 and had received some constructive comments.

Further to Minute 17(b), the Chair reported that Member Management Committee would be asked to comment upon the proposed amendments to the Members E-Mail Code of Practice at its meeting to be held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

## **24 Minutes of the Assessment Sub-Committee**

The minutes of the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010 were received and noted.

## **25 Minutes of the Consideration Sub-Committee**

The minutes of the Consideration Sub-Committee meetings held on 29<sup>th</sup> June and 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010 were received and noted.

## **26 Minutes of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee**

The minutes of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee meetings held on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 29<sup>th</sup> July, 29<sup>th</sup> September, 15<sup>th</sup> November, 14<sup>th</sup> December 2010 and 24<sup>th</sup> January 2011 were received and noted.

Members queried whether the inclusion of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee minutes with the Standards Committee agenda was necessary. The Chair undertook to discuss this further with the Chair of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee and the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance).

## **27 Officer/Employee Code of Conduct**

The Head of Human Resources presented a report of the Chief Officer (Human Resources) providing an update on the work which has taken place, and is taking place, around the Code of Conduct which applies to staff. It was reported that legal advice is currently being sought as to whether it is lawful to require employees to register their membership of the Freemasons, following a letter received from the Grand Lodge.

Members particularly discussed the need to include more information in the Code of Conduct regarding vexatious complaints against Members, and how this would be dealt with.

The need to require employees with decision making powers to publicly register their interests was also discussed. Members were informed of the arrangements currently in place in different departments to help to ensure that employees declare conflicts of interest.

The Head of Human Resources undertook to refer the Committee's comments to the Chief Officer (Human Resources) in order that they can be considered as part of the review of the Employee Code of Conduct, and inform the Committee of the timeframe for the review within the next 7 days.

**RESOLVED** – Members of the Standards Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the report;
- (b) request that the Committee's comments are referred to the Chief Officer (Human Resources) and taken into account as part of the review of the Employee Code of Conduct; and
- (c) request that the Head of Human Resources informs the Committee of the timeframe for the review of the Employee Code of Conduct within the next 7 days.

## **28 Ethical Audit Action Plan: HR Issues Update**

The Head of Human Resources presented a report of the Chief Officer (Human Resources) providing a final update to the Committee on the actions assigned to the Chief Officer (Human Resources) as a result of the Ethical Audits undertaken in 2006 and 2007.

Members particularly discussed the meaning of 'operational matters' and the types of issues that it would be inappropriate for a Member to become involved in, such as staffing matters.

**RESOLVED** - Members of the Standards Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the contents of the report; and
- (b) note the more targeted approach to potential risk areas set out in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the report.

## **29 Implications of the Localism Bill for the Ethical Framework in Leeds**

The Head of Governance Services presented a report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) briefing Members of the Standards Committee on the aspects of the Localism Bill which relate to the Council's ethical governance arrangements, specifically the Members' Code of Conduct, Standards Committee, and local assessment arrangements.

The following issues were discussed:

- The Localism Bill proposes to impose a duty on Councils to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Members and co-opted members of the authority, even though there would be no obligation to adopt a Code of Conduct;
- Conduct issues could be dealt with through group Whips, or criminal law for more serious matters, instead of a Code of Conduct;

- It would be useful to create a guidance note for Members on how to behave;
- Comparisons of the way in which conduct matters were handled in other organisations;
- The current threshold at which it is necessary to register the receipt of gifts and hospitality (£25.00) is too low and should rise to £50.00 to be in line with the threshold for election returns;
- Members should only have to register interests that are relevant to the decisions they take; and
- It is too early to comment upon the proposals in the Localism Bill as it could be amended before it receives Royal Assent, therefore the report should be noted.

**RESOLVED** – Members of the Standards Committee resolved to note the report.

### **30 Standards Committee - Interim Annual Report**

The Corporate Governance Officer presented a report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) providing members of the Standards Committee with performance information regarding the Standards Committee's activities during the 2010/11 municipal year.

**RESOLVED** – Members of the Standards Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the contents of the report;
- (b) agree that the information in the report will form the basis of the Standards Committee's Annual Report for the current municipal year; and
- (c) agree that the information in the report be presented to the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee as part of the six monthly reporting arrangements.

### **31 Annual Report of the Monitoring Officer**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) presented a report providing the Monitoring Officer's Annual Report which is required under paragraph 5 of the Monitoring Officer Protocol.

**RESOLVED** – Members of the Standards Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the assurances and performance information provided in the report; and
- (b) request that all Members are notified that this report is available.

### **32 Standards Committee Work Programme**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report notifying Members of the Committee of the work programme for the remainder of the municipal year. Members were asked to cancel the final meeting of the municipal year which was due to be held on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2011, as there were no scheduled items.

**RESOLVED** – Members of the Standards Committee resolved to:

(a) note the work programme; and

(b) agree that the Standards Committee meeting due to be held on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2011 be cancelled.

### **33 Chair's Closing Remarks**

The Chair informed the Committee that Rosemary Greaves' and Councillor John Priestley's term of office would expire on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2011, therefore this would be their final Standards Committee meeting. It had been decided not to seek any re-appointments due to the reduction in the workload of the Committee and the proposals in the Localism Bill.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair expressed his appreciation to Ms Greaves and Councillor Priestley for their service and helpful contributions.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Corporate Governance and Audit Committee**

**Monday, 14th February, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Driver in the Chair  
Councillors P Grahame, N Taggart,  
C Campbell, G Kirkland, A Lowe, S Smith,  
J Elliott, P Harrand, W Hyde, J Lewis and  
T Hanley  
**Co-optee** G Tollefson

Apologies

**88 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

**89 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

**90 Late Items**

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

**91 Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**92 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies received for absence.

**93 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2011 were approved as a correct record.

**94 Matters Arising**

The Chief Officer (Audit and Risk) informed the Committee, in relation to Minute 86, Annual Audit Inspection Letter, that in light of discussions with KPMG during the item and through officer negotiation, KPMG will propose an

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

audit fee of £513,000k which is line with Audit Commission recommendations. The proposed fee had previously been £598,500.

## **95 Corporate Performance Management Arrangements**

The Performance Manager (Planning, Policy and Improvement) presented a report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) which showed the procedures in place that will act as an early warning system for potential areas of concern, rather than the authority relying on inspection from external bodies alone. The report also introduced Members to the Performance Dash Board that has been adopted by the authority and were presented with a visual display showing what the Performance Dashboard looks like.

Members contemplated the Performance Dashboard presented to them and stressed the importance of this work in contributing to a strong control environment and reducing the potential for any unexpected outcomes which could have a negative impact on the Council.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to note the contents of the report.

## **96 Implications of the Localism Bill for the ethical framework in Leeds**

The Chair of the Standards Committee and the Head of Governance Services presented a report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) which sought preliminary views from the Committee as part of a consultation process on aspects of the Localism Bill which relate to the Council's ethical governance arrangements, specifically: Members' Code of Conduct; Standards Committee; and Local Assessment arrangements.

Members discussed the report in detail, considering the various questions relating to the Standards Regime which had been framed in response to the Member Code of Conduct implications of the Localism Bill

Members considered whether in principle a code of conduct need be put in place. Members commented that public interest in such arrangements is likely to remain. Members also commented that should a new code be introduced consideration of allegations of misconduct should be different to what has gone before in that Members should be informed from the outset that a complaint had been made against them. Furthermore that it would be essential for any complaint to be reviewed before any proceedings take place to ensure that frivolous complaints are rejected.

Members were also of the view that if adopted any new code of conduct should be signed by all current Members and any new Members on being elected to the Council.

The Committee agreed that if any local arrangement be introduced consideration would need to be given as to the role of independent people as co-opted Members.

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

**RESOLVED** – Members resolved that:

- (a) should a voluntary code of conduct be introduced by the Council, that the code be different to the previous code, specifically allowing Members to be informed from the outset of any complaint made in respect of their compliance with it; and
- (b) a further report be brought to the Committee providing details of the wider governance implications of the Localism Bill

(Councillor Taggart entered the meeting at 2:20pm during the discussion of this item. Councillor Lowe entered the meeting at 2:40pm during the discussion of this item.)

## **97 International Financial Reporting Standards**

The Principal Finance Manager (Financial Management) presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report updated the Committee on progress towards implementing IFRS based accounts for the 2010/11 financial year.

Members discussed the report raising particular concerns with regards to: ensuring that all Leases the Council had entered into had been recorded; and the increase in the deficit figure.

**RESOLVED** - Members resolved to note the progress to date on implementation of IFRS.

## **98 Reporting Arrangements for Significant Legal Cases Involving the Council**

The Chief Officer (Legal, Licensing and Registration) presented his report which advised the Committee of current arrangements in respect of significant legal cases involving the Council and make recommendations in respect of such arrangements.

Members discussed the report and specifically considered the proposals featured in paragraph 7 of the report. Members considered which Members should be kept informed of significant legal cases and the depth of information that should be given.

It was considered that rules surrounding which Members should be informed of significant legal cases might not be the best option as this could potentially restrict the flow of information to Members. Members also considered that reports should be received as appropriate and that they should be provided by Directors.

Members also asked questions on the trends of cases against the Council and the reasons behind any trends. It was considered that the statistics and costs of legal cases would be best considered at the Central and Corporate Scrutiny Board.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) agree that the Chair of the Committee write to the Chair of the Central and Corporate Scrutiny Board to request that the Board considers whether it wishes to add to its work programme consideration of the statistics and spend relating to legal cases made against the Council.
- (b) not be limited by rules as to which Members should be informed about legal cases involving the Council;
- (c) agree that a brief outline for each significant case should be given to the relevant Executive Member and ward members where appropriate;
- (d) the timing of such reports should be monthly or at key stages of the case; and
- (e) agree the responsibility for updating Members should fall to Directors.

#### **99 Reporting Arrangements for Significant Claims Against the Council**

The Insurance Manager presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report advised the Committee of the current arrangements for advising management of significant legal action against the Council.

Members discussed the report in detail. Members asked questions with regards to the costs associated with insuring the Council's assets. Also highlighted was the cost of the numerous small claims made against the Council and that efforts should be made to prevent this type of claim.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) receive details on the cost of insuring the Council's assets;
- (b) receive a further report detailing the amount and type of small claims and the actions taken to reduce them; and
- (c) confirm they were satisfied with the process for dealing with trends in insurance claims and the process for informing Members of significant claims against the Council.

#### **100 Internal Audit Report February 2011**

The Head of Internal Audit presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report detailed the cost of Internal Audit to the Council and provided information on the value the section adds to the Council. The report also provided the Committee with the reports Internal Audit has issued from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2010 to the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2011.

Members discussed the report and highlighted the importance of keeping a significant number of days for counter fraud and corruption work. Whilst considering the report Members were also concerned to ensure that all outstanding duplicate payments owed to the Council are recovered.

The Committee raised concerns about suspected misappropriation of ICT equipment due to poor control arrangements and noted the work Internal Audit has done to improve this situation.

In reviewing the audits completed Members identified Mount St Mary's School had be marked as having a failing control environment and failing in compliance with it and requested further information on the reasons behind this.

In summary Members agreed in light of the current economic climate there should be a re-ordering of priorities in terms of auditing Council services.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the Internal Audit report, the changes to the 2010/11 Operational Plan and the value added to the organisation by the Internal Audit section; and
- (b) request details on the finding of the audit of Mount St Mary's School.

#### **101 Communities and Local Government Consultation - Amendments to the Accounts & Audit Regulations 2003**

The Principal Finance Manager (Financial Management) presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report informed Members of the main amendments to the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 and sought Members' views on the proposed changes.

Members discussed the report and expressed dissatisfaction with the de-criminalisation of contravention of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to note the contents of the report.

#### **102 Work Programme**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report notifying Members of the draft work programme.

The Committee reviewed its forthcoming work programme.

**RESOLVED** - The Committee resolved to note the draft work programme.

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

## **Development Plan Panel**

**Tuesday, 8th March, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Fox, T Leadley,  
J Lewis and R Lewis

### **45 Late items**

Although there were no formal late items, Members were in receipt of the following additional information (minute 48 refers):

Revised appendices 1 and 2 providing an improved layout to assist in reading the report

Plans showing minor revisions to the site boundaries to the Knostrop site boundary and the Skelton Grange site

### **46 Declaration of interests**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Councillor J Lewis – declared a personal interest through being a member of the Community Liaison Committee for Methley Quarry as the report makes reference to the Quarry (minute 48 refers)

### **47 Minutes**

**RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be approved, subject to a minor amendment at minute 43, in respect of gypsy and traveller sites to read ' The AMR had subsequently been amended to include provision of three pitches during 2009/10 (indicator H4)

### **48 Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (NRWDPD) ' Formal Submission'**

Further to minute 30 of the Development Plan Panel held on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2010 where Panel considered a report and publication draft of the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (DPD), Members considered a report of the Director of City Development requesting Panel to recommend to Executive Board that the DPD be approved by Council for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination

The Head of Forward Planning and Implementation presented the report and explained that the Natural Resources and Waste DPD would be the first DPD of the Local Development Framework (LDF) to be subject to formal submission and examination

A total of 28 responses to the final publication consultation (which took place from 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010 to 9<sup>th</sup> February 2011), were received, with these being set

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 5th April, 2011

out in Appendix 1 together with the Council's response to those comments. Appendix 2 comprised a schedule of consolidated proposed amendments to the DPD which, if agreed, would be submitted with the accompanying DPD to the Secretary of State. It was anticipated that examination would commence early/mid summer

Officers outlined the responses which had been received on the DPD

Of the responses received to the latest round of consultation, most related to the minerals section of the DPD, with Leeds being urged to do more to specify what the Authority was doing to meet minerals requirements. North Yorkshire Council had raised concerns on this matter and it was felt this would be the subject of debate in the independent examination

Members were informed that it was not considered possible to calculate a Leeds apportionment. An error in the original document was being rectified through an amendment which was being proposed which stated a regional apportionment for West Yorkshire, this being 5.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel and 17.8 million tonnes of crushed rock for the period 2001 to 2016. It was felt that it would be necessary to explain to the Inspector that there was not an apportionment for Leeds

In terms of the timescale of the regional apportionment ie up to 2016, the DPD went beyond that to 2026 and this was something the Minerals, Waste and Contaminated Land Manager would take up at the Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP)

Officers considered that the approach being adopted to this was felt to be sound and reasonable and that the Midgely Farm sand and gravel allocation and areas of search met the need

Arising from the consultation, the need for a specific sand and gravel allocation at Methley had been raised by the minerals operator Lafage and whilst Officers had requested more detailed information to consider this, none had been provided, consequently the broad location identified in the DPD is retained as an 'Area of Search', rather than a specific allocation

Representations by the Coal Authority sought developers to be encouraged to extract coal prior to development commencing. Whilst the Coal Authority had required this for all sites, it was felt there could be occasions when this would be too onerous so the wording had been amended to '... applicants should always consider the opportunity to recover any coal present ....'

The Coal Authority's request for a coal mining risk assessment where previous mining had taken place had been accommodated and it was hoped this would be sufficient to enable the objection to be withdrawn

Highways had commented on the minerals section and had raised concerns regarding the transport movements on the network, with Officers of the view that these concerns could be alleviated with a minor amendment

Arup on behalf of Aire Valley Environmental were supportive of the DPD but had requested a minor boundary amendment to the Knostrop site to reflect land ownership. Officers were recommending the proposed boundary alteration

Keyland Developments Ltd had raised an objection, although a subsidiary, Yorkshire Water, supported the aspiration for a zero waste city. In terms of strategic waste sites, there were three sites identified in the plan although it was considered one would not be required. Once it was established which of these sites would come forward for this use, the remaining site would be available for other forms of development. Members were advised that some alterations to clarify the text to reflect this could be sufficient for Keyland to withdraw their objection



In respect of the Biffa site, a further amendment to the site boundary was proposed to enable the pipe work and sub-station to be excluded

An objection had been received from Npower as concerns had been raised about the restriction placed on them by site allocation. In addition a reduction in the red line boundary was requested. Members were informed that no changes would be made, especially to the site boundary as an application for an Energy from Waste facility had not yet been made

Three representations had been received from residents regarding incineration although the issues raised did not fall within the remit of the DPD. Members were informed that there was scope to contact these respondents to explain the issues which could be considered in the DPD

English Heritage had requested a stronger emphasis on heritage in the strategic objectives of the DPD. Officers were of the opinion that amendments could be made which would include an emphasis on re-using local stone and it was hoped the proposed amendments would enable English Heritage to withdraw their objection

Regarding wharves and rail sidings, Officers reported an objection from British Waterways in respect of the Old Mill Lane site at Holbeck, which was a safeguarded wharf and was possibly the only purpose-built wharf remaining in Leeds. In the DPD this was marked for retention but British Waterways felt that the site could be developed for alternative uses (housing). Network Rail had also objected to the safeguarding of the wharf as they considered this was inconsistent with the regeneration objectives in Aire Valley Leeds

Members were informed that greater clarity about the meaning of 'regeneration' was needed ie this referred to a mix of uses rather than solely housing

An objection had been made by Towngate Estates Ltd regarding Bridgewater Road as the site had originally been proposed for housing in the Aire Valley Area Action Plan (AVAAP) at the 'Preferred Options' stage but that this had been reconsidered due to the substantial flood risk of the site

The Head of Forward Planning and Implementation explained the procedure if the DPD was approved for examination, which was likely to be a round table discussion

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether the Inspector could be critical that the Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) meetings had not resulted in a figure for Leeds being provided. Members were informed that an Inspector could not impose a figure but could only consider the approach taken, which was felt to be sound and reasonable
- that local Members strongly supported the policy in respect of Pool
- that only a small amount of sand and gravel had been extracted from the Methley site recently and much of this had been transported out of the area
- there was support for the proposed approach of considering this on a regional basis
- regarding coal extraction prior to development, a suggestion was made that the text should state this would be on the best available information as the Coal Authority was not aware of all sites which harboured coal

- concerns that developers did not routinely extract coal prior to development commencing but an acceptance that in some cases this would be uneconomic
- the possibility of fire risk if coal was not removed
- the future of Neville Hill Rail Depot and its strategic importance but that this was an issue beyond the immediate scope of the NRWDPD
- if the plan was approved, whether further changes could be made. The Head of Forward Planning responded by stating that if approved, any subsequent changes would need to be directed to the Secretary of State for consideration

**RESOLVED** - To request Executive Board to recommend to Council to approve the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (together with the proposed changes detailed in Appendix 2 of the report, together with the boundary revisions as presented and the further amendment to page 9 of the covering report, to change the word 'for' to 'against' in the 4<sup>th</sup> line) for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination, pursuant to Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(During consideration of this matter, Councillor Anderson left the meeting)

**49 Date and time of next meeting**

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

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

**THURSDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Chastney in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Atha, S Bentley,  
J Chapman, P Ewens, M Hamilton,  
G Harper, J Illingworth, J Matthews,  
J Monaghan and L Yeadon

**OFFICERS:** Jane Maxwell, Area Leader  
Chris Dickinson, West North West Area Management  
Kate Sibson, West North West Area Management  
Michele Tynan, Adult Social Care  
Tim Taylor, Adult Social Care  
Ryan Platten, Community Planner  
Lynne Hamshaw, West North West Homes Leeds  
Simon Jessop, West Yorkshire Police  
John Grieve, Chief Executive's Department

### **MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:**

Dr Richard Tyler, Leeds HMO Lobby  
John Dickinson, Weetwood Resident's Association  
Richard Norton, Headingley Development Trust  
Amanda Jackson, University of Leeds  
Paul Gold, Leeds University Union  
Maddy Hale, Leeds University Union, Far Headingley  
Community Representative  
Jessica Biddle, Leeds University Union, Central  
Headingley Community Representative  
John Mc Guinness, Leeds University Union  
Jo Johnson, Leeds Metropolitan Students Union  
Bill McKinnon, Friends of Woodhouse Moor  
Mercia Southon, Friends of Woodhouse Moor  
Sue Buckle, South Headingley Community  
Association  
Tony Crooks, South Headingley Community Association  
Janet Bailey, South Headingley Community Association  
Scott Blakeway, Unipol Student Homes  
Penny Bainbridge, Cardigan Centre  
David Santa Maria, Royal Park Community Consortium  
Tony Pavey -Smith, North Hyde Park Neighbourhood  
Association  
Annie Faulder, North Hyde Park Neighbourhood  
Association  
Ken Waterworth, Kirkstall Valley Community Association  
Sheila Waterworth, Kirkstall Valley Community  
Association  
Barbette Dorton - Scott, LWCA

Trevor Eggett, LWCA  
Barbara Mitchell, LWCA  
Victoria Jaquiss, City of Leeds School/Hyde Park  
Karim Abdul-Ghaffar, Hyde Park Residents  
Mike Woods, Leeds Reformed Baptist Church  
Tanya Hutchinson, Local Resident  
Pat Fillingham, Local Resident  
Christine Smith, Local Resident  
Marian Charlton, Local Resident  
David Salinger, Local Resident  
Howard Eaglestone, Local Resident  
Tony Green, Local Resident  
Isabel Sidebottom, Local Resident  
Amit Roy, Local Resident  
Neil Walshaw, Local Resident  
Steve Harris, Local Resident  
Josie Green, Local Resident  
J Sherwin, Local Resident  
D. Carey Jones, Local Resident

**56 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the February meeting of the North West (Inner) Area Committee held in St Chad's Parish Centre, St Chad's Vicarage, Otley Road, Leeds 16.

He also welcomed Jane Maxwell to the meeting and on behalf of the Area Committee, he congratulated her on her recent appointment as Area Leader.

**57 Declarations of Interest**

The following personal declarations of interest was declared:-

- Councillor B Chastney in his capacity as a Board Member on West North West Homes (Agenda Item 9) (Minute 70 refers)
- Councillor J Illingworth in his capacity as a Member of Kirkstall Valley Country Park (Agenda Item 9) (Minute 70 refers)

**58 Deputations**

- a) The Committee received a deputation from Sue Buckle, Friends of Woodhouse Moor requesting the Area Committee to fund Park Wardens on Woodhouse Moor for another year.

The Chair reported that budget discussions were still ongoing and no firm commitments could be made until the next Area Committee meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That the deputation be received and noted.

- b) The Committee received a deputation from Tony Crooks, South Headingley Community Association regarding their concerns about

plans to close a section of Hyde Park Road to through traffic going southwards.

In the discussion that ensued Members were of the opinion that inadequate consultation had taken place and that the proposed solution would create more problems than it would solve. The scheme as proposed was out of date.

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the deputation be received.
- (ii) That the Chair with the support of Ward Members write to the Head of Scrutiny Support with a view to seeking a reconsideration of the decision.

**59 Open Forum**

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

a) Maintenance of the Hollies

Mr John Dickinson, representing the Friends of the Hollies expressed the groups concern about the poor lack of maintenance in recent years of the “Hollies” in Weetwood.

In responding the Chair said he would write to the Chief Parks and Countryside Officer raising the issue of parks maintenance, with specific reference to the “Hollies”.

b) Royal Park Community Centre

Mr David Santa Maria, representing the Royal Park Community Consortium updated the Committee on the activities of the group.

The Chair on behalf of the Committee thanked Mr Santa Maria for the update and expressed best wishes to the group on it's future endeavours.

c) Cardigan Centre Leeds

Dr Richard Tyler, Director of the Cardigan Centre sought the assistance and support of the Area Committee in obtaining a 77 year lease for the Cardigan Centre.

The Chair, said he would write to the Executive Board expressing the Area Committee's support for a long lease for the Cardigan Centre.

d) Historic Walks – Eighteenth Century Boundaries of Little Woodhouse

Mrs Barbara Mitchell, representing the Little Woodhouse Community Association gave details of an Historic Walk around the eighteenth century boundaries of Little Woodhouse taking place on Friday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2011 departing from the Swarthmore Education Centre at 4.00pm. Anyone interested in taking part should contact the Association at [bamitchell92@gmail.com](mailto:bamitchell92@gmail.com)

**60 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be approved as a correct record.

**61 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

**a) Leeds Girls High School (Minute No. 46 (b) refers)**

At the last meeting Members were made aware that the Planning Application in respect of Rose Court was now the subject of a formal complaint against the Council.

Councillor Illingworth asked if feedback on the outcome of the formal complaint could be made known to Members.

**b) Royal Park School (Minute No. 48 (b) refers)**

At the last meeting of the Area Committee it was reported that The Royal Park Community Consortium could not occupy any part of the site until funding for development of the scheme had been secured.

A number of Members expressed concern about the situation and asked if further clarification could be obtained.

It was agreed that the Chair would write to the Chief Asset Management Officer seeking clarification as to why the Consortium had been denied access to the Caretakers House.

**62 Delegation of Environmental Services**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing the Area Committee with an update on progress towards achieving delegation of certain environmental services from the next municipal year (June 2011). The report also presented proposals for the involvement of Members throughout this preparatory stage.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Delegation of Environmental Services showing how the proposed delegation will work through working to Service Level Agreements (Appendix 1 refers)
- Programme of Member Involvement (Appendix 2 refers)

Helen Freeman, Project Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2011

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- A suggestion that robust measures be introduced to remove parked cars when street cleaning was in operation
- That an emphasis be placed on front line service delivery rather than management
- A justification for why refuse collection was not being delegated and that more frequent bin collections were needed in areas with high concentrations of HMOs
- The need for clarity on how decisions about resources will be taken at the wedge level in relation to individual Area Committees
- That decisions about resource allocation be taken on the basis of need

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee specifically notes the programme of Member involvement as outlined in the report.
- c) That further comments be made known to the Area Management Team by 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

**63 Transition of Health Improvement Function to Local Government**

The Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager submitted a report outlining the significant changes taking place locally following the publishing of the recent government white paper and guidance which highlighted implications for the work of the local Health and Wellbeing area partnerships.

Tim Taylor, Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager, Adult Social Care presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- General Practitioners would take on a much larger role for the delivery of service
- Localism Bill, significant changes proposed but too early to comment at this stage
- Implications for Area Committees
- Concern about the impact of the reforms on the National Health Service

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted and welcomed.
- b) That this Committee notes the changes taking place as a result of recent national policy drivers and implications for local authorities.

**64 Future Options for Long term Residential and Day Care for Older People**

The Deputy Director – Strategic Commissioning, Adult Social Care submitted a report presenting the Area Committee with information relating to the future options for long term residential and day care services for older people. The report also outlined the consultation process to progress and implement the recommendations of the Executive Board agreed on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010 which was appended and formed the basis of the report.

Michele Tynan – Older Peoples services, Adult Social Care presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

A map identifying the Elderly Residential & Day Care establishment within the Inner North West Area was circulated at the meeting.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Members questioned the accuracy of the map circulated and requested a list of residential day care centres in the Inner North West area
- The changing demographic profile of older people in the city
- The development of new services as alternatives to residential and day care

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the criteria for determining the most appropriate option for each facility outlined in the Executive Board report be noted, particularly in terms of any specific local factors.
- c) That this Committee endorses the suggestion for any local voluntary organisations working with older people in the outer north west area as outlined in paragraph 15 of the report.
- d) That this Committee notes that a further report on this issue would be submitted to the next Area Committee meeting in April 2011 for consideration.

**65 Changes to HMO Legislation and Leeds City Council's Article 4 Direction**

The Community Planner submitted a report on proposed changes to HMO Legislation and Leeds City Council's Article 4 Direction.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- copy of Leeds City Council's article 4 direction to remove permitted development rights to convert C3 properties to C4 HMOs (Appendix 1 refers)
- map showing Leeds City Council's article 4 direction area (Appendix 2 refers)
- map showing location of HMOs across Leeds (source: Council Tax data) (Appendix 3 refers)



- table showing the percentage of properties that are let as HMOs either to students or groups of people (Appendix 4 refers)
- table showing the number of complaints received by Environmental Health by Ward regarding issues that can be associated with high concentrations of HMOs (Appendix 5 refers)
- burglary rates by ward (March 2009-2010) (Appendix 6 refers)

Ryan Platten, Community Planner presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

Councillor Illingworth sought clarification as to whether Members of the public were able to comment on the local consultation exercise in relation to the introduction of the article 4 direction.

In response officers confirmed that the public could offer comment. Contact details were provided as follows:-

[ldf@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@leeds.gov.uk)

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- To note objections had been received from private landlords
- To note the comment from Scott Blakeway of Unipol, that the new policy could restrict affordable housing for young people
- Planning permission would still be required
- That the proposals were supported by the Area Committee

#### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That authority be given for the Chair to submit comments on behalf of the Inner North West Area Committee to the Council as part of the local consultation exercise in relation to the introduction of the article 4 direction. Individual Members were also encouraged to make their own representations
- c) That this Committee supports the continued use of the Community Planner resource to work on behalf of the Inner North West Area Committee to support the Forward Planning and Implementation team. where appropriate, in the creation of new local planning policies to address issues surrounding Houses in Multiple Occupation.

#### **66 Children's Services Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report on the support of local elected member engagement with the work of children's services by providing Area Committees with an update of key data relating to education for the academic year 2009-10 and November 2010 NEET and Not Known data. The report also provides details of recent key inspections that have taken place across Children's Services and provides an update on the development of the new Children and Young People's Plan 2011-2015.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Ofsted inspection judgments; attainment; absence/ attendance and exclusions data (Appendix 1 refers)
- NI 108 – Key Stage 4 attainment for Black and minority ethnic groups (Appendix 1a refers)
- NEET and Not Known data (Appendix 2 refers)

Jane Maxwell, Area Leader presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The reduction in fixed term exclusions in secondary schools
- Young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) who were resident in Headingley

**RESOLVED** –That the contents of the report and appendices be noted and welcomed in order to improve the Area Committee's role in improving outcomes locally.

#### **67 Hyde Park Neighbourhood Management**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the Area Management Team's approach to Neighbourhood Management in Hyde Park and seeks the Area Committee's support for its governance and partnership arrangements.

Chris Dickinson, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The establishment of a new neighbourhood Management Project for Hyde Park to address some of the area's challenges with a view to delivering long term improvements
- The project to be overseen by the Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods and Housing
- Twice-yearly reports would be prepared for the Committee on the Hyde Park programme

#### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the progress made to establish a new Neighbourhood Management programme in Hyde Park.

## **68 Area Leader's Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report informing Members of the progress in relation to two schemes, namely; the New Generation Transport Scheme and the HEART Centre.

Chris Dickinson, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Richard Norton, representing the Headingley Development Trust provided further information about the HEART Centre.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The current position of the New Generation Transport Scheme and the HEART Centre
- That for the time being the HEART Centre would not be open on Sunday's

### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the progress made on the New Generation Transport Scheme, together with the developments relating to the HEART Centre in Headingley.

## **69 Key Messages from Area Committee Sub Groups and Forums**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing Members with an update and summary on progress made at the Area Committee sub groups and ward forums that that have taken place since the last Area Committee.

Chris Dickinson, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Specific reference was made to the key messages outlined in Section 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 of the report arising from meetings of the Planning Sub Group, Environment Sub Group and Transport Sub Group.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- A number of issues raised within the Planning Sub Group were now not proceeding
- Concern was expressed that a limited number of Members were present at each of the meetings

### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That the key messages outlined in Section 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 of the report arising from the Planning Sub Group, Environment Sub Group and Transport Sub Group be noted and approved, where applicable.

- c) That the following dates of recent and future meetings be noted:-
  - i) Planning Sub Group – 9<sup>th</sup> February 2011
  - ii) Little London Forum - 16<sup>th</sup> March 2011
  - iii) Hyde Park and Woodhouse Forum – 7<sup>th</sup> April 2011

**70 Wellbeing Fund Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing the Area Committee with a 2010-11 end-of-year budget position, highlighting the projected capital and revenue Wellbeing carry forward into 2011-12. The report also recommended that capital funding for two projects be decommissioned and one new capital project be considered for Wellbeing funding.

Chris Dickinson, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That the capital budget reduction as highlighted in Section 3.0 of the report be noted.
- c) That the capital budget position as highlighted in Section 3.1 of the report be noted.
- d) That approval be given to the budget reconciliation mechanism as set out in Section 3.2 of the report.
- e) That approval be given to the decommissioning of capital projects as set out in Section 3.3 of the report.
- f) That approval be given to the new capital request as set out in Section 3.4 of the report.
- g) That approval be given to a request from HOPS for £10,000 of Capital Wellbeing from the Kirkstall Ward subject to a suitable application being received
- h) That approval be given to a request from Area Management for £2,375 of capital Wellbeing for the Woodsley Road District Centre Improvement scheme from the Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward, subject to a suitable application being received.
- i) That the capital budget position as set out in Section 3.5 of the report be noted.
- j) That a special meeting of the Area Committee be arranged for 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2011 in order that further clarity may be obtained on the Wellbeing Budget for 2011-12.

**71 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2011 at 7.00pm at the West Park Centre, Spenn Lane, Leeds LS16 5BE.

(The meeting concluded at 9.40pm)

## NORTH WEST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor B Cleasby in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
J L Carter, R Downes, C Fox, G Kirkland,  
P Latty, C Townsley and P Wadsworth

### 63 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the February meeting of the North West (Outer) Area Committee held in Yeadon Town Hall, High Street, Yeadon, Leeds 19.

He also welcomed Jane Maxwell to the meeting and on behalf of the Area Committee, he congratulated her on her recent appointment as Area Leader.

### 64 Declaration of Interests

The following personal interests were declared at the meeting:-

- Councillor B Cleasby in view of the fact that his granddaughter attends Rawdon St Peter's Primary School (Agenda Item 8) (Minute 68 refers) and also in his capacity as a Member of the Horsforth Live at Home Scheme (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 71 refers)
- Councillor C Fox in his capacity as a Member of West North West Leeds Area Panel (Agenda Item 8) (Minute 68 refers)
- Councillor R Downes in his capacity as Chair of the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (Agenda Item 9) (Minute 69 refers)

### 65 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors A Barker and G Latty.

### 66 Open Forum

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

#### a) Otley and District Road Safety Committee - Road Safety Quiz

Hazel Lee referred to the above issue and informed the meeting that the quiz would take part on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2011 with 15 schools taking part. She informed the meeting that it cost approx £1,000 to run the quiz and that the organisers were struggling to find the funds for this year's event.

In concluding, she requested the support of the Area Committee and following discussions, Jane Pattison, West North West Area

Management agreed to forward a Well-being application to Hazel Lee for her completion.

b) Proposed Relocation of One Stop Centres within the Guiseley and Rawdon and Otley and Yeadon wards

At the request of the Chair, Councillor C Townsley raised his concerns over a proposal to relocate two One Stop Centres located within the Guiseley and Rawdon and Otley and Yeadon wards from the beginning of the financial year without any prior consultation with Ward Members.

Detailed discussions ensued and arising from the discussions, Jane Maxwell, Area Leader agreed to commence a dialogue with both the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) and the Chief Customer Services Officer to ascertain the options available and to report back the outcome discussions to Ward Members as a matter of urgency.

In addition to this course of action, the Chair also agreed to write, on behalf of the Area Committee, to the above officers conveying the Committee's concerns with regards to these proposals and seeking the reassurance to work in a constructive way.

**67 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

**68 Well-being Budget Report**

Referring to Minute 56 of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing Members with a current position statement on the well-being budget, details of proposed projects and small grant applications received to date.

Jane Pattison, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the current position of the Well-being budget as detailed in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the report.
- c) That the following projects outlined in Section 4.0 of the report be dealt with as follows:-

<u>Name of Project</u>	<u>Name of Delivery Organisation</u>	<u>Decision</u>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

Installation of Communal Recycling Points across the Holtdales Estate	Recycling and Waste Services - LLC	Agreed £9,098 revenue
Safe Haven at Willow Green	Safe Haven at Willow Green	Agreed £5,000 revenue
Canopy over Early Years Foundation Stage base (EYFS)	Rawdon St Peter's Primary School PTA	Agreed £3,575 capital
Bramhope Public Footpaths surface improvement scheme	LCC Parks and Countryside	Agreed £8,014 revenue
Site Based Gardener for Guiseley and Rawdon and Otley and Yeadon	LCC Parks and Countryside	Agreed £23,301, with £13,225 from Guiseley and Rawdon based on three days a week with £5,090 to be allocated now and the remainder to be the subject of a new allocation of well-being funding in 2011/12, together with a figure to be agreed with Ward Members in Otley and Yeadon based on two days a week
Additional Staff for Yeadon Tarnfield and Otley Wharfemeadows Parks)	LCC Parks and Countryside	Agreed £4,545 revenue (Option one) with further discussions to be undertaken around dates of duties
Tranmere Park Design Group	Tranmere Park Design Group	Agreed £3,942

## 69 Key Messages from Area Committee Sub Groups and Forums

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing Members with an update and summary on progress made at the

Area Committee sub-groups and Ward Forums that have taken place since the last Area Committee meeting.

Jane Pattison, West North West Area Management presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

At the request of the Chair, Councillor B Anderson in his capacity as Chair of the Environment and Streetscene Sub Group reported on the Environment and Streetscene Sub Group meeting immediately prior to the Area Committee. In summary the issues raised were:-

- concerns about the allocation of resource and the basis upon which this would be made
- concerns that Members do not know what level of environmental service the area currently gets
- the need to see ginnel cleansing and grounds maintenance included in the delegated services
- a requirement not to include the dog warden service or graffiti in the delegation
- concerns that a new manual street cleansing regime had been implemented with no Elected Member consultation
- concerns that the consultation regarding the delegation of Environmental Services was being rushed through

Specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- the need for the Environment and Streetscene Sub Group to meet on a monthly basis to keep up to speed on the proposals
- the need for the Area Committee to be supplied with regular information around graffiti prosecutions  
*(The Area Leader responded and agreed to have further discussions with the Contact Centre with a view to improving the reporting of management information to Elected Members)*
- clarification of the current Health Visitor arrangements for Guiseley Health Centre  
*(The Area Leader responded and agreed to follow up this issue)*

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

#### **70 Transition of health improvement function to local government**

The Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager submitted a report outlining the significant changes taking place locally following the publishing of the recent government white paper and guidance which highlighted implications for the work of the local Health and Wellbeing area partnerships.

Tim Taylor, Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager, West North West presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.



In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- the need for more actions and initiatives around smoking
- clarification of the role and appointment of Ian Cameron, Joint Director of Public Health, NHS Leeds/Leeds city Council
- the need for more joint working to relieve the tensions within the health service

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted and welcomed.
- b) That this Committee notes the changes taking place as a result of recent national policy drivers and implications for local authorities.

**71 Future Options for Long term Residential and Day Care for Older People**

The Deputy Director – Strategic Commissioning, Adult Social Care submitted a report presenting the Area Committee with information relating to the future options for long term residential and day care services for older people. The report also outlined the consultation process to progress and implement the recommendations of the Executive Board agreed on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010 which was appended and formed the basis of the report.

Dennis Holmes, Deputy Director - Strategic Commissioning, Adult Social Care presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- the need to involve the Health and Well-being sub group as part of the consultation exercise
- clarification of the proposals for those people who are affected by the future options for long term residential and day care services for older people  
*(The Deputy Director – Strategic Commissioning responded and circulated a map showing the proposed options for the information of the meeting)*
- clarification of the role of the Neighbourhood Networks
- the need to address capital investment and consider the maintenance backlog when addressing the options
- the need to focus on best care provision when addressing the Adult Social Care budget
- the need to consult Horsforth Live at Home and Billing View Community Group with the proposals

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the criteria for determining the most appropriate option for each facility outlined in the Executive Board report be noted, particularly in terms of any specific local factors.
- c) That this Committee endorses the suggestion for any local voluntary organisations working with older people in the outer north west area as outlined in paragraph 15 of the report.

- d) That approval be given to refer the report to the Area Committee's Health and Well-being sub-group on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2011 for a response to be considered as part of the consultation.
- e) That this Committee notes that a further report on this issue would be submitted to the next Area Committee meeting in March 2011 for consideration.

(Councillor J L Carter left the meeting at 3.30pm at the conclusion of the above item)

## 72 **Delegation of Environmental Services**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing the Area Committee with an update on progress towards achieving delegation of certain environmental services from the next municipal year (June 2011). The report also presented proposals for the involvement of Members throughout this preparatory stage.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Delegation of Environmental Services showing how the proposed delegation will work through working to Service Level Agreements (Appendix 1 refers)
- Programme of Member Involvement (Appendix 2 refers)

Dayle Lynch, Project Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods presented the report and responded to Member's queries and comments.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- the infrequent cleaning of ginnels within the North West Outer area
- clarification of the procedure for checking the standard of work undertaken and whether or not this could be incorporated within the Service Level Agreement
- clarification of the sanctions available when enforcing a Service Level Agreement against a department  
*(The Area Leader responded and made reference to the forthcoming Localism Bill which would introduce new measures in holding people to account)*
- the need to involve and consult Parish Councils and for this to be written into the Service Level Agreement
- the need for 'spot' checks to be undertaken to ensure that routine street cleansing activities were being carried out, and that they were to acceptable standards
- the need for the Council to take ownership/action in relation to minimising the need for the public to make repeat calls in referring environmental issues

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee specifically notes the programme of Member involvement as outlined in the report.
- c) That approval be given to develop the delegation and Service Level Agreement through the Area Committee Environment sub-group, and for a further progress report being submitted to the next meeting in March 2011.

**73 Children's Services Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report on the support of local elected member engagement with the work of children's services by providing Area Committees with an update of key data relating to education for the academic year 2009-10 and November 2010 NEET and Not Known data. The report also provides details of recent key inspections that have taken place across Children's Services and provides an update on the development of the new Children and Young People's Plan 2011-2015.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Ofsted inspection judgments; attainment; absence/ attendance and exclusions data (Appendix 1 refers)
- NI 108 – Key Stage 4 attainment for Black and minority ethnic groups (Appendix 1a refers)
- NEET and Not Known data (Appendix 2 refers)

Jane Maxwell, Area Leader presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

**RESOLVED** –That the contents of the report and appendices be noted and welcomed in order to improve the Area Committee's role in improving outcomes locally.

**74 West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (WYFRS) - Collaborative Working within the Area Committees**

(At the request of the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, this item was deferred until the next meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011)

**75 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011 at 2.00pm (venue to be confirmed).

(The meeting concluded at 4.05pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH EAST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Rafique in the Chair  
Councillors J Dowson, S Hamilton,  
G Hussain, V Kendall, B Lancaster,  
M Lobley and E Taylor

### 73 Declaration of Interests

No declarations of interest were made.

### 74 Open Forum

Reference was made to the provisions contained in the Area Committee Procedure Rules for an Open Forum session to take place at each ordinary meeting of an Area Committee, for members of the public to ask questions or to make representations on any matter within the remit of the Area Committee. On this occasion, no such matters were raised.

### 75 Minutes - 31st January 2011

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the inquorate meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record, and the decisions taken at that meeting be confirmed.

### 76 Matters Arising from the Minutes

- a) Attendance of Chief Executive, Leeds City Council (Minute No. 58 refers)

With reference to Members comments at the last meeting regarding individual accountability of officers, Councillor Lobley clarified that, in particular, he was referring to vulnerable children. Whilst the Director of Children's Services bore ultimate responsibility, in Councillor Lobley's view, there was also a need for greater accountability at a lower level, e.g. social workers and team leaders dealing with particular cases.

- b) Expansion of Primary School Provision (Minute No. 67 refers)

It was confirmed that the 'dot maps' referred to at the last meeting, which plotted pupil intake for schools in the Committee's area, had subsequently been circulated to Members.

The Chair requested a report back in the new municipal year regarding the outcome of the review of the admission criteria by Education Leeds, the likely effects on selection of pupils and parental choice in respect of Roundhay High School, and the effect of adopting Braimwood Primary School as a feeder school for Roundhay High School on the long-term future of Kerr Mackie Primary School and the High School options of Kerr Mackie pupils.

c) West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (Minute No. 70 refers)

It was reported that Ian Thompson had taken over from Richard Gomersall as Station Manager, Moortown and Wetherby.

## **77 Dog Control Orders - Phase 2**

Further to Minute No. 16, 21<sup>st</sup> June 2010, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating Members on the introduction of Phase 2 of the City-wide Dog Control Orders. Phase 2 related to dogs being placed on leads whenever the owner was requested to do so by an authorised officer, and also excluding dogs from certain prescribed areas.

Stacey Campbell, Health and Environmental Action Service, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments. In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- It was suggested that Meanwood Park was an area where perhaps dogs should be kept on leads, and that children's play areas, such as in Roundhay Park, were areas where dogs should be excluded. It was suggested that Friends of Roundhay Park should be included in the public consultation exercise which would take place over the summer.
- Cemeteries were another area where dogs should possibly be banned – this was a sensitive issue, especially for Muslims. As a compromise, perhaps dogs should be kept on leads in cemeteries, to prevent them roaming and fouling.
- The use of signs to deter dog owners from allowing their dogs to foul was discussed, and a particular request was made for more signs in Chandos Avenue, Roundhay.
- Members were broadly supportive of a suggestion from the Area Leader regarding a possible publicity and education campaign.
- The Dog Control Orders did form part of the delegation of elements of Environmental Services to Area Committees, so the Area Committees should have some influence on these matters in their areas, but always bearing in mind the need for overall consistency across the City.
- Consultation would take place throughout the summer, with a view to reports going to the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Date Not Specified

and the Executive Board in the autumn, for implementation of any new orders early in 2012. It was agreed that the formal outcome of the consultation exercise should be relayed to Members at Ward Member meetings.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments and suggestions, the report be received and noted.

## **78 Children's Services - Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report updating Members on performance levels in a variety of areas, including recent statutory inspections of the adoption service, the youth offending service and five children's centres, various education performance indicators, the latest NEET (young people Not in Education, Employment or Training) figures, and the top priorities contained in the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP) 2011-15.

In attendance at the meeting, and responding to Members' queries and comments, was Ken Morton, Locality Enabler, Children's Services. In brief summary, the main areas of discussion were:-

- Ken Morton reported that the Children's Services and Education Leeds performance monitoring teams were in the process of being integrated and, following comments and requests made at other Area Committees, it was hoped that in future it would be possible to provide a more detailed statistical analysis, reflecting issues on a Ward, gender and ethnic background basis;
- Members raised concerns regarding performance levels at a particular local primary school, and enquired why Local Members had not been kept better informed?

The point was accepted. Refining the statistical analysis, as outlined in the previous bullet point, would assist Members and officers to highlight any potential areas of concern. Members would have access to this information and officers could be invited to attend Ward Member meetings to explore further any issues. The active involvement of Local Members was welcome. The Area Management Officer undertook to liaise with Ken Morton regarding this suggestion and to arrange attendance at Ward Member meetings.

- Members raised concerns regarding attainment levels and possible links to ethnicity or free school meal backgrounds, and requested a more detailed breakdown. It was explained that, presently, this could only be provided on an individual school basis, not on a Ward level basis, but this would be provided;
- NEETs- Some surprise was expressed at the number of NEETs in the Roundhay Ward, and some concern and frustration was also

expressed at current services aimed at assisting young people to find employment.

The recent improvements in the collection of NEET information, particularly the reduction in the number of 'Not Knowns' was explained, and the services currently on offer via IGEN, Prospects, the City College initiative, and the Council's efforts to promote apprenticeships, were outlined. Some of the structural changes at schools level, including sponsored academies were explained, as well as City-wide initiatives to provide integrated, coherent family support services, and the priority being given to improving school attendance as the first step in improving attainment levels.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments and requests for further information, the report be received and noted.

#### **79 Area Delivery Plan and Community Charter - Annual Refresh**

Further to Minute No. 62, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011, the Committee considered the report of the East North East Area Leader relating to refreshing the Area Delivery Plan and Community Charter for 2011/12.

In general, Members regarded that the draft Charter was still rather too detailed for its intended purpose, and that a pared down version, perhaps with links pointing interested people to sources of further, more detailed information would be more appropriate.

**RESOLVED** – That the Area Leader re-draft the proposed Community Charter 2011/12, taking into account Members' comments, and re-circulate it to Members via e-mail, with a deadline for any further comments, after which the Area Leader arrange for the final document to be produced and distributed and reported back to the next meeting for information purposes only.

(NB: Councillor J Dowson joined the meeting at 5.26 pm, during the consideration of this item.)

#### **80 Priority Neighbourhoods - Progress Report and Action Plans 2010/11**

**RESOLVED** – That the item be deferred to the June meeting.

#### **81 Inner North East Community Engagement Strategy 2011/12**

The Committee considered the report of the East North East Area Leader regarding the Committee's proposed Community Engagement Strategy 2011/12.

The Area Management Officer undertook to supply Councillor S Hamilton with details of the proposed equality impact assessment associated with the strategy.



**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the 'Working Together' community engagement strategy 2011/12 be approved;
- b) That the intention to use the Citizens' Panel, subject to the outcome of the pending review by Corporate Communications, be noted and endorsed.

**82 Delegation of Environmental Services**

Further to Minute No. 42, 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010, Minute No. 48, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010 and Minute No. 65, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating the Committee on the proposals to delegate elements of the Environmental Services to Area Committees in the new municipal year.

The next Members seminar, to discuss the draft Service Level Agreement, was on Thursday, 24<sup>th</sup> March 2011, 10.00 am to 1.00 pm, and Members had been sent a separate invitation to attend.

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

**83 Wellbeing Fund 2010/11 and 2011/12 - Update Report**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report updating the Committee on the current revenue and capital wellbeing budget balances, and setting out details of various applications for funding in 2011/12, principally in respect of summer holiday projects. Further to Minute No. 61, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011, the report also sought approval of several 'in principle' decisions taken at the last meeting.

Some Members felt that applications before the Committee tonight, if approved, represented a substantial proportion of the Committee's overall revenue budget for 2011/12, leaving relatively little funds for other applications later in the year. A concern was also expressed regarding the likelihood of duplication of effort, and participants, in respect of the suggested summer holiday programme. In this regard it was suggested that, in future, it would be more appropriate for all the holiday programme scheme providers to get together to discuss, rationalise and co-ordinate their efforts, and to submit their proposals earlier. For this year, it was proposed that consideration be deferred to the June meeting, to allow the Committee's Wellbeing Working Group to meet with and interview applicants before recommendations were made to the June Area Committee meeting.

Other Members felt that the way the Committee currently operated its wellbeing budgets, via the Wellbeing Working Group, and the composition of the Working Group itself, should be reviewed.

The consensus which emerged was that June was considered to be too late for considering summer holiday programme applications, decisions needed to be taken earlier, if not tonight. Decisions also needed to be taken in respect of several other applications, principally those approved in principle at the last meeting (Minute No. 61 refers).

It was also regarded that the Wellbeing Working Group had served the Committee well over the years. Notwithstanding that, the membership of the Group should be reviewed annually, along with other appointments.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted, including the delegated decisions taken by the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods following the January 31st Area Committee meeting, and the update on the Probation Community Payback scheme;
- b) That expenditure be approved in respect of the following projects, to be funded from the 2011/12 budget :-
  - i) Continuation of Neighbourhood Manager Post - £35,000
  - ii) Continuation of Community Payback Scheme - £15,000
  - iii) Festive Lights - £14,106\*
  - iv) Volunteer Thank You Event - £2,000
  - v) Consultation and Community Engagement - £2,000
  - vi) Community Skips - £3,000
  - vii) Roundhay Park run - £1,500
- c) That in respect of the remaining applications contained in the report, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be authorised to take the necessary delegated decisions, in consultation with the Committee's Wellbeing Working Group, all Area Committee Members to be invited to a special meeting of the Working Group, and at least one Member from each Ward to be present in order for decisions to be taken.

- \*(NB: 1) In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillors J Dowson and G Hussain wished it to be recorded that they abstained from voting in respect of the Festive Lights application (£14,106), and Councillor S Hamilton wished it to be recorded that she voted against granting this sum.
- 2) Councillor B Lancaster left the meeting at 6.45 pm at the conclusion of this item.)

#### **84 Dates, Times and Venues of Area Committee Meetings 2011/12**

**RESOLVED** – That the following dates and times be approved for meetings of the NE Inner Area Committee for the 2011/12 municipal year, venues to be arranged by the Area Leader in consultation with Members:-

Monday, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2011.

Monday, 5<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

Monday, 17<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

Monday, 12<sup>th</sup> December 2011.

Monday, 30<sup>th</sup> January 2012.

Monday, 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

All at 4.00 pm.

**85 Mike Earle, Democratic Services**

This being his last meeting prior to his retirement, on behalf of the Committee the Chair paid tribute to Mike Earle, Democratic Services, thanked him for all his work for the Council and wished him a long and happy retirement.

The meeting concluded at 6.46 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**MONDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Wilkinson in the Chair

Councillors A Lamb, J Procter,  
R D Feldman, Mrs R Feldman, P Harrand,  
A Castle and M Robinson

Apologies Councillor R Procter

### **53 Late Items**

In accordance with his powers under Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to admit to the agenda a late report in respect of Agenda Item 11 (Minute No. 66 refers) – Wellbeing Fund 2010/11 – Update Report.

The report had not been available at the time of agenda despatch, but it was regarded as necessary to consider it as a late item of urgent business, as it contained details of applications for funding from various local organisations.

### **54 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence from the meeting was submitted on behalf of Councillor R Procter.

### **55 Declaration of Interests**

The following declarations of personal interest were made:-

- Agenda Item 19 (Minute No. 63 refers) – West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service – Collaborative Working within Area Committees – Councillors A Castle and P Harrand in their capacity as members of the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

See also Minute No. 61.

### **56 Open Forum**

Reference was made to the provision contained in the Area Committee Procedure Rules for an Open Forum session to take place at each ordinary meeting of an Area Committee, to allow members of the public to ask questions or to make representations on matters which fell within the remit of the Area Committee. On this occasion, no such matters were raised.

### **57 Minutes - 6th December 2010**

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

## **58 Towards Integrated Locality Working**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report outlining the concept of locality working across the City, and how this was proposed to be introduced.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were Shaid Mahmood, Area Leader, South East Leeds, and Rory Barke, Area Leader, East and North East Leeds. In brief summary the main points of discussion were:-

- Whilst welcoming the appointment of Rory Barke to his new position under the revised arrangements, Members expressed some scepticism at the impact the new Area Leader posts would have in practice. It was regarded that much of the power over local service delivery still lay either with other Council officers – Streetscene Services being a good example – or with partner agencies which had their own priorities and budget issues. In these circumstances, Members were likely to adhere to the tried and tested method of contacting the Chief Officer or the Chief Executive direct if they had any problems. The officers accepted that it was unrealistic to expect an overnight improvement, it would be a gradual process. However, experience with the pathfinder project, piloted in SE Leeds, had shown that greater co-ordination of services and effort towards the common goal of improved services at local level had led to real achievements in community engagement, partnership working and locality improvements.

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

## **59 Proposed Delegation of Environmental Services to Area Committees**

Further to Minute No. 35, 25<sup>th</sup> October 2010, and Minute No. 45, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating the Committee regarding the proposed delegation of elements of Streetscene Services to Area Committees with effect from the beginning of the new Municipal Year.

In attendance at the meeting, and responding to Members' queries and comments, was Dayle Lynch, Environment and Neighbourhoods Department. In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- It was explained that overall control of the delegated services would remain with the Chief Officer Environmental Services within the Environment and Neighbourhoods Department. In terms of day to day operation of the services, this responsibility would lay with three posts

of Locality Manager, one within each of the three wedges across the City.

- Reference was made to Member involvement to date, which included an Outer NE workshop held on 12<sup>th</sup> January, and proposals for further Member involvement in Phase 2 of the implementation plan in February and March, which included discussions on proposed Service Level Agreements for each Area Committee area.
- Members were not convinced that the proposals were a material improvement on existing arrangements. No extra resources were being made available, and it appeared that central control would be maintained over staff and machinery.

It was explained that, via the Area Leaders and the Locality Managers, Area Committees would have a real say in establishing priorities in their areas and allocating resources to meet those priorities.

- Members regarded that the whole concept was ill-conceived and requested that the architect of the proposals appear before them to enable them to further explore their concerns. Members also requested to know the costs involved in the proposed exercise, including all the consultation arrangements. They were also sceptical regarding any alleged cost savings.
- Members also requested to be supplied with concrete details regarding current service and expenditure levels in the NE Outer area, together with details of proposed expenditure levels and equipment levels under the new proposals.
- Members also queried whether, as it appeared, this proposed delegation was a fait accompli, or whether Area Committees could opt for the status quo ?

In response, officers replied that if the majority of Area Committees did not regard the proposed new arrangements as satisfactory, then the proposed delegation may have to be reviewed. However, the proposals had generally found favour with Members. If the discontent was with only one or two areas, then perhaps in those particular areas the situation would have to be looked at again, but this would mean that those particular Area Committees would not be able to shape service levels or priorities to the same degree.

- In conclusion, Members stated that they were not content with the current proposals, which, in their view, passed responsibility down to Area Committees, but without any real power or control over resources.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments and concerns, the update report be received and noted.

(NB: Councillor P Harrand left the meeting at 6.20 pm, at the conclusion of this item.)

## **60 Children's Services - Performance Report**

Further to Minute No. 26, 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010, and Minute No. 33(a), 25<sup>th</sup> October 2010, the Director of Children's Services submitted a report updating the Committee on performance levels in a variety of areas, including recent statutory inspections of the adoption service, the youth offending service and five children's centres, various education performance indicators, the latest NEET (young people Not in Education, Employment or Training), and the top priorities contained in the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP) 2011-2015.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were Amanda Jackson, Locality Enabler, Children's Services, and Shaid Mahmood, Area Leader, South East Leeds. In brief summary the main areas of discussion were:-

- The development of the multi-disciplinary children's wellbeing concept across the City, as outlined to the Committee at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010 (Minute No. 26 refers). This concept was evolving.

Members reiterated their view expressed on 20<sup>th</sup> September, that it was important that resources followed the child – in other words, in an area like the NE Outer area, where a lot of pupils from across the City travelled to school, then the resources needed to be allocated to provide appropriate services in the NE Outer area, and not all linked to a young person's home address.

This point was acknowledged, as was the need to work collaboratively across wedge boundaries.

- Members expressed concern at the number of 'Not Knowns' amongst the NEET statistics, and the possible or potential problems which this statistic might be masking.

The officers accepted that this was a major challenge and more work needed to be done. However, a lot of work had already been done and the latest available figures represented a significant improvement on the previous position.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

## **61 Future Options for Long Term Residential Care and Day Care for Older People**

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011



The Committee received and considered a report submitted by the Deputy Director of Adult Social Care (Strategic Commissioning) relating to future options for the provision of long term residential care and day care for older people in Leeds, and the current extensive consultation exercise taking place on the issue.

In attendance at the meeting and responding to Members' queries and comments, were Michele Tynan and Kim Maslyn, Adult Social Care.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The costs associated with possibly modernising the Council-owned accommodation, compared with the already cheaper services on offer in the private sector.
- The lack of consultation to date with Local Members. Members regarded that, in effect, they were being presented with a fait accompli - the Executive Board had effectively decided that savings needed to be made and, in the Area Committee's view, this consultation exercise was merely an academic exercise, pending the decision later in the year to close facilities.

The officers stressed that no decisions had been taken, and the present consultation process was a very real process, in which all stakeholders' views were being sought and would be taken into account in the final report back to the Executive Board in the summer.

- Primrose Hill Residential Home, Boston Spa – Members expressed surprise that residents and relatives had not, to date, been consulted on the review. The officers responded that, clearly, they would be consulted, but in their experience, and from comments which had been received in the past, residents, relatives and staff found it unsettling and upsetting to be consulted in a general way on non-specific proposals – it often raised unnecessary fears.

Members were also sceptical whether, if Primrose Hill did close, places could be found locally for the 36 current residents. In their view, any suggested closure of Primrose Hill should be co-ordinated with the proposed opening of the new private home in Wetherby, and Primrose Hill residents should be given priority in terms of the new home.

The officers drew Members' attention to the information and options set out in the report to the Executive Board at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, which was appended to the report on tonight's agenda.

- The Chair requested that officers add Wetherby In Support of the Elderly (WISE) to their list of organisations to be consulted – Area Management Officer to supply the details. Also, Boston Spa Parish Council.

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

(NB: Councillor M Robinson declared a personal interest in this item, as he had a relative who was resident in a care home.)

## **62 Transformation of Learning Disability Day Services**

The Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report informing Members of a current review of learning disability day services across the City, the aim of which was to move away from segregated services based in large, former adult training centres, which were now viewed as outdated and a potential barrier to independence and social inclusion.

In terms of the NE Outer area, consultation was progressing on the potential closure of the Wetherby Fulfilling Lives Centre on Sandbeck Way, and the provision of possible smaller alternative facilities. A number of potential sites had, or were, being considered, including the Wetherby One Stop Centre (subsequently regarded as unsuitable), Wetherby Leisure Centre or part of the Leeds City College site (formerly Wetherby High School).

Michele Tynan and Andy Rawnsley, Adult Social Care, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments. In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- Members again raised their concerns at a lack of consultation to date with Local Members. It appeared to them that, yet again, they were being faced with a fait accompli, with only lip service being paid to consultation.
- Issues were raised regarding the suggested use of part of the Leeds City College site – this school now had Trust status and Councillor Lamb indicated that he was unaware of the suggestion, even though he was a school governor. Expectations may have been raised amongst service users and their carers which the Department might not be able to fulfil. Concern was expressed that the proposals for this site only proposed to cater for approximately half the current users of the Wetherby Fulfilling Lives Centre, which meant that friendship groups might have to be broken up.
- On a more general point, Members regarded that it was hypocritical of the Council to talk of an expanded and enhanced role for Area Committees, and the development of a 'One Council / Locality Working' concept, whilst examples of lack of involvement and consultation, such as this item and the last, were rife.

**RESOLVED** – That a meeting be sought with the Executive Member (Adult Health and Social Care) to further explore and explain the Committee's concerns.

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Monday, 21st March, 2011

**63 West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service - Collaborative Working within the Area Committees**

Graham Ambler, Deputy Station Commander, Moortown and Wetherby, presented a report regarding the community risk management strategy initiative included in the WYFRS Service Plan 2011-15. The service already worked collaboratively with its public sector partners across the City. However, in these times when all public sector organisations faced budget pressures, it was regarded that even closer working ties would be mutually beneficial. For instance, the Fire and Rescue Service could no longer afford to maintain its home safety check programme and its resources had to be targeted at the most vulnerable – hence the need for closer co-operation and data sharing between agencies. As an example, PCSOs in the area had been taught home safety basics and would also alert the Fire and Rescue Service, say when someone would benefit from having a smoke alarm fitted. The Fire and Rescue Service also ran educational programmes in schools and in respect of arsonists.

Members welcomed the suggestion regarding more joined-up services. It was suggested that WYFRS representatives might be invited to occasionally attend Ward Member meetings and, in the meantime, if Members wished to pass on any information regarding vulnerable constituents, or contacts who might be helpful to WYFRS, then this could be done via the Area Management Officer.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be received and noted.

**64 Appointments to Outside Bodies - Ancient Parish of Barwick in Elmet Trust**

**RESOLVED** – That Mr Jack Anderson be re-appointed as the Council's representative on the Ancient Parish of Barwick in Elmet Trust for a further four year period of office.

**65 Appointments to Outside Bodies - Lady Elizabeth Hastings' Educational Foundation**

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor John Procter be appointed as the Council's Nominative Foundation Trustee on this charity for a period of three years, commencing from the date of the resignation of the existing Trustee, Mr Michael Fox, or from the end of his term of office in June 2012, whichever is the sooner.

**66 Wellbeing Fund 2010/11 - Update Report**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report updating the Committee on its current revenue and capital wellbeing budgets, and setting out details of some applications before the Committee for a decision.

Further to Minute No. 34, 25<sup>th</sup> October 2010, and Minute No. 47, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the report also addressed proposals to rectify the accounting error previously identified and discussed.

Members felt that there was still confusion surrounding the Committee's previous and current financial position and, in view of that, they could not satisfy themselves that what was being proposed fully rectified the matter.

**RESOLVED** – That a decision be deferred, and a further meeting be sought with the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods to discuss the Committee's wellbeing budget situation.

#### **67 Area Delivery Plan and Community Charter 2011/12 - Update Report**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report regarding the preparation of the draft Area Delivery Plan (ADP) and Community Charter 2011/12, the final draft version of which was proposed to be submitted to the next meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

Some concerns were raised regarding the content of both documents, which contained commitments over which the Area Committee had no direct control, i.e. services provided by partner agencies. The value of producing a separate Community Charter document was also questioned.

The Area Leader indicated that similar comments had been made at other Area Committees, and the proposed content of the documents could be reviewed. However, the ADP was not just about the Area Committee's commitments – a key role and responsibility of Area Committees was to engage its public sector partners in dialogue and to hold them to account for their promises, so this needed to be reflected somehow in the ADP. With regard to the production of a Community Charter document, unlike the ADP, this was entirely discretionary, but it did help to simplify the ADP commitments and aims for the wider public.

**RESOLVED** – That a decision be deferred pending further discussions at Ward Member meetings.

#### **68 Town and Parish Council Forum - Feedback Report**

It was noted that Councillor Wilkinson would Chair the next Forum meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April, in lieu of Councillor J Procter.

**RESOLVED** – That the notes of the Harewood and Wetherby Town and Parish Council Forum meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be received and noted.

#### **69 Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting**

Monday, 21<sup>st</sup> March 2011, 6.00 pm, Treetops Community Centre, Alwoodley.

The meeting concluded at 8.32 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **EAST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 2011**

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

Councillors S Armitage, M Dobson,  
P Grahame, P Gruen, W Hyde, J Lewis,  
M Lyons, T Murray, D Schofield and  
K Wakefield

### **57 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the February meeting of the East (Outer) Area Committee.

### **58 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Armitage declared a personal interest in agenda item 9, Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2010/11, in her capacity as Chair of Swarcliffe Good Neighbours. (Minute No. 64 refers)

Councillor W Hyde declared a personal interest in agenda item 9, Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2010/11, in his capacity as Chair of Cross Gates Good Neighbours. (Minute No. 64 refers)

Councillor P Grahame declared a personal interest in agenda item 9, Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2010/11, in her capacity as a Member of Cross Gates Good Neighbours Scheme. (Minute No. 64 refers)

Further declarations of interest were made at later points in the meeting. (Minute No. 65 refers)

### **59 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **60 Minutes - 7th December 2010**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **61 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

#### Minute No. 44 – Community Centres Report

Martin Hackett, Area Management Officer, reported that the Community Centres Sub-Committee met on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2011. The Area Committee was informed that there was no longer a maintenance budget for each community

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd March, 2011

centre – there was now a centrally held budget of £1m for council owned buildings.

#### Minute No. 52 – Annual Report – for Parks and Countryside Service in East Outer Area Committee

Clarification was provided about arrangements for the transfer of St Aidan's site – it was pointed out that the timescale for transfer was likely to be in excess of one year.

#### Minute No. 53 – Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2010/11

Members were informed that the Methley 'switch on' was cancelled due to severe weather conditions. It was reported that the Cross Gates 'switch on' did take place and was a great success.

### **62 Open Forum**

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

On this occasion, there were no matters raised under this item by members of the public.

### **63 Actions, Achievements and update report**

The South East Area Manager submitted a report which updated Members on the actions and achievements of the Area Management Team since the last meeting.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Minutes of East Children Leadership Team held on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010
- Draft City Health and Wellbeing Priority Plan 2011-15
- Minutes of East North East Divisional Community Safety Partnership Meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2010
- Minutes of Cross Gates Consultative Forum held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010
- Minutes of Halton Moor Forum held on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010
- Minutes of Halton Fourm held on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2010
- Minutes of Garforth and Swillington Forum held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

Martin Hackett, Area Management Officer, presented the report and responded to Members' questions and comments.

In brief summary, the main highlighted points were:

- Community Centres Sub Committee – various issues associated with the pricings and lettings policy, e.g. greater consistency needed in

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd March, 2011



terms of lettings charges with a view to developing market and subsidy rates. The Area Management Officer agreed to report back to the Area Committee on progress with the review on pricings and lettings.

- The Area Committee considered appointments to the outer east environmental sub-group. Councillors Pauleen Grahame and Tom Murray volunteered to serve on this group. It was reported that if any Member from Temple Newsam or Kippax and Methley Wards wished to join this sub-group then they should contact Area Management.
- The Chair welcomed to the meeting Graham Ambler, Station Commander, West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, to provide an update on restructuring of the service.  
Key areas were discussed as follows:
  - the current financial climate and the impact of cuts on the service – Members were advised that there would be no changes to fire cover, although there would be some changes to crew arrangements, e.g. some fire-fighters would be expected to work longer hours.
  - acknowledgement and positive contribution of fire prevention work.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted
- (b) That Councillors Pauleen Grahame and Tom Murray be appointed to serve on the outer east environmental sub-group to progress the delegation and service level agreement with environmental services.

**64 Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2010/11**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report which contained details of proposed projects and activities to deliver local actions relating to the agreed themes and outcomes of the Area Delivery Plan (ADP).

Martin Hackett, Area Management Officer, presented the report.

Members supported the work of previous gardening schemes, particularly in terms of the benefits to local communities. Some Members felt there was less demand for the decorating aspect of the scheme.

Members discussed increasing the charge of cricket coaching in 2011 from 50p to £1.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted
- (b) That the following decision be made in relation to an application for 2010/11 revenue wellbeing funding:

- Garforth Arts Festival – £5,000 approved.

- (c) That a decision on Swarcliffe Good Neighbours providing a

gardening / decorating scheme in 2011/12, be deferred to the March 2011 Area Committee.

## **65 Future Options for Long term Residential and Day Care for Older People**

The Deputy Director (Strategic Commissioning) of Adult Social Care submitted a report which presented the Area Committee with information in relation to future options for long term residential and day care services for older people.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting the following officers to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments:

- Anna Clifford, Programme Manager, Adult Social Care
- Kim Maslyn, Head of Service – Support and Enablement, Adult Social Care.

In brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- The role of Neighbourhood Networks and the range of services provided.
- Concerns about the lack of consultation with Elected Members.
- The need for more detailed information in the report about the following key areas:
  - greater social policy and budget context
  - how do we move forward?
  - The role of neighbourhood networks, particularly in terms of supporting people living in their own homes.
- Concerns about the impact of proposed changes on dementia sufferers.
- Ongoing work with the Intermediate Care Team and other joined up working.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

(Councillor W Hyde declared a personal interest in this item in his capacity as Chair of the Federation of East Leeds Neighbourhood Networks.)

(Councillor Armitage declared a personal interest in this item in her capacity as a Member of the Federation of East Leeds Neighbourhood Networks.)

## **66 Towards Integrated Locality Working**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report which informed the Area Committee on the progress of recent work on locality working through a Locality Working Pathfinder in the South East wedge of the city.

Appended to the report was a copy of the Locality Working Draft Design Principles.

Keith Lander, Deputy Area Manager, presented the report.

Members welcomed the design principles, although it was felt that greater focus was needed in relation to delivering tangible outcomes.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

## **67 Delegation of Environmental Services**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report which provided the Area Committee with an update on progress towards achieving delegation of certain environmental services from the 2011/12 municipal year.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Diagram showing how the proposed delegation will work
- Proposed programme of member involvement.

Keith Lander, Deputy Area Manager, presented the report and responded to Members' questions and comments.

In brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- Clarification about ownership and responsibility of ginnels and whether they formed part of the delegation. The Area Committee also requested a map of ginnels in the outer east area.
- Greater focus needed on outcomes, e.g. specifying the frequency of litterbins being emptied, etc.
- Concern about current reporting arrangements and the need to develop a more co-ordinated approach.
- Members requested further information about the level of litter pickers in the outer east area.

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted
- (b) That a further progress report be submitted to the next Area Committee in March 2011.

(Councillor Wakefield left the meeting at 3.50 pm and Councillor Dobson at 3.55 pm, during the consideration of this item.)

## **68 South East Health and Wellbeing Programme**

The South East Health and Improvement Wellbeing Manager submitted a report which outlined the significant changes taking place locally following

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd March, 2011

publication of the recent government white paper and highlighted implications for the work of the local area partnerships.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, Bash Uppal, Health and Improvement Wellbeing Manager, and Councillor James Lewis (outer east health and wellbeing champion), to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments.

In brief summary, the main areas of discussion were:

- Local context – emphasis of work focussed on the inner south area
  - Mapping of local facilities taking place
  - Developing the role of the Citizen's Panel and First Contact Scheme.

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

## **69 Children's Services Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report which provided Area Committees with an update against key data in relation to education for the academic year 2009-10; and November 2010 NEET and Not Known data. The report also provided details of recent key inspections that had taken place across Children's Services and provided an update on the development of the new Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) 2011-2015.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Ofsted inspection judgements; attainment; absence / attendance and exclusions data
- National Indicator 108 – Key Stage 4 attainment for black and minority ethnic groups
- NEET and Not Known data
- Draft Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) for 2011-15

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, Ken Morton, Locality Enabler, Children's Services, to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments.

There was concern about the level of absenteeism at primary schools and the reasons behind this, e.g. illness and other family reasons. One Member raised the issue of parents taking their children on holiday during term time when the cost of going on holiday was less expensive. It was also queried whether any work had been undertaken with holiday operators to try and restrict this practice. The Locality Enabler agreed to report back.

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

(Councillor Gruen left the meeting at 4.15 pm during the consideration of this item.)

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd March, 2011

## **70 Dates and Times of Future Meetings**

To note the remaining meeting date and time for the 2010/11 municipal year:

- Tuesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2011 at 3.00 pm

(Meeting to take place at Leeds Civic Hall, Committee Rooms 6 and 7)

(The meeting concluded at 4.25 pm.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SOUTH (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Gabriel in the Chair

Councillors J Blake, D Congreve, G Driver,  
K Groves, E Nash and A Ogilvie

### **57 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the February meeting of the South (Inner) Area Committee.

### **58 Late Items**

The Chair admitted to the agenda additional wellbeing projects for approval, to be considered under agenda item 8, Inner South Wellbeing Budget. (Minute No. 64 refers)

The Chair also admitted to the agenda a map highlighting elderly residential and day care provision in the inner south area, to be considered as part of agenda item 9, Future Options for Long term Residential and Day Care for Older People. (Minute No. 65 refers)

### **59 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **60 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillors Davey and Iqbal.

### **61 Minutes - 12th January 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **62 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

#### Minute No. 50 – Open Forum

In relation to concerns about parked vehicles on Princes Street, Holbeck, it was reported that yellow lines had now been introduced. One member of the public raised concern that there were some gaps in the markings. Members were informed that the Highways Department were looking into the issue.

## Minute No. 55 – Actions and Achievements Report

Keith Lander, Deputy Area Manager, confirmed that details of independent and voluntary sports providers had been forwarded to Members.

### **63 Open Forum**

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

A representative of SPLASH attended the meeting and expressed concern about the proposed closure of leisure facilities. Members highlighted the budget pressures facing the Council – it was reported that there was now £1m less in the leisure centre budget. In response to a query, the Area Committee was informed that there were still some possibilities in relation to maintaining provision at South Leeds Sports Centre, although no further details were available at this stage. Another representative of SPLASH sought clarification about the timescales involved to develop South Leeds Sports Centre – Councillor Ogilvie agreed to attend a future SPLASH meeting to discuss this issue and other related concerns.

Mick Wood, Station Commander at Hunslet Fire Station, reported that West Yorkshire Fire Service were available to attend community meetings / events, to discuss fire safety measures and other activities in the local area. For further information please contact [mick.wood@westyorkshirefire.gov.uk](mailto:mick.wood@westyorkshirefire.gov.uk)

A member of the public requested an update in relation to the recent meeting involving Tesco's to develop sites in Holbeck. It was reported that there had been interest in various sites and discussions were ongoing.

### **64 Inner South Wellbeing Budget**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report which contained details of proposed projects and activities to deliver local actions relating to the agreed themes and outcomes of the Area Delivery Plan (ADP).

Keith Lander, Deputy Area Manager, presented the report.

The Chair welcomed representatives of St Luke's Cares and Re'new to present a review of work undertaken throughout 2010/11, together with outline proposals for further work in 2011/12.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report and information appended to the report be noted
- (b) That the proposals for revenue wellbeing funding 2011/12, submitted by St Luke's Cares and Re'new be deferred to enable further discussions with Ward



Members, with a view to a further report being submitted to the March Area Committee

(c) That the following proposals for capital wellbeing funding be approved as follows:

- Hunslet Library – £70,529
- Holbeck binyards – £45,000
- Holbeck street nameplates – £8,000.

## **65 Future Options for Long term Residential and Day Care for Older People**

The Deputy Director (Strategic Commissioning) of Adult Social Care submitted a report which presented the Area Committee with information in relation to future options for long term residential and day care services for older people.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting Dennis Holmes, Deputy Director (Strategic Commissioning), Adult Social Care, to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments:

In brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- Concern about the future of Harry Booth House, which it was highlighted, was the only council owned residential home in the inner south area. The Area Committee was advised that there were a number of council owned residential homes in need of further investment. One Member requested further information about alternative provision, which the Deputy Director (Strategic Commissioning) undertook to provide.
- The role of Neighbourhood Networks in supporting the consultation process.
- Concerns associated with mixed services at day care centres, etc and support for dementia sufferers.
- Exploring opportunities for voluntary and community sector organisations to extend the range of services offered.

**RECOMMENDED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

(Councillor Nash left the meeting at 7.50 pm during the consideration of this item. The Chair advised that the meeting was now inquorate as there were no Members present from the City and Hunslet Ward. Any formal decisions would need to be ratified at the March Area Committee meeting.)

## **66 Children's Services Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report which provided Area Committees with an update against key data in relation to education for the academic year 2009-10; and November 2010 NEET and Not Known data. The report also provided details of recent key inspections that had taken place

Minutes approved as a correct record  
at the meeting held on Thursday, 24th March, 2011

across Children's Services and provided an update on the development of the new Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) 2011-2015.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Ofsted inspection judgements; attainment; absence / attendance and exclusions data
- National Indicator 108 – Key Stage 4 attainment for black and minority ethnic groups
- NEET and Not Known data
- Draft Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) for 2011-15

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, Ken Morton, Locality Enabler, Children's Services, to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments.

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:

- The need for more detailed local data and analysis in the report.
- The role of clusters and other key agencies in tackling issues relating to absenteeism and NEET.
- One Member requested a breakdown of exclusion data, including numbers as well as percentages.

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

(Councillor Congreve left the meeting at 8.25 pm during the consideration of this item.)

## **67 Delegation of Environmental Services**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report which provided the Area Committee with an update on progress towards achieving delegation of certain environmental services from the 2011/12 municipal year.

The following information was appended to the report:

- Diagram showing how the proposed delegation will work
- Proposed programme of member involvement.

Keith Lander, Deputy Area Manager, presented the report and responded to Members' questions and comments.

In brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- One Member requested further information about resource implications and monitoring arrangements.
- Clarification whether enforcement and educational awareness formed part of the delegation.

- Clarification about services included as part of the delegation – Members were advised that refuse and recycling services and city centre street cleansing had not been included in the scope delegation.
- Members were encouraged to participate in the member involvement programme of workshops.
- Raising awareness in schools, community groups, etc and developing community pride, e.g. positive work undertaken in the Cardinals area developing street champions, Friends of Middleton Park organising litter picks, etc.
- More litter bins needed as well as increasing the frequency of emptying the bins.
- Examples of good practice in the UK and abroad.

**RECOMMENDED** – That the report and information appended to the report be noted.

## **68 Dates, Times and Venues of Future Meetings**

To note the remaining meeting date, time and venue for the 2010/11 municipal year:

- Thursday, 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2011 at 6.30 pm

Meeting to take place at South Leeds Youth Hub, Middleton Road, Belle Isle, Leeds, LS10 3JA.

(The meeting concluded at 8.40 pm.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SOUTH (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor R Finnigan in the Chair

Councillors J Dunn, J Elliott, B Gettings,  
S Golton, T Grayshon, T Leadley,  
L Mulherin, K Renshaw, S Varley and  
D Wilson

### **64 Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations at this stage of the meeting.

### **65 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor S Smith

### **66 Minutes - 31 January 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2011, be confirmed as a correct record.

### **67 Open Forum**

The agenda made reference to the provision contained in the Area Committee Procedure rules for an Open Forum Session at each ordinary meeting of an Area Committee, for members of the public to ask questions or to make representations on matters within the terms of reference of the Area Committee. On this occasion, no matters were raised under this item by those members of the public who were in attendance.

### **68 Dog Control Orders - Phase 2**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods provided information to the Area Committee with regards to the Council's proposals to introduce further Dog Control Orders across the City. Dog Control Orders have been considered in two phases. Phase One orders came into force on 1 February 2011.

The Chair welcomed Graham Wilson, Head of Environmental Services to the meeting.

It was reported that Dog Control Orders had been introduced to encourage responsible dog ownership and Members were reminded of the orders

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on 4 July 2011

introduced during phase one. These limited the numbers of dogs that could be walked by one person, introduced some exclusion areas (children's playgrounds) and areas where dogs had to be kept on leads when requested to do so. Phase two would introduce further exclusion areas and areas where dogs were to be kept on leads at all times.

The Committee was informed of the consultation process for Phase Two which would give landowners opportunity to opt in to the exclusion areas. It was planned for the consultation to go public in July 2011 before referral back to the Scrutiny Board (Environment & Neighbourhoods) for further consideration.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Exclusion on Golf courses – it was reported that this may not be possible due to the requirement for signposting and the area of land covered but other enforcement issues could still be applied.
- Enforcement – concern was expressed that there weren't enough Dog Wardens across the City to enforce the orders and that other staff should be trained. It was reported that other staff with enforcement powers would be able to issue fixed penalty notices and it was recognised there needed to be an expansion of enforcement staff. The use of PCSOs was also discussed.
- The use of Dog Control Orders on private land which had public rights of way – all land that had public access could be subject of a Dog Control Order. Issues where landowners left dogs in what could be considered to be a threatening position could be in breach of the Dangerous Dogs Act.
- Dog Wardens could operate alone and did not need anyone else to corroborate evidence where fixed penalty issues were noticed or for any breach of Dog Control Orders.
- Cemeteries – the move to ensure dogs be kept on leads in cemeteries was welcomed.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and proposals for Dog Control Orders be noted.

(Councillors Finnigan, Golton and Renshaw joined the meeting during the discussion on this item. Councillor Finnigan assumed the Chair at the end of the item).

## **69 Children's Services Performance Report**

The report of the Director of Children's Services supported local member engagement with the work of Children's Services by providing the Area Committee with an update against key data relating to education for the academic year 2009/10 and November 2010 and NEET and Not Known data. It also provided details of recent key inspections that had taken place across

Children's Services and provided an update on the development of the new Children and Young People's Plan 2011-15.

Shaid Mahmood, South East Area Leader presented this item to the Committee.

Members attention was brought to the appendices to the report which included data on the following issues:

- Ofsted Inspection reports on schools
- Level 4 attainment at Key Stage Level 2
- Information relating to proportion of pupils achieving 5 grade A\*-C or equivalent in GCSEs.
- Attendance and Absence records
- Exclusions
- Those not in education, employment or training (NEETs) and others whose information was not known.

Other issues referred to include inspections across Children's Services including those on the Adoption Service and the Youth Offending Service and the outcomes of the Children's and Young People's Plan.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The use of free schools meal data for providing information.
- Each school had its own individual targets to meet.
- Concern regarding the numbers of children leaving primary school who could not read.
- Members requested information on a ward basis. It was suggested that this could be provided at Ward Member briefings.
- Members welcomed areas of good progress including looked after children and improvements in attainment.
- The need to tackle issues such as absence and poor attainment as these eventually led to NEETs.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted
- b) That ward information be supplied to Members at Ward briefings.

#### **70 St Gabriel's Community Centre - 12 Month Review**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods provided a review of the operation of St Gabriel's Community Centre over the last 12 months. It highlighted the work of the Management Committee, Area Management and partners in supporting the operation of the Centre.

Tom O'Donovan, South East Area Management presented the report.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on 4 July 2011

The Committee was reminded of the review period for St Gabriel's Community Centre, youth service provision at the centre and support given by Area Management. Attention was brought to current financial position and the protocols developed for the management of the centre.

The following issues were discussed:

- Difficulties in contacting Corporate Property Management with regard to repairs.
- A suggestion that it could be transferred to a community group or 'Friends of' group to be managed independently.
- Difficulty in arranging lettings.
- Prohibitive costs for letting the centre and a need to review the charging policy.
- Caretaking arrangements.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted and a further report be brought to the Area Committee in March 2012.

(Councillor Renshaw declared a personal interest in this item due to her position on the St Gabriel's Community Centre Management Committee)

## **71 Site Based Gardeners in Community Parks and Green Spaces**

The report of the Chief Recreation Officer provided the Area Committee with a review of the site based gardeners scheme that was currently funded by the Area Committee Wellbeing fund. This funding was due to cease on 31 March 2011. It also outlined options available to the Area Committee for the continuation of the service.

The Chair welcomed Victoria Nunns, to the meeting.

There were two options for continuation of the service detailed in the report. The first option would be for 12 months at a cost of £69,903 and the second would be for 6 months at a cost of £34,951.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Use of Probation Service Community Payback Teams – these had been used where possible and more assistance would be welcomed but they could not carry out some of the more specialised work.
- Security provided by the presence of site based gardeners.

**RESOLVED** –

- a) That the report be noted.



- b) That the decision on the options to continue the service be deferred to the Wellbeing Fund item.

## **72 Priority Neighbourhood Worker and Neighbourhood Improvement Plans 2008-11**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods introduced the evaluation report of the Priority Neighbourhood Worker project and the 2008-11 Neighbourhood Improvement Plan programme as part of the Wellbeing funding monitoring process. Members were requested to consider the future of the programme.

Tom O'Donovan, South East Area Management presented the report and introduced Judith Hickman, Health For All and Nicky Greening to the meeting.

The Committee was informed of the work of the Priority Neighbourhood Worker that had taken place with groups and individuals and the leadership role within communities. The progress of the Neighbourhood Improvement Plans was highlighted and members were reminded of the previous evaluation and the key community engagement role involved.

Members welcomed the report and the work to date and supported the continuation.

### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted.
- b) That the future work as outlined in 4.0 be agreed as an Area Committee priority.
- c) That the PNW project be extended for a further 2 years from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2013, subject to annual Executive Board approval of future Wellbeing Budgets

## **73 Well Being Report**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods provided the Area Committee with the following:

- Confirmation of the 2011/12 revenue allocation
- The current position on the wellbeing budget
- Details of revenue and capital funding for consideration and approval
- Details of revenue agreed to date
- Details of capital projects agreed to date
- A summary of the revenue allocation for 2010/11 already approved and linked to the priorities and outcomes of the Area Delivery Plan
- A summary of projected and possible revenue allocations for 2011/12

Tom O'Donovan presented the report and gave the Committee further details on the project applications.

## **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted.
- b) That the position of the Well being Budget as set out at 3.0 be noted
- c) That the revenue amounts for 2010/11 as outlined in Appendix 1 be noted.
- d) That the Wellbeing capital projects already agreed as listed in Appendix 2 be noted.
- e) That the 2011/12 revenue Well being budget as allocations as detailed in 3.2 be agreed including £34,591.50 for site based gardeners.
- f) That the following project proposals be approved:
  - Off Road Bikes - £2,964 (revenue)
  - Mother's Pride Tea Time Club - £3,750 (revenue)
  - My Woodkirk - £20,000 (capital)
  - East Ardsley Recreation Ground Footpath Improvements - £5,000 (capital)
  - Proposed Zebra Crossing (Leadwell Lane/Westfield Road) - £20,000 (capital)
  - Gildersome Guiding Centenary - £2,000 (capital)
  - Improved Access Arrangements, East and West Ardsley Allotment Gardens - £3,000 (capital)
- g) That the small grants situation in 5.1 be noted.

(Councillors Elliott and Varley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item due to their positions with Morley Murals (application for funding from My Woodkirk) and left the meeting during the discussion and decision making on this application)

## **74 Area Leader's Report**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods detailed a range of activities that had taken place in the Outer South Leeds Area and provided Members with an update on actions and achievements of the Area Management Team relating to priorities and work of the Area Committee since the Area Committee meeting in January 2011.

Tom O'Donovan presented the report and brought Members attention to the Community Centres Sub Committee, the Oulton and Woodlesford Design Statement and South Leeds Youth Hub. Members were requested to consider a funding request in respect of the Oulton and Woodlesford Design Statement.

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

**75 Dates, Times and Venues of Future Meetings**

**RESOLVED** – That meetings be held on the following dates in the 2011/12 Municipal Year:

- 4 July 2011
- 5 September 2011
- 17 October 2011
- 5 December 2011
- 13 February 2012
- 26 March 2012

All meetings to start at 4.00 p.m. Venues to be confirmed.

This page is intentionally left blank

## WEST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Harper in the Chair

Councillors D Atkinson, T Hanley, A Lowe,  
J McKenna and N Taggart

### 63 Late Items/Supplementary Information

Reference was made to two late appendices in respect of Agenda Item 14 (Minute No. 74 refers) – Children’s Services – Performance Report – which had been inadvertently left off the agenda when it was published. These were circulated round the meeting.

### 64 Declaration of Interests

Councillor D Atkinson made a declaration of personal interest in respect of Agenda Item 17 (Minute No. 73 refers) – Future Options for Long Term Residential Care and Day Care for Older People – as she was currently in receipt of home care services.

### 65 Open Forum

The Committee considered representations from a local resident, Mr Jeffrey Houseman, relating to the condition of, and the amount of annual expenditure on, Rodley Park, compared to other Council parks in West Leeds.

Mr Houseman was informed by Members of current discussions taking place with the Council’s Parks and Countryside Division, relating to Bramley and Stanningley Ward, which would address his concerns. Reference was also made to recent improvements in respect of the footpaths in Rodley Park. Reference was also made to the free bulbs scheme operated by Groundwork Leeds each September.

It was agreed that the Area Management Officer should arrange another meeting between Councillor Hanley and the relevant Council officers and that Mr Houseman should be invited to attend.

Mr Houseman was thanked for raising the issue.

### 66 Minutes - 15th December 2010

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 67 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 6th April, 2011

- a) NW Divisional Community Safety Partnership – Annual Report (Minute No. 61 refers)

Councillor Atkinson made reference to the new police computer programme which allowed the public to check on incidences of crime in specific streets, and raised her concerns regarding burglary rates in the Ganners and an assault in Eric Street, Bramley.

Inspector Bownass undertook to liaise separately, outside the meeting, with Councillor Atkinson regarding these matters.

Inspector Bownass also undertook to ensure that the maps referred to at the last meeting (Minute No. 55) were distributed to all the relevant residents – apparently, to date, some residents had not received the information, but others had.

- b) Friday Night Project, Armley Lazer Centre (Minute No. 57 refers)

Further to Minute No. 57, 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Chair reported that she had since visited the Friday Night Centre, and congratulated everyone involved in this brilliant initiative.

## **68 Community Forum Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the Armley Community Forum meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2011, and the Bramley and Stanningley Community Forum meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2011, be received and noted.

(NB: Councillor N Taggart joined the meeting at 5.25 pm, at the conclusion of this item.)

## **69 Wellbeing Budget 2010/11 - Update Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating the Committee regarding its revenue and capital wellbeing budget balances for 2010/11 and containing details of several new applications for funding in 2011/12.

The current revised capital balance of £3,199 was noted, and Members indicated that there were one or two pressing issues in Bramley and Stanningley Ward, in addition to the proposals for possible new litter bins in Armley and Bramley. It was agreed that the final allocation of this balance should be dealt with by the Director via a delegated decision, in consultation with a Sub Group, comprising the Chair and a Member from Bramley and Stanningley Ward.

Jane Earnshaw, Director, I Love West Leeds Festival, attended the meeting, outlined various costed options for the event in 2011 and reported on other sponsorship and funding streams being pursued, including the Arts Council.

## **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted, including the Committee's revenue and capital wellbeing budget balances;
- b) That the following in principle decisions be taken in respect of the applications for funding in 2011/12 listed below, subject to final confirmation of the Committee's wellbeing budget for 2011/12 :-
  - i) 'I Love West Leeds' Festival 2011 - £25,000 – Approved.
  - ii) Holiday Sports Provision - £4,000 – Approved.
  - iii) West Yorkshire Police – Covert crime reduction initiative - £6,063 (2011/12 only) – Approved.
  - iv) Armley Sports Project - £1,656 – Approved.
  - v) Additional litter bins - £2,800 maximum (£350 per bin) – referred to Sub Group (see (c) below);
- c) That in respect of the above applications, the final allocation of the 2010/11 capital balance of £3,199 and also the £25,000 approved in principle at the last meeting in respect of the post of Town Centre Manager, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be authorised to implement the decisions, using his concurrent delegated powers, once the Committee's final budget for 2011/12 is confirmed, in consultation with a Members' Sub Group comprising the Chair and a Bramley and Stanningley Ward Member.

### **70 Area Manager's Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating the Committee on progress in respect of the implementation of the Committee's Area Delivery Plan 2008-11.

The Chair introduced Jane Maxwell, the newly appointed Area Leader for West and North West Leeds.

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

### **71 Forward Plan of Area Committee Business - 5th April 2011**

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

### **72 Community Safety - Update Report**

Inspector Mark Bownass and Gill Hunter, Divisional Community Safety Co-ordinator, updated the Committee on community safety issues in the Committee's area and responded to Members' queries and comments.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted, and the Police and officers be congratulated in respect of their efforts, which is evidenced in the report.

### **73 Future Options for Long Term Residential Care and Day Care for Older People**

The Deputy Director of Adult Social Care (Strategic Commissioning) submitted a report outlining a current review and extensive public consultation exercise in respect of long term residential care and day care services for older people across the City.

Anna Clifford and Kim Maslyn, Adult Social Services, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments. In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:-

- The extent of the problems facing the Council was acknowledged. The elderly population was increasing, the costs of caring for them was getting more expensive, local authorities were under tremendous financial pressure, the Council's current stock of accommodation needed extensive investment just to bring it up to a modest standard, the services available in the private sector had increased dramatically and often costs were lower and standards of accommodation higher in the private sector. This was a big issue the Council was facing, but it was regarded that it was going about it in a reasonable and responsible way via the process outlined by the officers.
- Council staff involved in the planning and provision of services for the elderly in Leeds were praised for their dedication.
- The current and possible future needs of the BME population in Leeds and in the Committee's area needed to be taken into account in the process, including consultation with local communities via contact with churches mosques, gurdwaras, etc. If the officers contacted Touchstone, it would also be able to assist.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted, and an update report be submitted to the next meeting in April.

### **74 Children's Services - Performance Report**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report updating the Committee on performance levels in a variety of areas, including recent statutory inspections of the adoption service, the youth offending service and five children's centres, various education performance indicators, the latest NEET (Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training), and the top priorities contained in the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP) 2011-15.



Amanda Jackson, Locality Enabler, Children's Services attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments. In brief summary, Members made the following points:-

- Appendix 1a – Key Stage 4 attainment levels for BME pupils – Members requested that consideration be given in future reports to providing separate information in the 'White Gypsy, Roma and Travellers of Irish Heritage' category, as these were distinct groups with their own cultures and issues. Members requested more gender-based information, as often there were distinct differences in performance levels, e.g. black Caribbean boys and girls. Members also requested information relating to pupils in receipt of free school meals and possible links to under-attainment in this group.

The Committee agreed to defer more detailed consideration of the report to the next meeting, to enable the area's Secondary School Improvement Adviser to be present.

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted, and placed on the agenda again for the next meeting.

## **75 Delegation of Environmental Services**

Further to Minute No. 47, 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010, and Minute No. 54(e), 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report updating the Committee regarding progress on implementing the proposed delegation of elements of Streetscene Services to Area Committees, including work being done on draft Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and plans for further Member workshops in March (31<sup>st</sup> March in respect of the West Inner Area Committee). Dayle Lynch, Environment and Neighbourhoods Department, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Members requested the provision of accurate, up to date maps at the next briefing, showing the extent and frequency of the mechanical and hand street sweeping rounds in the Committee's area. They also requested that the briefing be re-arranged from 31<sup>st</sup> March to another date, to avoid a clash with the meeting of the Plans Panel (West).

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the above comments, the report be received and noted.

(NB: Councillor T Hanley left the meeting at 6.57 pm at the conclusion of this item.)

## **76 Transition of Health Improvement Function to Local Government**

Tim Taylor, Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager, presented a briefing paper informing the Committee of the proposals contained in the Government's White Paper 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS' for

greater involvement of local authorities in public health matters. He indicated that he was happy to respond separately, outside the meeting, to any queries or requests for further information from Members.

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

**77 Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting**

The Committee's final meeting in the current municipal year was on Tuesday, 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011, at 5.30 pm, Strawberry Lane Community Centre. At that meeting, the Committee would be asked to agree the dates, times and possible venues for its meetings in 2011/12.

The meeting concluded at 7.03 pm.