



**A meeting of the Council will be held in the Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 16th January, 2013 at 1.30 pm**

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

- 1        **Minutes** 1 - 22  
  
To confirm the minutes of the two Council Meetings held on 14<sup>th</sup> November and the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012.
- 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        **Calculation of the Council Tax and Business Rates tax bases for 2013/14 and determinations in relation to Council Tax premiums and discounts** 23 - 72  
  
To consider the report of the Director of Resources on the Calculation of the Council Tax and Business Rates tax bases for 2013/14 and determinations in relation to Council Tax premiums and discounts  
  

**K WAKEFIELD**
- 6        **Recommendations of the December Executive Board - Consultation outcomes on local Council Tax support scheme.** 73 - 132  
  
To consider the report of the Director of Resources on recommendations of the Executive Board in respect of the Consultation outcomes on local council tax support scheme.  
  

**K WAKEFIELD**

7            **Recommendations of the January Executive Board regarding the Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document**            To follow

To consider the report of the Director of City Development regarding the Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document subject to the outcome of the consideration of this matter by Executive Board on the 9<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

**K WAKEFIELD**

8            **Questions**

To deal with questions in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11

9            **Minutes**

To receive the following minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.2(i):-

Executive Board	133 - 148
Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services)	149 - 156
Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)	157 - 172
Scrutiny Board (Sustainable Economy and Culture)	173 - 180
Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities)	181 - 192
Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration)	193 - 216
Scrutiny Board (Health and Well-being and Adult Social Care)	<b>To follow</b>
North and East Plans Panel	217 - 232
South and West Plans Panel	233 - 248
City Plans Panel	249 - 282
Joint Plans Panel	283 - 286
Licensing Sub-Committee	287 - 314
Development Plan Panel	315 - 318
Corporate Governance and Audit Committee	319 - 324
North West (Inner) Area Committee	325 - 336
North West (Outer) Area Committee	337 - 348
North East (Inner) Area Committee	349 - 358
North East (Outer) Area Committee	359 - 366
East (Inner) Area Committee	367 - 372
East (Outer) Area Committee	373 - 380

South (Inner) Area Committee	381 - 386
South (Outer) Area Committee	387 - 394
West (Inner) Area Committee	395 - 400
West (Outer) Area Committee	<b>To follow</b>
Joint Committees	401 - 462

10 **Back Bench Community Concerns**

To receive Community Concerns in respect of:-

- 1) Councillor Finnigan – Concerns regarding Morley Fire Station.

**R FINNIGAN**

- 2) Councillor E Taylor – Outreach work undertaken in the Chapel Allerton ward to address infant mortality rates, particularly in connection to teenage pregnancies, and improve the health and wellbeing of children and young parents.

**E TAYLOR**

- 3) Councillor Urry – Impact of the closure of Leeds Remploy factory on individuals, direct culpability of Government, creation of other opportunities for employment of displaced people in Leeds in our wards and the wider Leeds Community.

**B URRY**

- 4) Councillor Robinson – Concerns about flooding in Collingham and the impact on local people. We call for more effective Council intervention on this matter to prevent this problem continuing to cause misery to residents.

**M ROBINSON**

- 5) Councillor M Hamilton – The benefits to Headingley and other Leeds areas of a compulsory licensing scheme for private landlords.

**M HAMILTON**

**White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor J Procter) - Education**

This Council notes with growing concern the shortage of school places in Leeds meaning that in some cases parents have to accept that their children will not attend a local school.

This Council further notes that the requirement to deliver more new housing in the city is likely to place further strain on school place planning. While the recent meeting to address basic need provision in the city has made a start, this Council believes that there is still a need for a coherent strategy to deal with a shortage in school places and the continuing growth in both birth rates and housing.

This Council therefore instructs officers to bring forward proposals to Executive Board by Spring 2013 that will fully fund the required education provision within the authority, whether this is through use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or Section 106 agreements or other sources of funding, and that these proposals should complement the plans being developed as part of the Core Strategy.

**J PROCTER**

**White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor A Blackburn) - Energy Bill Revolution Campaign**

This Council notes that the combination of rising fuel prices and the UK's energy inefficient houses have a major impact on fuel poverty and health.

Over the next 15 years the Government will raise an average of £4 billion every year in carbon taxes through the European Emissions Trading Scheme and the Carbon Floor Price. Recycling this revenue back into energy efficiency measures could lower people's bills, cut carbon emissions, create jobs and help combat global warming.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Support the Energy Bill Revolution Campaign calling for the Government to recycle revenues from carbon taxes into improving the energy efficiency of UK homes.
2. Notify local Members of Parliament of its support for the campaign and urge them to sign Early Day Motion 47 – "Reducing Fuel Bills through Energy Efficiency."

**A BLACKBURN**

**White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor Blake) - Poverty**

This Council expresses its deep concern about the profound impact of child poverty on outcomes for educational attainment, employment, health and safeguarding.

With 23.4% of children and young people in Leeds growing up in poverty, Council reaffirms its commitment to work with partners to achieve the ambitions set out in the Leeds Child Poverty Strategy.

However, with 59% of poor children living in a household where at least one adult works, Council also reiterates, in the strongest possible terms, the damaging cumulative impact of Government welfare reforms on low income families in this city.

Council requests that officers produce a report for consideration by the Executive Board detailing the anticipated impact of welfare reform on both child poverty and advice services in the city.

Given that economic deprivation has a direct correlation to reduced outcomes for children, especially in areas of entrenched poverty, Council calls on the Government to:-

- § Reassess welfare reforms in light of the impact on its own commitment to eradicate child poverty by 2020.
- § Swiftly empower the newly created Financial Conduct Authority to limit the impact of high cost credit and high interest rates on poor families with a view to ultimately ensuring all families have access to mainstream financial services.
- § Reinstate the Early Intervention Grant to help support some of our most challenging and vulnerable young people.

Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to write to all Leeds MPs asking them to work with us to highlight the devastating impact of child poverty on our communities and to lobby the Government to take action on the issues above.

**J BLAKE**

Tom Riordan  
Chief Executive

Civic Hall  
Leeds  
LS1 1UR

This page is intentionally left blank

Proceedings of the Meeting of the Leeds City Council held  
Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 14th November, 2012

**PRESENT:** The Lord Mayor Councillor Ann Castle in the Chair

**WARD**

**ADEL & WHARFEDALE**

Barry John Anderson  
John Leslie Carter  
Clive Fox

**ALWOODLEY**

Neil Alan Buckley  
Dan Cohen  
Peter Mervyn Harrand

**ARDSLEY & ROBIN HOOD**

Karen Renshaw  
Jack Dunn  
Lisa Mulherin

**ARMLEY**

Alison Natalie Kay Lowe  
James McKenna  
Janet Harper

**BEESTON & HOLBECK**

Angela Gabriel  
Adam Ogilvie  
David Congreve

**BRAMLEY & STANNINGLEY**

Caroline Gruen  
Ted Hanley  
Neil Taggart

**BURMANTOFTS & RICHMOND HILL**

Maureen Ingham  
Asghar Khan  
Ron Grahame

**WARD**

**CALVERLEY & FARSLEY**

Andrew Carter  
Joseph William Marjoram  
Rod Wood

**CHAPEL ALLERTON**

Eileen Taylor  
Mohammed Rafique  
Jane Dowson

**CITY & HUNSLET**

Elizabeth Nash  
Patrick Davey  
Mohammed Iqbal

**CROSS GATES & WHINMOOR**

Pauleen Grahame  
Peter John Gruen

**FARNLEY & WORTLEY**

David Blackburn  
Ann Blackburn  
John Hamilton Hardy

**GARFORTH & SWILLINGTON**

Andrea McKenna  
Mark Dobson  
Thomas Murray

**GIPTON & HAREHILLS**

Roger Harington  
Arif Hussain  
Kamila Maqsood

**GUISELEY & RAWDON**

Graham Latty  
Paul Wadsworth

**HAREWOOD**

Rachael Procter  
Matthew James Robinson

**HEADINGLEY**

Janette Walker  
Neil Walshaw  
Martin Hamilton

**HORSFORTH**

Christopher Townsley  
Dawn Collins  
Brian Cleasby

**HYDE PARK & WOODHOUSE**

Christine Denise Towler  
Gerry Harper  
Javaid Akhtar

**KILLINGBECK & SEACROFT**

Graham Hyde  
Veronica Morgan  
Brian Michael Selby

**KIPPAX & METHLEY**

Mary Elizabeth Harland  
James Lewis  
Keith Ivor Wakefield

**KIRKSTALL**

Lucinda Joy Yeadon  
John Anthony Illingworth  
Bernard Peter Atha

**MIDDLETON PARK**

Paul Anthony Truswell  
Judith Blake  
Kim Groves

**MOORTOWN**

Alex Sobel  
Rebecca Charlwood  
Sharon Hamilton

**MORLEY NORTH**

Robert Finnigan  
Robert William Gettings  
Thomas Leadley

**MORLEY SOUTH**

Judith Elliott  
Neil Dawson  
Shirley Varley

**OTLEY & YEADON**

Sandy Edward Charles Lay  
Colin Campbell  
Ryk Downes

**PUDSEY**

Josephine Patricia Jarosz  
Richard Alwyn Lewis  
Mick Coulson

**ROTHWELL**

David Nagle  
Karen Bruce  
Barry Stewart Golton

**ROUNDHAY**

Bill Urry  
Christine Macniven  
Ghulam Hussain

**TEMPLE NEWSAM**

Judith Cummins  
Katherine Mitchell  
Michael Lyons

**WEETWOOD**

Jonathan Bentley  
Susan Bentley  
Judith Mara Chapman

**WETHERBY**

Gerald Wilkinson  
Alan James Lamb  
John Michael Procter

## **50 Announcements**

- a) The Lord Mayor congratulated the following on their recent successes in the RHS Britain in Bloom Awards 2012:-
- Leeds in Bloom, who won Gold in the Large City category.
  - St George's Crypt, joint winners of the Young People's Award.
  - Kippax Leeds, Urban Community Gold and a joint category winner.
  - Pat Sammy from Kippax who won a discretionary award as a Community Champion.
- b) The Lord Mayor congratulated the Leeds Rhinos on winning the Super League Grand Final 2012.
- c) The Lord Mayor reminded Members that the State of the City Council meeting on Wednesday, 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012 would commence at 1.00 pm.

## **51 Minutes**

It was moved by Councillor J Lewis, seconded by Councillor G Latty and

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2012 be approved.

## **52 Declarations of Interest**

The Lord Mayor announced that a list of written declarations submitted by Members was on display in the ante-room, 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 Members' Code of Conduct were made as follows:-

- a) Councillor R Grahame declared 'other' interests in minutes 62 of this meeting as follows:-
- Minute 30 (SB - Resources & Council Svcs) – In his capacity as a Member of GMB Union
  - Minute 97 (Executive Board) – In his capacity as a Member of ENE ALMO Board
- b) Councillor Cleasby declared 'other' interests in minute 54 of this meeting as his daughter is an allotment holder.

## **53 Communications**

The Chief Executive informed Council that a response had been received from Edward Timpson MP the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Children and Families in response to the resolution of Council at its September meeting regarding the School Sports and Olympic Legacy. The response had previously been circulated to all Members of Council.

## **54 Deputations**

Four deputations were admitted to the meeting and addressed Council, as follows:-

- 1) Leeds and District Gardeners' Federation regarding growing your own food in Leeds and the costs to the Council of the allotment model.
- 2) Leeds residents regarding payday loan companies and their effect on residents of Leeds.
- 3) Leeds University Union, Leeds Trinity Students' Union and Leeds Metropolitan Students' Union regarding the Council's support for current and future students of Leeds in 3 areas, education, employment and empowerment.
- 4) Morley Town Council regarding quality bus contract.

**RESOLVED** – That the subject matter in respect of deputations (1), (2) and (3) be referred to the Executive Board for consideration and the subject matter in respect of deputation (4) be referred to West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority for consideration.

**55 Report on Appointments**

It was moved by Councillor J Lewis, seconded by Councillor G Latty and

**RESOLVED** – That the report of the City Solicitor on appointments be approved, namely that

Councillor Walshaw replace Councillor A Khan on Member Management Committee.

**56 Late Item - Leeds Award**

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor A Carter and

**RESOLVED** – That Council agree , in the light of the seriousness of current allegations;

- a) To rescind the Leeds Award granted to Jimmy Savile in 2008
- b) That the previous resolution of Council, made following Jimmy Savile's death in 2011 be not progressed.

**57 Report on Attendance at Council Meetings**

It was moved by Councillor J Lewis, seconded by Councillor Lowe and

**RESOLVED** – That Council note the possible absence of Councillor Armitage from meetings of Full Council for a period of six months from the date of this meeting.

**58 Recommendations of General Purposes Committee regarding the Review of Council Meetings.**

It was moved by Councillor J Lewis, seconded by Councillor Wakefield, and

**RESOLVED** – That the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee, as presented by the report of the City Solicitor, with regard to the review of Council meetings and the new Council Procedure Rules be approved.

**59 Recommendations of the Executive Board regarding the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Licensing Policy**

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

**RESOLVED** – That the recommendations of the Executive Board as presented by the report of the Chief Officer Democratic and Central Services, that the Gambling

Act 2005 Statement of Licensing Policy 2010-2012 be approved as the new policy to have effect from 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013.

**60 Recommendations of the Executive Board regarding the LDF Core Strategy - Submission to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination and Pre-Submission Changes**

It was moved by Councillor P Gruen, seconded by Councillor Wakefield that the recommendations of the Executive Board as presented by the report of the Director of City Development, with regard to the LDF Core Strategy – Submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination and pre-submission changes, be approved.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Leadley to add at end of recommendation 1, on page 2 of the 'LDF Core Strategy – Pre-submission Changes for Consultation' report, the following:-

“subject to the deletion of the words ‘in conjunction with Community Infrastructure Levy’ on page 58 of the report, at the end of the top paragraph.”

During summing up on the matter Councillor Gruen also advised Council that a reference was also made to Community Infrastructure Levy in criteria iv) of the pre-submission changes to Policy H5 and if they were to accept the amendment, then for consistency, it was recommended that reference to Community Infrastructure Levy in iv) should also be omitted:

The amendment in the name of Councillor Campbell and the subsequent reference to criteria iv) of the pre-submission changes to Policy H5 also being omitted was carried, and upon being put as the substantive motion, it was

**RESOLVED** – That the following recommendations of the Executive Board, as presented by the report of the Director of City Development with regard to the LDF Core Strategy – Submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination and pre-submission changes, be approved subject to the deletion of the words ‘in conjunction with Community Infrastructure Levy’ on page 58 of the report, at the end of the top paragraph and for consistency, the reference to Community Infrastructure Levy in criteria iv) of the pre-submission changes to Policy H5 should also be omitted.

- A. That the pre-submission changes to the Publication Draft of the Core Strategy be approved.
- B. That the Publication Draft Core Strategy and the sustainability report be approved for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination pursuant to Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 .
- C. That approval be given to a further period for representations to be provided on the pre-submission changes, and that any further representations received be submitted to the Secretary of State at the time the Publication Draft is submitted for independent examination.

**61 Questions**

Q1 Councillor Wood to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services):-

Given the importance of the Little London, Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI scheme, and the numerous changes to the scope and finances considered by Executive Board over the last year, would the Executive Member care to

comment on the finances and affordability of the scheme, and indicate whether it is on course to be delivered on time and on budget?

The Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services) replied.

Q2 Councillor J Bentley to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy):-

Could the Executive Board Member for Development and the Economy inform Council whether the West Park Centre is safe?

The Executive Member (Development and the Economy) replied.

Q3 Councillor Towler to the Leader of Council:-

Does the Leader of the Council agree with Birmingham City Council that the scale of future financial challenges will change the landscape of local government nationally?

The Leader of Council replied.

Q4 Councillor D Blackburn to the Executive Member (Environment):-

Bearing in mind that the Wrap-Up Leeds scheme has now reached its end, could the Executive Member tell me how many properties have benefited from work under the scheme?

The Executive Member (Environment) replied.

Q5 Councillor Harington to the Executive Member (Leisure and Skills):-

Does the Executive Member for Leisure & Skills share my enthusiasm and excitement about the potential of Leeds being able to play its part in a regional stage of the 2014 Tour de France, and does he agree that this will bring massive benefits to the city?

The Executive Member (Leisure and Skills) replied.

Q6 Councillor G Wilkinson to the Executive Member (Children's Services):-

Will the Executive Board Member for Children's Services please tell me why I was the only Opposition Group Member to be interviewed by the consultant engaged to look into the provision of Youth Services in Leeds?

The Executive Member (Children's Services) replied.

Q7 Councillor Golton to the Leader of Council :-

Does the Leader of Council agree with the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's drive for transparency?

The Leader of Council replied.

Q8 Councillor Maqsood to the Executive Member (Adult Social Care):-

Can the Executive Member for Adult Social Care provide an update on work with private sector partners in the city to improve corporate social responsibility?

The Executive Member (Adult Social Care) replied.

Q9 Councillor R Finnigan to the Executive Member (Leisure and Skills):-

Is the Executive Member for Leisure and Skills aware of any bogus event which was attached to the Morley Literature Festival and which may have involved the city Council's library service as an unwitting and innocent accomplice.

The Executive Member (Leisure and Skills) replied.

At the conclusion of question time, the following questions remained unanswered and it was noted that, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 11.6, written answers would be sent to each Member of Council:-

Q10 Councillor M Harland to the Executive Member (Environment).

Q11 Councillor Robinson to the Executive Member (Adult Social Care).

Q12 Councillor Lay to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).

Q13 Councillor Ingham to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).

Q14 Councillor Charlwood to the Executive Member (Children's Services).

Q15 Councillor Lamb to the Executive Member (Children's Services).

Q16 Councillor Downes to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).

Q17 Councillor Dunn to the Executive Member (South (Outer) Area Committee Chair).

Q18 Councillor Iqbal to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy).

Q19 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).

Q20 Councillor S Bentley to the Executive Member (Children's Services).

Q21 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy).

Q22 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy).

Q23 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy).

Q24 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Development and the Economy).

- Q25 Councillor J Blake to the Executive Member (Children's Services).
- Q26 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Environment).
- Q27 Councillor Anderson to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).
- Q28 Councillor Marjoram to the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services).

## **62 Minutes**

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor J Lewis 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.

## **63 Back Bench Community Concerns**

During discussion on this item, it was moved by Councillor G Latty, seconded by Councillor Lamb, that Leave of Council be given to allow the introduction of a sixth Community Concern in the name of Councillor Wadsworth.

- 1) Councillor Cleasby – The impact of housing development and the SHLAA on communities in Horsforth Ward.

Councillor Taggart responded.

- 2) Councillor Harland – The impact of flooding on residents in Kippax and Methley, and Kirkstall.

Councillor R Lewis responded.

- 3) Councillor Hardy – Expressing concern regarding the potential impact of a reduction in police numbers on Farnley and Wortley.

Councillor P Gruen responded.

- 4) Councillor Leadley – The need to ensure high quality and well informed decision making at Plans Panels.

Councillor J Harper responded.

- 5) Councillor Buckley – To discuss the vital need for a new medical centre in Alwoodley. Such a centre would bring widespread benefits to the health and wellbeing of residents in Alwoodley as well as in neighbouring wards.

We would particularly like to call on officers to conclude their work regarding the location of the centre and ownership of the land, in order to ensure that the project can progress through the planning process and take advantage of the time-limited funding opportunities that are available.

Councillor Mulherin responded.

- 6) Councillor Wadsworth – Housing and Highways concerns in the Guiseley and Rawdon Ward.

Councillor Taggart responded.

During the consideration of Community Concerns, the meeting was suspended at 5.00 pm and resumed at 5.25 pm.

**64 White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor Lamb) - Private Service Companies**

It was moved by Councillor Lamb, seconded by Councillor G Latty that this Council notes with strong concern recent examples of senior Leeds City Council staff being paid via private service companies and commits to bringing this practice to an immediate end.

This Council believes that the recent Government consultation, 'Taxation of Controlling Persons', sets a clear approach to this issue and further believes that both morally and in the interest of fairness the Council should fully support the proposals in the consultation.

This Council commits to developing a clear policy that will create a strong framework for the future appointment of all senior members of staff and further commits to developing this as quickly as possible and through the submission of a report to the Executive Board.

Council further requests that the Scrutiny Board for Resources and Council Services monitors this issue as part of their ongoing work programme.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor Groves that this Council notes with strong concern recent examples of senior Leeds City Council staff being paid via private service companies and commits to bringing this practice to an immediate end.

Delete the second paragraph and replace with the following 3 paragraphs:-

'This Council welcomes in principle many of the proposals which are included in the recent 'Taxation of Controlling Persons' consultation. Council further acknowledges that this issue affects all aspects of the public sector and notes with concern that 2,400 staff have been identified as being paid off the payroll within the Civil Service.

Council recognises the positive steps that have already been taken within Leeds City Council to end this practice, and notes that by the end of November the number of people being paid this way will have been completely reduced from 5 to 0.

Given the complexity of implications arising from new legislation, Council requests that officers seek clarity as to whether better enforcement of IR35 legislation could be a quicker and more cost effective way of achieving transparency in relation to the taxation arrangements for controlling persons.'

Retain the final two paragraphs:-

'This Council underlines its commitment to continuing work on a policy to further strengthen the framework when appointing senior members of staff. Council resolves to bring a report to the Executive Board as soon as possible outlining the details.

Council further requests that the Scrutiny Board for Resources and Council Services monitors this issue as part of their ongoing work programme.'

Motion would read:-

That this Council notes with strong concern recent examples of senior Leeds City Council staff being paid via private service companies and commits to bringing this practice to an immediate end.

This Council welcomes in principle many of the proposals which are included in the recent 'Taxation of Controlling Persons' consultation. Council further acknowledges that this issue affects all aspects of the public sector and notes with concern that 2,400 staff have been identified as being paid off the pay-roll within the Civil Service.

Council recognises the positive steps that have already been taken within Leeds City Council to end this practice, and notes that by the end of November the number of people being paid this way will have been completely reduced from 5 to 0.

Given the complexity of implications arising from new legislation, Council requests that officers seek clarity as to whether better enforcement of IR35 legislation could be a quicker and more cost effective way of achieving transparency in relation to the taxation arrangements for controlling persons.'

'This Council underlines its commitment to continuing work on a policy to further strengthen the framework when appointing senior members of staff. Council resolves to bring a report to the Executive Board as soon as possible outlining the details.

Council further requests that the Scrutiny Board for Resources and Council Services monitors this issue as part of their ongoing work programme.'

The amendment in the name of Councillor Wakefield was carried, and upon being put as the substantive motion, it was

**RESOLVED** – That this Council notes with strong concern recent examples of senior Leeds City Council staff being paid via private service companies and commits to bringing this practice to an immediate end.

This Council welcomes in principle many of the proposals which are included in the recent 'Taxation of Controlling Persons' consultation. Council further acknowledges that this issue affects all aspects of the public sector and notes with concern that 2,400 staff have been identified as being paid off the pay-roll within the Civil Service.

Council recognises the positive steps that have already been taken within Leeds City Council to end this practice, and notes that by the end of November the number of people being paid this way will have been completely reduced from 5 to 0.

Given the complexity of implications arising from new legislation, Council requests that officers seek clarity as to whether better enforcement of IR35 legislation could be a quicker and more cost effective way of achieving transparency in relation to the taxation arrangements for controlling persons.'

'This Council underlines its commitment to continuing work on a policy to further strengthen the framework when appointing senior members of staff. Council

resolves to bring a report to the Executive Board as soon as possible outlining the details.

Council further requests that the Scrutiny Board for Resources and Council Services monitors this issue as part of their ongoing work programme.

**65 White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor P Gruen) - Planning Permissions**

It was moved by Councillor P Gruen, seconded by Councillor A Carter and

**RESOLVED** – That this Council believes that decisions regarding development should reflect the aspirations, policies and ambitions of this city and the views of local people. Council therefore believes that locally elected representatives rather than national government are best placed to make decisions about the sustainability of proposed developments.

This Council expresses particular concern about the proposals to allow some rear garden extensions to go ahead without planning permission for a 3 year period and commits, once the precise details of the Government's proposals are clear, to explore the feasibility, costs and benefits of using article 4 powers to ensure that planning permission will continue to be required for those extensions in Leeds which have significant implications for neighbours and local areas.

In order to ensure strong decision making and democratic accountability locally this Council also opposes the proposals to:-

- Give the Planning Inspectorate additional powers so that local agreements between Councils and developers about affordable housing allocations could be overridden;
- Allow developers to immediately appeal to the Planning Inspectorate when they disagree with local agreements regarding the allocation of affordable housing in their applications;
- Take planning powers away from local authorities in instances where The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government regards the decision to be 'nationally significant' or if decision making is seen to be too slow.

Council requests that the Chief Executive writes to The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and all local MPs outlining Council's opposition to the plans.

**66 White Paper Motion (in the name of Councillor S Golton) - Lettings Policy**

It was moved by Councillor Golton, seconded by Councillor M Hamilton that this Council has grave concerns about the potential impact of government reforms to housing benefit and recognises its responsibility to act to protect the welfare of affected residents in Leeds.

Council also notes that the housing waiting list currently stands at 27,000, that no Council housing was built between 1980 and 2008 whilst more than 28,000 properties were sold off under the right to buy.

However, Council also notes that the current lettings policy, whilst aiming to provide fairness and transparency, often limits the ability of tenants to move home and therefore affects housing supply.

Council believes it is unfair that some families should suffer overcrowding at the same time that others are unable to move to a smaller property that better suits their needs due to a lack of priority.

Given the current volume of tenants wishing to move and the lack of available properties, Council calls on the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services to reform current lettings policy, allowing appropriate prioritisation for tenants who wish to move to a smaller home to be implemented by local housing offices. This will help free up suitable housing for overcrowded families and mitigate the impact to tenants of reforms to the benefit system.

Council further calls for the Exec Member to review such arrangements after a suitable period to assess their effectiveness at achieving the specified objective.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Gruen, seconded by Councillor Congreve, that this Council has grave concerns about the potential impact of Government reforms to housing benefit and recognises its responsibility to act to protect the welfare of affected residents in Leeds.

Delete all after 'residents in Leeds' and replace with:-

Council recognises that if these reforms are given the go-ahead, some of the most vulnerable people in the city will be hit the hardest by these changes.

Furthermore, Council also acknowledges the enormous challenge this authority faces through its lettings policy in tackling a housing waiting list that currently stands at 27,000. Council reiterates its aspiration to deliver more social and affordable housing in the city.

Whilst this Council welcomes a range of positive changes which have already been made to the lettings policy by the current administration, council also underlines its continuing commitment given the severity of the housing situation and complexity of many issues, to see where further improvements could potentially be made to the system.

A revised draft lettings policy, which responds to this and other challenges, will be presented to the Executive Board in December (advertised on the forward plan in August 2012). It is proposed that an all party working group is created to inform and oversee the consultation process before formal adoption.

A second amendment was moved by Councillor Anderson, seconded by Councillor Lamb to delete all after 'affected residents in Leeds' and replace with:-

'Council notes the historically high numbers on the Social Housing Register in Leeds and in particular those residents of Leeds who are in need of a home due to homelessness, or their current housing needs are assessed as not being adequate by the Housing Options team, or they are ex members of Her Majesty's Armed Forces.

Council believes that imaginative solutions need to be brought forward by the administration, including identifying potential sources of funding, to provide additional housing in various parts of the city to meet these needs. Any new housing should be on Brownfield sites, throughout the city.

This Council further acknowledges the work done by the previous administration in freeing up family housing through the successful Under Occupation Scheme.

This Council calls for the Executive Board Member to bring a report to Executive Board outlining the options available in addressing this issue in both the short and long term.'

Motion would read:-

'This Council has grave concerns about the potential impact of Government reforms to housing benefit and recognises its responsibility to act to protect the welfare of affected residents in Leeds.

Council notes the historically high numbers on the Social Housing Register in Leeds and in particular those residents of Leeds who are in need of a home due to homelessness, or their current housing needs are assessed as not being adequate by the Housing Options team, or they are ex members of Her Majesty's Armed Forces.

Council believes that imaginative solutions need to be brought forward by the administration, including identifying potential sources of funding, to provide additional housing in various parts of the city to meet these needs. Any new housing should be on Brownfield sites, throughout the city.

This Council further acknowledges the work done by the previous administration in freeing up family housing through the successful Under Occupation Scheme.

This Council calls for the Executive Board Member to bring a report to Executive Board outlining the options available in addressing this issue in both the short and long term.'

The amendment in the name of Councillor Gruen was carried, and upon being put as the substantive motion, it was

**RESOLVED** – That this Council has grave concerns about the potential impact of Government reforms to housing benefit and recognises its responsibility to act to protect the welfare of affected residents in Leeds.

Council recognises that if these reforms are given the go-ahead, some of the most vulnerable people in the city will be hit the hardest by these changes.

Furthermore, Council also acknowledges the enormous challenge this authority faces through its lettings policy in tackling a housing waiting list that currently stands at 27,000. Council reiterates its aspiration to deliver more social and affordable housing in the city.

Whilst this Council welcomes a range of positive changes which have already been made to the lettings policy by the current administration, council also underlines its continuing commitment given the severity of the housing situation and complexity of many issues, to see where further improvements could potentially be made to the system.

A revised draft lettings policy, which responds to this and other challenges, will be presented to the Executive Board in December (advertised on the forward plan in

August 2012). It is proposed that an all party working group is created to inform and oversee the consultation process before formal adoption.

Council rose at 7.30 pm.

Proceedings of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Leeds City Council held  
Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 14th November, 2012

**PRESENT:** The Lord Mayor Councillor Ann Castle in the Chair

**WARD**

**ADEL & WHARFEDALE**

Barry John Anderson  
John Leslie Carter  
Clive Fox

**ALWOODLEY**

Neil Alan Buckley  
Dan Cohen  
Peter Mervyn Harrand

**ARDSLEY & ROBIN HOOD**

Karen Renshaw  
Jack Dunn  
Lisa Mulherin

**ARMLEY**

Alison Natalie Kay Lowe  
James McKenna  
Janet Harper

**BEESTON & HOLBECK**

Angela Gabriel  
Adam Ogilvie  
David Congreve

**BRAMLEY & STANNINGLEY**

Caroline Gruen  
Ted Hanley  
Neil Taggart

**BURMANTOFTS & RICHMOND HILL**

Maureen Ingham  
Asghar Khan  
Ron Grahame

**WARD**

**CALVERLEY & FARSLEY**

Joseph William Marjoram  
Rod Wood

**CHAPEL ALLERTON**

Eileen Taylor  
Mohammed Rafique  
Jane Dowson

**CITY & HUNSLET**

Elizabeth Nash  
Mohammed Iqbal

**CROSS GATES & WHINMOOR**

Pauleen Grahame  
Peter John Gruen

**FARNLEY & WORTLEY**

David Blackburn  
Ann Blackburn  
John Hamilton Hardy

**GARFORTH & SWILLINGTON**

Andrea McKenna  
Mark Dobson  
Thomas Murray

**GIPTON & HAREHILLS**

Roger Harington  
Arif Hussain  
Kamila Maqsood

**GUISELEY & RAWDON**

Graham Latty  
Paul Wadsworth

**HAREWOOD****HEADINGLEY**

Janette Walker  
Neil Walshaw  
Martin Hamilton

**HORSFORTH**

Christopher Townsley  
  
Brian Cleasby

**HYDE PARK & WOODHOUSE**

Christine Denise Towler  
Gerry Harper  
Javaid Akhtar

**KILLINGBECK & SEACROFT**

Graham Hyde  
Veronica Morgan  
Brian Michael Selby

**KIPPAX & METHLEY**

Mary Elizabeth Harland  
James Lewis  
Keith Ivor Wakefield

**KIRKSTALL**

Lucinda Joy Yeadon  
John Anthony Illingworth  
Bernard Peter Atha

**MIDDLETON PARK**

Paul Anthony Truswell  
Judith Blake  
Kim Groves

**MOORTOWN**

Alex Sobel  
Rebecca Charlwood  
Sharon Hamilton

**MORLEY NORTH**

Robert Finnigan  
Robert William Gettings  
Thomas Leadley

**MORLEY SOUTH**

Judith Elliott  
Neil Dawson  
Shirley Varley

**OTLEY & YEADON**

Sandy Edward Charles Lay  
Colin Campbell  
Ryk Downes

**PUDSEY**

Josephine Patricia Jarosz  
Richard Alwyn Lewis  
Mick Coulson

**ROTHWELL**

David Nagle  
Karen Bruce  
Barry Stewart Golton

**ROUNDHAY**

Bill Urry  
Christine Macniven  
Ghulam Hussain

**TEMPLE NEWSAM**

Judith Cummins  
Katherine Mitchell  
Michael Lyons

**WEETWOOD**

Jonathan Bentley  
Susan Bentley  
Judith Mara Chapman

**WETHERBY**

Gerald Wilkinson  
Alan James Lamb  
John Michael Procter

**49 Appointment of Honorary Aldermen**

It was moved by Councillor J L Carter, seconded by Councillor Wakefield and supported by Councillors Cleasby, Elliott and D Blackburn and

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY** – That under Section 249(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council admit the former Councillor, William Schofield Hyde, of the Leeds City Council to be an Honorary Alderman of the City in recognition of the long and distinguished public service rendered by him.

Council rose at 1.33 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

Proceedings of the State of the City Meeting of the Leeds City Council held  
Civic Hall, Leeds on Wednesday, 28th November, 2012

**PRESENT:** The Lord Mayor Councillor Ann Castle in the Chair

**WARD**

**ADEL & WHARFEDALE**

Barry John Anderson  
John Leslie Carter  
Clive Fox

**ALWOODLEY**

Neil Alan Buckley  
Dan Cohen  
Peter Mervyn Harrand

**ARDSLEY & ROBIN HOOD**

Karen Renshaw

Lisa Mulherin

**ARMLEY**

Alison Natalie Kay Lowe  
James McKenna  
Janet Harper

**BEESTON & HOLBECK**

Angela Gabriel  
Adam Ogilvie  
David Congreve

**BRAMLEY & STANNINGLEY**

Caroline Gruen  
Ted Hanley  
Neil Taggart

**BURMANTOFTS & RICHMOND HILL**

Maureen Ingham  
Asghar Khan  
Ron Grahame

**WARD**

**CALVERLEY & FARSLEY**

Rod Wood

**CHAPEL ALLERTON**

Eileen Taylor  
Mohammed Rafique  
Jane Dowson

**CITY & HUNSLET**

Elizabeth Nash

Mohammed Iqbal

**CROSS GATES & WHINMOOR**

Pauleen Grahame  
Peter John Gruen

**FARNLEY & WORTLEY**

Ann Blackburn  
John Hamilton Hardy

**GARFORTH & SWILLINGTON**

Andrea McKenna  
Mark Dobson  
Thomas Murray

**GIPTON & HAREHILLS**

Roger Harington  
Arif Hussain  
Kamila Maqsood

**GUISELEY & RAWDON**

Graham Latty  
Paul Wadsworth

**HAREWOOD**

Matthew James Robinson

**HEADINGLEY**

Janette Walker  
Neil Walshaw  
Martin Hamilton

**HORSFORTH**

Christopher Townsley  
Dawn Collins  
Brian Cleasby

**HYDE PARK & WOODHOUSE**

Christine Denise Towler  
Gerry Harper  
Javaid Akhtar

**KILLINGBECK & SEACROFT**

Graham Hyde  
Veronica Morgan  
Brian Michael Selby

**KIPPAX & METHLEY**

Mary Elizabeth Harland  
James Lewis  
Keith Ivor Wakefield

**KIRKSTALL**

Lucinda Joy Yeadon  
John Anthony Illingworth  
Bernard Peter Atha

**MIDDLETON PARK**

Paul Anthony Truswell  
Judith Blake  
Kim Groves

**MOORTOWN**

Alex Sobel  
Rebecca Charlwood  
Sharon Hamilton

**MORLEY NORTH**

Robert Finnigan  
Robert William Gettings  
Thomas Leadley

**MORLEY SOUTH**

Neil Dawson  
Shirley Varley

**OTLEY & YEADON**

Sandy Edward Charles Lay  
Colin Campbell  
Ryk Downes

**PUDSEY**

Josephine Patricia Jarosz  
Richard Alwyn Lewis  
Mick Coulson

**ROTHWELL**

David Nagle  
Karen Bruce  
Barry Stewart Golton

**ROUNDHAY**

Bill Urry  
Christine Macniven  
Ghulam Hussain

**TEMPLE NEWSAM**

Judith Cummins  
Katherine Mitchell  
Michael Lyons

**WEETWOOD**

Jonathan Bentley  
Susan Bentley  
Judith Mara Chapman

**WETHERBY**

Gerald Wilkinson  
Alan James Lamb  
John Michael Procter

**67 Announcements**

a) David Marsh

The Lord Mayor invited representatives of each group to move a vote of thanks to David Marsh, Municipal Reporter, who was attending his last meeting of Council.

Councillors Wakefield, J L Carter, Golton, Finnigan and A Blackburn thanked Mr Marsh for his dedication and professionalism over a number of years and wished him well for the future.

b) Webcast

The Lord Mayor reminded those present that the meeting was to be webcast.

**68 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

**69 State of the City Report**

It was moved by Councillor Wakefield, seconded by Councillor J Lewis and

**RESOLVED** – That the content of the report be noted, and that the issues emerging be used to inform action and debate.

Following consideration of the State of the City Report, the meeting was suspended at 1.45 pm and resumed at 4.00 pm.

**70 Guest Speakers**

At the resumption of the meeting, the Lord Mayor invited the following speakers to address Council, as follows:-

- a) Nicole Thomas – Deputy Member of the Youth Parliament for Leeds addressed Members on the State of the City Report from a young persons perspective.
- b) Professor Mike Campbell – Addressed Members on Skills and Employment policy – its role in successful Cities.
- c) Alistair Brownlee – The 2012 Olympic Triathlon Champion addressed Members on London 2012 inspiring a generation.

Council rose at 4.40 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report author: Mike Woods  
Tel: 51373

**Report of Director of Resources**

**Report to Council**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013**

**Subject: Calculation of the Council Tax and Business Rates tax bases for 2013/14 and determinations in relation to Council Tax premiums and discounts**

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

**Summary of main issues**

1. Each year, under the Local Government Finance Act 1992, Leeds City Council is required to calculate a council tax base for Leeds and for each parish or town council within the Council's area. These tax bases are used to calculate the council taxes to be levied in Leeds and in each parish/town council for the year.
  
2. For 2013/14 the Government has introduced major changes to the funding arrangements for local government. These changes affect the way the council tax bases are calculated and also introduce a requirement for the Council to prepare an estimate of non-domestic rates income it will collect in the year, as set out in the "*National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 2013-14*" (Appendix 2) .
  
3. The factors affecting the calculations and the detailed figures are set out in the main body of the report, but the headline amounts for 2013/14 are as follows:

<b>Council Tax Base:</b>		208,529
<b>NNDR:</b>	Amount to be paid to Central Government:	£178,732,139
	Amount to be retained by Leeds under the Rates Retention scheme:	£175,304,496
	Amount to be passed to West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority	£ 3,577,643

4. The Council is required to finalise the council tax bases (for Leeds and the parish/town councils) and the non-domestic rates estimates by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013.
5. The new funding arrangements include regulations made under the Local Government Finance Act 2012 which have removed certain categories of council tax exemptions and replaced them with discretionary powers to give discounts.
6. The regulations also give billing authorities powers to charge a premium on long term empty properties within their areas.

## 7. Recommendations

Members are requested to:

- a) agree that, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the Council as its council tax base for the year 2013/2014 shall be 208,529 for Leeds and for each parish as listed in Section 3.12, below, and Appendix 1;
- b) agree in principle the business rates data contained within the *National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 2013-14* attached as Appendix 2, and delegate authority to the Director of Resources to make any necessary detailed amendments and to submit a final version to DCLG on or before 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013;
- c) note the removal of the classes of council tax exemptions as set out in Section 3.3, below;
- d) agree, in accordance with section 11A of the Local Government Act 1992<sup>1</sup>, to determine that the discounts under section 11(2)(a) of that Act for prescribed Class C and D<sup>2</sup> properties, shall not apply;
- e) agree that, under section 11B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992<sup>3</sup>, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013, Leeds City Council will charge a 50% council tax premium on empty dwellings that have been unoccupied for more than two years;
- f) agree that the current 10% discount for furnished dwellings that are not anyone's sole or main residence should cease with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

### 1 Purpose of this report

The purpose of this report is to explain the changes to the arrangements for calculating council tax bases and the new requirements in respect of non-domestic rates, and to seek agreement:

- a) to the 2013/14 council tax bases for Leeds and the parish/town councils set out in the report;

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by s11(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Set out in the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings (England) Regulations 2003, and amended by the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012.

<sup>3</sup> As inserted by Section 12 of the Local Government Finance Act 2012.

- b) in principle to the business rates data to be submitted on the *National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 2013-14*, and to give the Director of Resources delegated authority to finalize the return before 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013;
- c) to charge a 50% council tax premium on empty dwellings that have been unoccupied for more than two years.

## 2 Background information

- 2.1 Members will be aware that Government are making major changes to the funding regime for local government from 2013/14 onwards. The long-established formula grant system under which funding depended on the balance between local needs and resources is being replaced by a system based upon the capacity to deliver housing and business growth.
- 2.2 A number of technical changes to the classes of exemptions considered for council tax purposes have been introduced as part of these new funding arrangements. At the same time council tax benefit is being replaced by a system of council tax support for which government funding is being reduced by 10%.

## 3 Main issues

### Council Tax Discounts and Exemptions

- 3.1 From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004, the Council reduced the council tax discount for furnished dwellings that are not anyone's sole or main residence from 50% to 10%. From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005 the Council also reduced the discount on eligible long-term empty dwellings (those empty for more than 6 months) from 50% to 0%.
- 3.2 The Local Government Finance Act 2012<sup>4</sup> removes certain statutory exemptions from council tax and replaces them with powers for billing authorities to give discounts. The Act also gives powers to billing authorities to make additional charges in respect of certain properties not occupied as a person's main residence.
- 3.3 The exemptions that have been removed are as follows:
  - **Class A - Properties which are unoccupied, unfurnished and either requiring or undergoing major repairs**, which applied for a maximum of 12 months. Again, billing authorities having the option to award a discount between 0% and 100%. If no discount is granted it is estimated that the additional income for 2013/14 would be £390,000.
  - **Class C - Properties which are unoccupied and unfurnished**, which applied for a maximum of 6 months from becoming empty. Billing authorities now have the option to award a discount between 0% and 100%. If no discount is granted it is estimated that the additional council tax income would be £5.3 million for 2013/14. A one month discount period at 100% discount would reduce that £5.3 million to £3.1 million.
- 3.4 From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 billing authorities can agree to charge an "empty homes premium" on long term empty properties which have been unoccupied over two years. The legislation

---

<sup>4</sup> By inserting section 11A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

limits the premium to an additional 50% of the relevant council tax charge for the property. It is estimated that the premium could raise an additional £554,000 during 2013/14.

- 3.5 Views on possible amendments to discounts were sought as part of the consultation on Leeds' 2013/14 Council Tax Support scheme. Respondents were generally supportive of the removal of discounts on furnished dwellings, and were not supportive of additional discounts to replace the exemptions that have been removed.
- 3.6 In addition, the initial budget proposals considered by Executive Board in December 2012 assumed that the 10% discount for furnished but unoccupied dwellings would cease and that no discounts would be granted for the properties that previously qualified for the exemptions described in Section 3.3, above.
- 3.7 It is therefore proposed that an empty homes premium should be put in place from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 but that no further discounts should be introduced. In considering this issue, Members should be aware that Section 13A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 gives local authorities discretionary powers to reduce an amount of council tax payable by an individual "to such extent...as the billing authority...thinks fit". This power will allow any cases of genuine hardship to be considered.

#### Council Tax Support Scheme

- 3.8 The new council tax support scheme will operate as a discount on the same basis as other discounts currently in place with protected groups receiving a 100% discount. The scheme proposed for Leeds is the subject of a separate report elsewhere on the Agenda, but this report assumes that non-protected recipients of council tax benefit will be required to pay 19% of their council tax bills.
- 3.9 The localisation of council tax support will have effect of reducing the overall tax base for Leeds. Based on the 19% scheme the tax base will be reduced by 38,024 Band D equivalent properties, or £42.7 million.

#### Calculation of Council Tax Base

- 3.10 Under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and accompanying regulations, detailed procedures are laid down for calculating the tax base which will be used for calculating council tax. The tax base for the Leeds area is expressed as the number of Band D equivalent properties and will be used both for calculating Leeds City Council's own element of council tax and for notifying to the West Yorkshire Police and Fire Authorities for them to calculate their own elements of council tax. The West Yorkshire Police and Fire Authorities have to be notified of the tax base by 31 January 2013.
- 3.11 In addition to calculating the tax base for the Leeds area as a whole, a separate tax base has to be calculated for each part of the Council's areas to which a "special item" of expenditure relates. In Leeds, it is considered that only parish precepts should be treated as special items for these purposes and a tax base is therefore also calculated for each parish.
- 3.12 Details of the calculations for Leeds as a whole and for each individual parish are given in Appendix 1. In summary, the council tax base for Leeds is calculated at 208,529 Band D equivalent properties. This is calculated by taking into account the above changes, and

estimating changes from the Valuation Office Agency's Valuation List that will take place during 2013/14 by reference to the following:

- provision for successful appeals,
- provision for exempt properties,
- changes in number of properties (demolitions and new additions),
- estimated single person and other discounts, and
- estimated collection rate.

The equivalent amounts for each of the parishes (including the new parish of Rawdon) are:

<b>PARISH OF</b>	<b>Taxbase Numbers 2013/2014</b>
Aberford and District	742
Allerton Bywater	1,230
Alwoodley	3,606
Arthington	282
Austhorpe	22
Bardsey cum Rigton	1,147
Barwick in Elmet and Scholes	1,949
Boston Spa	1,749
Bramham cum Oglethorpe	712
Bramhope and Carlton	1,784
Clifford	729
Collingham with Linton	1,660
Drighlington	1,763
Gildersome	1,757
Great and Little Preston	454
Harewood	1,793
Horsforth	6,523
East Keswick	577
Kippax	2,795
Ledsham	94
Ledston	155
Micklefield	477
Morley	8,802
Otley	4,528
Pool in Wharfedale	941
Rawdon	2,499
Scarcroft	682
Shadwell	952
Swillington	908
Thorner	739
Thorp Arch	361
Walton	117
Wetherby	4,376
Wothersome	8

- 3.13 The council tax requirement for 2013/14, which will be decided by Council in February 2013, will be divided by the calculated council tax base to arrive at the council tax for a Band D property, from which the council taxes for other valuation bands will be calculated.

#### Non-Domestic Rates

- 3.14 Under the Business Rates Retention Scheme introduced by the Local Government Finance Act 2012, the Council has to complete a *National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 2013-14* (NNDR1). Under the scheme, non-domestic rates collected by Leeds has to be shared between Leeds itself, Central Government and the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority in the following proportions:

- 49% retained by Leeds;
- 50% passed to Central Government;
- 1% passed to West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

- 3.15 The final NNDR1 form has to be agreed and signed by the Director of Resources and sent to DCLG and the Fire and Rescue Authority on or before 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013.

- 3.16 The completed form is attached as Appendix 2. The proposed headline amounts are as follows:

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| • to be paid to Central Government:                        | £178,732,139 |
| • to be retained by Leeds                                  | £175,304,496 |
| • to be passed to West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority | £ 3,577,643  |

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.2 Views on possible amendments to discounts were sought as part of the consultation on Leeds' 2013/14 Council Tax Support scheme. Respondents were generally supportive of the removal of discounts on furnished dwellings, and were not supportive of additional discounts to replace the exemptions that have been removed.

### **4.3 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 4.3.1 The information contained in this report will inform the development of budget proposals which will be considered by Executive Board on 15<sup>th</sup> February, and agreed by Council on 27<sup>th</sup> February. The report itself has no specific implications for equality, diversity, cohesion or integration. A screening assessment has been carried out and is appended to this report.

### **4.4 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.4.1 As outlined above, this report will inform the development of budget proposals for 2013/14. The budget process seeks to ensure that financial resources are used to support the Council's policies and priorities.

#### **4.5 Resources and value for money**

This is a financial report and the financial and resource implications are detailed in the main body of the report.

#### **4.6 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.6.1 This decisions requested in this report will enable the City Council to fulfil its responsibilities under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and the Local Government Finance Act 2012 in relation to council tax discounts and exemptions. The decisions relating to council tax bases and non-domestic rates estimates will enable the Council to finalize its budget proposals and set a legal council tax for 2013/14.

#### **4.7 Risk Management**

4.7.1 The risks associated with the council tax base and the non-domestic rates estimates will be assessed as part of the budget-setting process and will be included in the budget proposals to be considered by Executive Board and Council in February.

### **5 Recommendations**

5.1 Members are requested to:

- a) agree that in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by the Council as its council tax base for the year 2013/2014 shall be 208,529 for Leeds and for each parish as listed in Section 3.12 and Appendix 1;
- b) agree in principle the business rates data contained within the National Non-Domestic Rates Return 1 2013-14 attached as Appendix 2, and delegate authority to the Director of Resources to make any necessary detailed amendments and to submit a final version to DCLG on or before 31st January 2013;
- c) note the removal of the classes of council tax exemptions as set out in Section 3.3;
- d) agree that, in accordance with section 11A of the Local Government Act 1992, to determine that the discounts under section 11(2)(a) of that Act for prescribed Class C and D properties, shall not apply;
- e) agree that, under Section 11B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, from 1st April 2013, Leeds City Council will charge a 50% council tax premium on empty dwellings that have been unoccupied for more than two years;
- f) agree that the current 10% discount for furnished dwellings that are not anyone's sole or main residence should cease with effect from 31st March 2013.

### **6 Background documents<sup>5</sup>**

None

---

<sup>5</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

This page is intentionally left blank

**TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014**

**Appendix 1**

**CALCULATION FOR THE WHOLE OF:**

**LEEDS**

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		385	133,942	72,217	65,111	32,292	19,534	9,273	6,477	625	339,856	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	9,368	6,080	3,186	1,639	554	189	129	19	21,165	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	3,155	1,129	754	390	161	78	55	9		
	= "H" in formula 2	385	127,729	67,266	62,679	31,043	19,141	9,162	6,403	615	324,423	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	33	17,059	6,555	4,965	2,032	960	426	264	36	32,328	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	208	98	78	50	15	9	7	3	468	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	1	-14	138	249	88	48	39	5	1	555	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	195	37923	8845	4285	1157	412	131	56	1	53005	3
<b>Proportion for relevant Band</b>	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
<b>Proportion for Band D</b>	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		88	48,628	40,523	47,783	27,992	21,795	12,499	10,159	1,165		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										210,632	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	3
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											208,526	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											3	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>											<b>208,529</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### ABERFORD and DISTRICT

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	72	106	108	149	190	93	60	4	782	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	1	5	1	4	0	2	1	15	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	0	9	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	72	107	104	151	187	94	58	3	776	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	12	11	10	10	7	3	2	0	54	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	21	18	7	5	3	1	0	0	55	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	26	61	79	137	217	130	94	6		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										750	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											742	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>ABERFORD and DISTRICT</b>										<b>742</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### ALLERTON BYWATER

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		6	1,049	577	312	95	25	0	1	1	2,066	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	32	12	6	1	0	0	0	0	51	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	10	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	
	= "H" in formula 2	6	1,027	573	310	94	25	0	1	1	2,037	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	104	40	15	4	0	0	1	0	164	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	202	41	17	3	2	0	0	0	265	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		3	481	383	247	97	28	0	1	2		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,242	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,230	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>ALLERTON BYWATER</b>										<b>1,230</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### ALWOODLEY

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	39	182	1,139	1,152	567	272	350	43	3,744	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	5	33	21	9	6	6	1	80	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	5	14	12	4	1	3	1	41	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	39	177	1,106	1,131	558	266	344	42	3,664	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	8	25	98	73	28	12	11	1	256	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	2	18	78	42	13	5	1	0	159	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	20	108	841	1,031	637	361	559	85		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										3,642	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											3,606	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											TOTAL	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>ALWOODLEY</b>										<b>3,606</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### ARTHINGTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	2	18	26	24	36	20	91	14	231	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	5	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	2	17	24	24	36	20	91	14	228	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	5	0	13	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	3	5	2	1	0	1	0	12	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	1	10	15	20	42	27	142	28		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										285	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											282	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>ARTHINGTON</b>										<b>282</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### AUSTHORPE

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	1	0	2	9	13	0	0	0	25	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	1	0	1	9	13	0	0	0	24	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	1	-1	1	7	15	-1	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										22	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											22	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>AUSTHORPE</b>										<b>22</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### BARDSEY cum RIGTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		1	25	67	43	143	230	238	228	16	991	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	0	0	2	2	4	6	1	16	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	0	10	
	= "H" in formula 2	1	25	67	44	144	230	235	224	15	985	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	3	8	6	12	13	12	6	0	61	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	10	10	4	12	5	6	4	0	51	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	8	38	30	120	260	313	360	30		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,159	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,147	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>BARDSEY cum RIGTON</b>										<b>1,147</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### BARWICK in ELMET and SCHOLES

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	114	221	811	475	328	192	83	3	2,227	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	7	18	10	3	1	0	0	39	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	2	5	8	3	2	2	1	0	23	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	115	219	801	468	327	193	84	3	2,211	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	18	24	64	36	16	7	4	0	168	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	43	33	48	20	7	3	0	0	154	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	36	126	614	414	374	265	134	6		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,969	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,949	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>BARWICK in ELMET and SCHOLES</b>										<b>1,949</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### BOSTON SPA

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	94	367	293	300	355	268	182	21	1,880	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	4	8	9	6	3	5	1	1	36	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	4	4	3	5	2	1	0	20	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	91	363	288	297	357	265	182	20	1,864	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	16	39	30	32	25	13	4	1	158	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	42	74	30	10	11	4	0	0	171	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	22	196	203	256	396	359	296	39		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,767	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,749	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>BOSTON SPA</b>										<b>1,749</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### BRAMHAM cum OGLETHORPE

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	115	117	88	84	150	94	88	5	741	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	2	3	4	1	2	1	0	0	13	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	3	5	3	0	2	1	1	0	15	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	116	119	87	83	150	94	89	5	743	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	14	10	9	6	8	5	3	0	54	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	4	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	25	12	5	2	6	2	0	0	52	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	51	76	65	78	167	126	146	10		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										719	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											712	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>											<b>712</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### BRAMHOPE and CARLTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	66	16	141	295	306	382	332	21	1,559	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	9	2	3	8	10	3	3	0	37	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	2	0	2	5	3	2	4	0	18	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	59	14	140	292	299	381	333	21	1,540	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	8	2	16	30	22	21	13	0	111	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	10	3	15	9	5	5	2	1	50	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	27	7	97	253	334	513	531	40		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,802	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,784	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>BRAMHOPE and CARLTON</b>										<b>1,784</b>	

Notes:

1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012

2 Laid down in the legislation

3 Estimated

4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band

5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### CLIFFORD

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	56	105	156	143	81	138	83	2	764	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	3	8	8	1	1	1	0	22	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	2	2	4	1	0	1	2	0	12	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	57	104	152	136	80	138	84	2	754	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	11	9	17	14	4	6	3	0	62	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	19	15	6	8	1	0	0	0	49	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	18	62	115	115	91	193	138	4		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										736	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											729	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>CLIFFORD</b>										<b>729</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### COLLINGHAM with LINTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	19	64	109	82	152	294	465	100	1,285	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	1	4	3	7	4	7	1	26	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	2	2	4	2	6	2	18	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	19	63	107	81	149	292	464	101	1,277	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	3	7	13	9	9	17	19	3	81	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	4	8	14	5	5	4	5	0	45	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	8	37	72	67	165	394	738	196		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,677	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,660	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>COLLINGHAM with LINTON</b>										<b>1,660</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### DRIGHLINGTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		5	613	497	768	267	241	52	15	3	2,461	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	25	14	9	8	3	0	0	0	57	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	14	5	5	2	3	1	0	0	30	
	= "H" in formula 2	5	602	488	764	261	241	53	15	3	2,434	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	81	44	54	13	10	1	1	0	202	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	135	43	42	15	5	1	2	0	243	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		3	259	313	595	234	277	73	21	6		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,781	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,763	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>DRIGHLINGTON</b>										<b>1,763</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### GILDERSOME

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		3	644	723	768	203	220	34	9	1	2,605	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	19	18	13	2	3	0	0	0	55	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	11	8	6	0	1	0	0	0	26	
	= "H" in formula 2	3	636	713	761	201	218	34	9	1	2,576	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	87	63	51	7	8	1	1	1	217	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	183	84	52	5	5	2	0	0	331	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		2	246	441	586	189	251	45	14	1		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										1,775	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,757	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>GILDERSOME</b>										<b>1,757</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### GREAT and LITTLE PRESTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		4	271	43	238	57	35	9	6	0	663	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	5	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	14	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
	= "H" in formula 2	4	269	44	233	56	35	9	6	0	656	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	29	3	15	4	1	0	0	0	52	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	5	2	6	3	0	0	16	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	68	5	9	3	3	0	0	0	88	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		2	115	28	191	51	45	17	10	0		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										459	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											454	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>GREAT and LITTLE PRESTON</b>										<b>454</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### HAREWOOD

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	9	32	315	338	228	253	329	79	1,583	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	2	1	13	11	4	3	3	0	36	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	6	8	7	3	3	0	27	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	7	31	308	335	231	253	329	79	1,574	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	1	5	30	29	13	13	11	2	102	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	8	25	20	6	7	4	0	70	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	4	14	229	287	260	338	524	155		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										1,811	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											1,793	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>HAREWOOD</b>										<b>1,793</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### HORSFORTH

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		2	915	2,544	2,189	1,551	824	394	165	11	8,595	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	46	137	62	28	16	2	3	4	298	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	23	45	25	13	5	1	2	0	114	
	= "H" in formula 2	2	892	2,452	2,152	1,536	813	393	164	7	8,411	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	137	253	178	100	40	13	5	2	726	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	11	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	248	326	112	57	12	5	2	0	762	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		1	338	1,463	1,658	1,381	932	543	262	11		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										6,589	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											6,523	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>HORSFORTH</b>										<b>6,523</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### EAST KESWICK

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	15	65	34	45	61	79	185	4	488	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	2	0	1	2	1	1	5	0	12	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	6	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	13	66	36	43	60	78	182	4	482	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	2	6	4	3	5	4	6	0	30	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	5	12	3	1	1	1	0	0	23	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	4	37	27	39	66	106	296	8		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										583	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											577	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>EAST KESWICK</b>										<b>577</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### KIPPAX

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		5	1,378	1,100	1,118	480	132	29	3	1	4,246	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	32	24	17	5	2	1	0	0	81	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	21	8	8	2	1	0	0	0	40	
	= "H" in formula 2	5	1,367	1,084	1,109	477	131	28	3	1	4,205	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	1	153	92	62	20	4	2	1	1	334	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	252	127	63	21	2	2	0	0	467	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		3	643	674	875	437	152	34	4	1		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										2,823	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											2,795	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>KIPPAX</b>										<b>2,795</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### LED SHAM

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	0	12	3	6	9	12	34	1	77	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	0	12	3	6	9	12	35	1	78	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	0	0	7	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	0	4	2	4	11	16	56	2		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										95	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											94	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>											<b>94</b>	

Notes:

1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012

2 Laid down in the legislation

3 Estimated

4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band

5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### LEDSTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		1	63	30	5	16	18	22	23	1	179	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	= "H" in formula 2	1	63	31	5	16	17	22	23	1	179	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	6	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	14	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	11	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		1	31	20	3	15	20	30	35	2		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										157	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											155	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>LEDSTON</b>										<b>155</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### MICKLEFIELD

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		3	589	83	77	60	32	7	5	0	856	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	24	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	28	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
	= "H" in formula 2	3	577	82	76	59	32	7	5	0	841	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	1	66	8	6	2	2	0	0	0	84	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	123	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	135	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		1	260	56	61	52	34	10	8	0		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										482	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											477	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>MICKLEFIELD</b>										<b>477</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### MORLEY

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		23	5,894	3,232	2,933	1,227	734	87	30	2	14,162	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	218	104	53	14	5	2	3	0	399	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	157	60	20	8	5	0	0	0	250	
	= "H" in formula 2	23	5,833	3,188	2,900	1,221	734	85	27	2	14,013	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	2	791	288	214	54	25	5	2	1	1,382	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	21	9	2	0	0	0	0	32	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	1,356	287	185	38	15	2	0	0	1883	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		12	2,461	2,050	2,232	1,131	848	113	42	2		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										8,891	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											8,802	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>MORLEY</b>										<b>8,802</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### OTLEY

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		3	805	2,130	1,701	944	524	163	58	6	6,334	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	29	52	32	12	4	4	1	0	134	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	21	30	17	6	2	1	0	1	78	
	= "H" in formula 2	3	797	2,108	1,686	938	522	160	57	7	6,278	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	129	208	149	66	27	9	3	1	591	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	250	312	95	29	4	1	1	0	692	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		2	282	1,237	1,286	846	601	218	89	13		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										4,574	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											4,528	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>OTLEY</b>										<b>4,528</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### POOL in WHARFEDALE

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		1	47	155	217	186	127	137	113	6	989	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	3	7	5	2	3	5	0	25	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	0	12	
	= "H" in formula 2	1	47	154	214	183	126	135	109	6	976	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	8	15	20	15	9	8	3	0	77	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	16	19	9	3	2	1	1	0	51	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	16	94	165	166	141	182	175	12		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										951	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											941	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>											<b>941</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### RAWDON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	79	410	833	631	439	261	195	28	2,876	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	4	3	4	3	2	4	2	0	22	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	3	8	14	5	3	3	2	0	37	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	78	415	843	633	440	260	195	28	2,891	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	11	47	68	43	20	12	6	1	205	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	48	216	64	12	11	4	0	355	3
<b>Proportion for relevant Band</b>	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
<b>Proportion for Band D</b>	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	45	249	499	526	499	344	307	55		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										2,524	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											2,499	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>											<b>2,499</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### SCARCROFT

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	3	20	41	55	45	68	207	65	504	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	4	1	0	1	2	6	1	15	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	1	10	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	3	16	41	56	46	68	204	65	499	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	2	6	4	4	3	7	1	26	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	1	2	5	2	2	1	0	0	13	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	1	10	27	50	49	93	331	128		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										689	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											682	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>SCARCROFT</b>										<b>682</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### SHADWELL

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	11	29	62	133	218	171	179	9	812	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	2	2	2	7	0	0	2	0	15	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	7	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	9	28	62	127	219	172	178	9	804	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	1	4	7	11	15	7	5	0	51	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	2	2	5	6	4	0	1	0	20	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	4	17	44	110	244	238	287	18		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										962	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											952	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>SHADWELL</b>										<b>952</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### SWILLINGTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		5	650	329	320	116	59	21	7	1	1,508	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	23	4	7	6	2	1	0	0	42	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	
	= "H" in formula 2	5	636	327	315	110	57	20	7	1	1,479	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	1	73	29	21	8	2	1	0	0	134	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	152	47	28	6	0	0	0	0	233	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		3	274	196	238	96	67	29	12	2		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										917	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											908	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>SWILLINGTON</b>										<b>908</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### THORNER

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		2	67	89	108	110	153	75	120	20	744	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	1	1	3	4	2	2	1	0	14	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	8	
	= "H" in formula 2	2	67	90	108	107	152	73	119	20	738	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	12	12	10	9	8	4	5	0	60	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	23	10	11	4	3	1	2	0	54	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		1	21	53	77	94	174	100	186	40		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										746	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											739	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>THORNER</b>										<b>739</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### THORP ARCH

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	0	33	90	46	82	17	67	11	346	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	5	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	0	33	88	47	82	17	67	11	345	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	2	8	5	5	1	4	0	25	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	2	10	4	2	0	0	0	18	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	0	22	62	38	93	23	105	22		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										365	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											361	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>THORP ARCH</b>										<b>361</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### WALTON

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	1	2	15	10	18	19	31	3	99	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	1	2	14	8	18	19	31	3	96	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	7	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	1	1	11	6	19	26	48	6		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										118	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											117	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>WALTON</b>										<b>117</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### WETHERBY

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		2	238	1,102	939	712	1,149	467	303	22	4,934	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	10	44	23	16	16	8	4	1	122	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	5	15	12	5	6	5	2	0	50	
	= "H" in formula 2	2	233	1,073	928	701	1,139	464	301	21	4,862	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	39	130	92	62	58	25	11	2	418	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	73	212	57	25	13	5	1	0	386	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		1	80	572	693	615	1,306	628	484	41		
<b>TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS</b>	= "A" in formula 1										4,420	4
<b>ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE</b>	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											4,376	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>WETHERBY</b>										<b>4,376</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

## TAX BASE FOR PURPOSE OF CALCULATING COUNCIL TAX 2013/2014

### CALCULATION FOR THE PARISH OF:

### WOTHERSOME

TAX BASE = A x B  
(Formula 1)

Where "A" equals total of relevant amounts as calculated below  
and "B" is the authority's estimation of its collection rate for the year

RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH  
BAND = ((H-Q+ E+J) -Z) x (F/G)  
(Formula 2)  
(paragraph 4 (1) of the legislation)

Where "H" is the number of chargeable dwellings on the relevant day  
and "Q" is a factor to take account of the discounts to which the amount of council tax payable was  
subject on the relevant day  
and "E" is a factor to take account of the premiums, if any, to which the amount of council tax payable  
was subject on the relevant day  
and "J" is the amount of any adjustment in respect of changes in the number of chargeable dwellings  
or discounts calculated  
and "Z" is the total amount that the authority estimates will be applied in accordance with  
the council tax reduction scheme in relation to the band  
and "F" is the relevant proportion applicable to each band  
and "G" is the relevant proportion applicable to band D

(paragraph 4 (1) of draft legislation)

		BAND A (5/9)	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H	TOTAL	Note
Dwellings in valuation list		0	0	2	4	0	1	0	2	0	9	1
Less Exempt dwellings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Add Technical Changes Adjustment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	= "H" in formula 2	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	2	0	9	
Total discounts	= "Q" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total Premiums	= "E" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Additions less Reductions	= "J" in formula 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reduction Scheme	= "Z" in formula 2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Proportion for relevant Band	= "F" in formula 2	5	6	7	8	9	11	13	15	18		2
Proportion for Band D	= "G" in formula 2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		2
RELEVANT AMOUNT FOR EACH BAND		0	0	1	3	0	1	0	3	0		
TOTAL RELEVANT AMOUNTS	= "A" in formula 1										8	4
ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE	= "B" in formula 1										99.0%	5
UNADJUSTED TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX: ("A" x "B")											8	
Addition by reference to payments from Secretary of State for Defence for Class O exempt properties (SI 1992/2943)											0	1
<b>TAX BASE FOR CALCULATION OF TAX FOR:</b>	<b>WOTHERSOME</b>										<b>8</b>	

Notes:

- 1 From Valuation List / Council Tax records on 30 November 2012
- 2 Laid down in the legislation
- 3 Estimated
- 4 Sum of result of formula 2 for each band
- 5 As for the District as a whole (legal requirement)

This page is intentionally left blank



Department for  
Communities and  
Local Government

## NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES RETURN 1 NADR1 2013-14

Please e-mail to : [nadr.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:nadr.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Please enter your details after checking that you have selected the correct authority name.

Please check the figures shown in the cells with a blue border and enter your own figures if you disagree with those suggested.

A provisional version of the form should be returned to the Department for Communities and Local Government by  
**Monday 7 January 2013**

The final version of this form, including a signed copy, must also be sent to the Department for Communities and Local Government by  
**Thursday 31 January 2013**

Select your local authority's name from this list:

Knowsley	-
Lambeth	-
Lancaster	-
Leeds	-
Leicester	-
Lewes	-

Check that this is your authority :

Leeds

Check that this is your E Code :

E4704

Local authority contact name :

Mark Amson

Telephone number of local authority contact :

0113 2475066

Fax number for local authority contact :

0113 2475874

E-mail address of local authority contact :

[mark.amson@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:mark.amson@leeds.gov.uk)

Ver 1.3

1. Number of hereditaments on the rating list on 30 September 2012

26,692

£

2. Aggregate rateable value on the rating list on 30 September 2012

925,552,263

### GROSS CALCULATED RATE YIELD

£

3. Enter line 2 x small business non-domestic rating multiplier (0.462)

427,605,145.51

### MANDATORY RELIEFS

#### Small business rate relief

£

4. Additional yield generated to finance the small business rate relief scheme

7,440,040.49

5. Cost of small business rate relief for properties within billing authority area

14,378,320.30

6. Net cost of the small business rate relief (Line 5 minus Line 4)

6,938,279.81

7. Cost of relief to charities

21,413,938.11

8. Cost of relief to Community Amateur Sports Clubs

282,565.03

9. Cost of relief for rural general stores, post offices, public houses, petrol filling stations and food shops

10,880.10

10. Cost of relief for partly occupied premises

1,000,000.00

11. Cost of relief for empty premises

21,900,000.00

12. Total mandatory reliefs (Sum of lines 6 to 11)

51,545,663.05

### DISCRETIONARY RELIEFS

13. Cost of relief to charities

49,000.49

14. Cost of relief to non-profit making bodies

415,193.01

15. Cost of relief to Community Amateur Sports Clubs

18,228.09

16. Cost of relief for rural general stores, post offices, public houses, petrol filling stations and food shops

6,123.00

17. Cost of relief to other rural businesses

5,323.83

18. Other Section 47 reliefs (Localism Act discounts)

0.00

19. Total discretionary reliefs (Sum of lines 13 to 18)

493,868.42

20. Gross Rate Yield after reliefs (Line 3 minus lines 12 & 19)

375,565,614.04

21. Estimate of 'losses in collection'

4,882,352.98

22. Allowance for Cost of Collection

1,234,002.11

23. Special Authority Deductions - City of London Offset

0.00

NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES RETURN 1 2013-14		Leeds
Ver 1.3		
<b>Section 2</b>		
<b>Enterprise Zones</b>		
24. Estimated level of discount to be awarded in 2013-14		£ 150,000.00
25. Estimated value of non-domestic rates in the Enterprise Zone area in 2013-14	1,055,000.00	
26. Enterprise Zone baseline	904,981.00	
27. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14 (Line 25 minus line 26)		150,019.00
<b>New Development Deals</b>		
28. Estimated value of non-domestic rates in the New Development Deals area in 2013-14	0.00	
29. New Development Deals baseline	0.00	
30. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14 (Line 28 minus line 29)		0.00
<b>Renewable Energy Schemes</b>		
31. Total estimated value of business rates to be retained in 2013-14		0.00
32. Net Rate Yield excluding transitional arrangements and rate retention (Line 20 minus the sum of lines 21 to 23, 27, 30 & 31)		369,299,239.95
<b>Rate retention adjustments</b>		
33. Estimate of the change in rateable value between 1 October 2012 and 30 September 2013		15,000,000.00
34. Estimate of the change in receipts as a result in the change in rateable value (line 33 times the multiplier)		6,930,000.00
	%	
This equates to a percentage change of	1.62	
35. Local authority's estimate of adjustment due to appeals		18,464,962.00
36. Net Rate Yield excluding transitional arrangements but after rate retention adjustments (Line 32 plus lines 34 and minus line 35)		357,764,278.00
<b>Section 3</b>		
<b>Transitional arrangements</b>		
37. Addition revenue received because reduction in rates have been deferred	216,813.00	
38. Revenue foregone because increase in rates have been deferred	987,018.20	
39. Net cost of transitional arrangements (Line 38 minus line 37)		770,205.20
40. Net Rate Yield after transitional arrangements and rate retention (Line 36 minus line 39)		356,994,073.00

<b>NNDR Summary for : Leeds</b>	
These figures show the percentage shares of the NNDR you estimate your authority will collect in 2013-14. They are based on line 36. See the <i>Tier Split</i> tab for full information	
Amount of NNDR to be paid to central government	£ 178,732,139.00
Amount to be retained by Leeds under the rates retention scheme	175,304,496.00
Amount to be passed to West Yorkshire Fire	3,577,643.00

<b>Certificate of Chief Financial Officer</b>	
I certify that the entries in lines 3, 12, 19, 20, 36, 39 and 40 of this form are the best I can make on the information available to me and that the figures given in lines 1 and 2 used in the calculating the amount shown in lines 36 and 40 are, to the best of my knowledge and belief those shown in the rating list for my authority as at 30 September 2012, subject to any order made before 15 January 2013 under the Local Government Act 1972 implementing boundary changes. I also certify that the authority has made proper arrangements for securing efficiency and effectiveness in relation to the collection of non-domestic rates. I also certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that any amount included as legal costs in line 22 and discretionary relief in line 24 meet the conditions set out in the Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention) Regulations 2013.	
Chief Financial Officer : .....	
Date : .....	

## Appendix 3



### Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

<b>Directorate:</b> Resources	<b>Service area:</b> Financial Development
<b>Lead person:</b> M. S. Woods	<b>Contact number:</b> 0113 395 1373

**1. Title:** Calculation of the Council Tax and Business Rates tax bases for 2013/14 and determinations in relation to Council Tax premiums and discounts

Is this a:

**Strategy / Policy**       **Service / Function**       **Other**

**If other, please specify**

**2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening**

The calculation of the tax bases for Council Tax and Business Rates tax bases for 2013/14 and changes to discounts available for Council Tax

### 3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?		✓
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	✓	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		✓
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		✓
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		✓

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

#### 4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

Whilst there has been (and there is unlikely to be) any significant public concern about the proposals, views on possible amendments to discounts were sought as part the consultation on Leeds' 2013/14 Council Tax Support scheme. Respondents were generally supportive of the removal of discounts on furnished dwellings and were not supportive of additional discounts to replace the exemptions that have been removed.

- **Key findings** (think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

- **Actions** (think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

**5. If you are **not** already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment.****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
--	--

Date to complete your impact assessment	
---	--

Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	
--	--

**6. Governance, ownership and approval**

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Maureen Taylor	Chief Officer (Financial Development)	7 <sup>th</sup> January 2013

**7. Publishing**

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

<b>Date screening completed</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> January 2013
---------------------------------	------------------------------

<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> January 2013
-----------------------------------	------------------------------

<b>Date published</b>	
-----------------------	--

(To be completed by the Equality Team)

Report author: Steve Carey  
Tel: 43001

**Report of Director of Resources**

**Report to Council**

**Date: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013**

**Subject: Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

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

**Summary of main issues**

1. The Local Government Finance Act 2012 requires Councils to agree and adopt by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 a local scheme of Council Tax Support to take effect from April 2013. The local scheme replaces the national Council Tax Benefit scheme for working age customers which is abolished from the end of March 2013. A national Council Tax Support scheme will remain for pension age customers.
  
2. Councils and precepting authorities will receive grant funding as a contribution to the costs of providing both the local scheme for working age customers and the national scheme for pension age customers. The total grant for Leeds City Council plus the related elements for the Police Authority, the Fire and Rescue Service and Parish Councils is £49.2m for 13/14 against a projected current year spend of £54.3m.
  
3. A public consultation exercise was undertaken and, following a report to the Executive Board in December 2012, the Executive recommended a local scheme for adoption by Council that would see certain vulnerable groups protected from reductions and other working age customers facing a reduction in support. The Executive also agreed that the costs of protecting vulnerable groups would be met by the Council and precepting authorities
  
4. Additional work was undertaken in relation to Second Adult Rebate scheme and the outcome is a recommendation that this scheme is removed.

## 5. Recommendations

Members are requested to adopt a local Council Tax Support scheme that:

- Protects lone parents with children under 5, carers and customers in receipt of severe or enhanced disability premium from reductions in support;
- Protects people in receipt of Armed Forces Compensation Payments from reductions in support and includes continuing the longstanding policy whereby the Council has exercised its discretion to disregard war pensions in full;
- Continues to support people moving into work by continuing to apply the current run-on scheme which sees qualifying people who move into work continuing to receive the same level of support for the first 4 weeks of work;
- Removes the Second Adult Rebate scheme; and
- Reduces Council Tax Support entitlement for all other working age customers by 19% as calculated using the Government's default scheme regulations which mirror and replace the current Council Tax Benefit regulations.

## 2 Purpose of this report

2.2 The report sets out a recommended local Council Tax Support scheme for adoption by Council. The scheme will operate for the 13/14 financial year and would become the default scheme for 14/15 unless Council adopts a different scheme for the 14/15 financial year.

## 3 Background information

3.1 As part of the Government's Welfare Reform programme, Council Tax Benefit is being abolished and replaced with local schemes of Council Tax Support decided by billing authorities. The key elements of the reform are:

- A national scheme will remain in place for pensioners which will see pensioners continuing to receive the same levels of support;
- Government funding will be reduced nationally by 10% with the funding needing to cover the cost of the national scheme for pensioners as well as the cost of the local scheme for working age customers;
- Billing authorities are largely free to decide local schemes but any costs over and above the level of Government funding would need to be met by the billing authority and precepting authorities;
- Failure to adopt a scheme by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 would see a default scheme imposed. The default scheme is equivalent to the current Council Tax Benefit scheme and the extra costs of this scheme would have to be met by the council and precepting authorities.

- Billing authorities will be required to adopt a local scheme each year. However, if in future years an authority does not adopt a scheme, the previous year's scheme becomes the default scheme and continues to operate.

#### **4 Main issues**

- 4.1 In December 2012, the Executive Board considered a report on local Council Tax Support scheme options. The report, which is attached at appendix 1, presented the outcomes of the public consultation exercise and set out a number of scheme options in response to the consultation.
- 4.2 The Executive supported a scheme that would see certain vulnerable groups protected from reductions in support, with the costs of protecting these vulnerable groups being met by the council and precepting authorities. These groups are:
- Lone parents with children under 5;
  - Carers; and
  - Customers getting enhanced or severe disability premium
- 4.3 The Executive also supported protecting customers in receipt of War Widows Pensions and War Pensions from reductions in support, including continuing to disregard income from these pensions when calculating entitlement. The remaining working age customers would face a reduction of between 17% and 19% - these figures were based on estimates assuming no change in caseload or Council Tax levels.
- 4.4 In late December, the Government confirmed that the total grant to be paid to Leeds City Council and the major and local precepting authorities would be £49.2m towards the cost of the local Council Tax Support scheme in 2013/14.
- 4.5 The main factors that will determine the final costs of the scheme are changes to caseload, both working age and pension age caseloads, the level of Council Tax levied (including precepts) and the split between in-work and out-of-work customers. Out-of-work customers tend to receive higher levels of Council Tax Support than in-work customers. In order to allow for potential changes to the costs of the scheme, it is recommended that a scheme which sees support reduced by 19% is adopted.

#### *Second Adult Rebate*

- 4.6 The initial public consultation was based on a published draft scheme that saw the Second Adult Rebate scheme removed. Further consultation was undertaken with the 573 recipients of Second Adult Rebates about the intention to abolish the scheme. The outcomes of this short consultation exercise are set out at appendix 2. In summary, 113 responses were received with 86% disagreeing with the proposal to remove the scheme. The main reasons for disagreeing with the policy were:
- The majority of the comments stated that the householder would suffer financial hardship.

- The majority of the remainder of the comments related the circumstances of the non-householder.

4.7 In response to these concerns, householders losing Second Adult Rebate would have the option of claiming main Council Tax Support instead. Similarly, the circumstances of the non-householder would be taken into account in the assessment for main Council Tax Support as it is with claims from couples with a non-dependent and households with more than 2 adults. In reality, many recipients of Second Adult Rebate have income levels too high to qualify for main Council Tax Support and, in the circumstances where the majority of working age customers will see a reduction in support, it would be unfair to maintain a scheme that takes little account of the income of the householder and pays benefit to households with income levels in excess of those required to be entitled to Council Tax Support.

4.8 It is recommended that the Second Adult Rebate scheme is removed.

## **5 Corporate Considerations**

### **5.1 Consultation and Engagement**

5.1.1 Public consultation was undertaken on the proposed changes. The results of the consultation are included as an appendix in the Executive Board report (appendix 1). The separate Second Adult Rebate consultation is shown at appendix 2.

### **5.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

5.2.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and published

### **5.3 Council policies and priorities**

5.3.1 The local Council Tax Support scheme is one of a number of welfare reforms that come into effect from April 2013. Others include the Benefit Cap, new under-occupancy rules in social sector housing and new local welfare schemes to be out in place by local councils. These changes, added together, have implications for key priorities around debt, housing and health.

### **5.4 Resources and value for money**

5.4.1 The costs of providing funding for the protection of vulnerable groups, has resource implications for the Council and precepting authorities but is likely to reduce Council Tax arrears and lessen impacts on the collection fund.

### **5.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

5.5.1 This decision requested in this report will enable the City Council to fulfil its responsibility under the Local Government Finance Act 2012 in relation to local council tax reduction schemes.

### **5.6 Risk Management**

5.6.1 There is a risk that the adoption of a scheme that reduces financial support for working age customers increases the risks of non-payment of Council Tax. An assessment of the

impact of non-payment needs to be built into the calculation when setting the council tax base and will impact on the amount of Council Tax income for the council and the major precepting authorities.

5.6.2 Variations in Council Tax and/or caseload levels, including variations in numbers of customers in vulnerable groups, could lead to an increase in costs which would have to be met by the council and major precepting authorities. The recommended scheme provides for potential increases in costs.

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 Members are requested to adopt a local Council Tax Support scheme that:

- Protects lone parents with children under 5, carers and customers in receipt of severe or enhanced disability premium from reductions in support;
- Protects people in receipt of Armed Forces Compensation Payments from reductions in support and includes continuing the longstanding policy whereby the Council has exercised its discretion to disregard war pensions in full;
- Continues to support people moving into work by continuing to apply the current run-on scheme which sees qualifying people who move into work continuing to receive the same level of support for the first 4 weeks of work;
- Removes the Second Adult Rebate scheme; and
- Reduces Council Tax Support entitlement for all other working age customers by 19% as calculated using the Government's default scheme regulations which mirror and replace the current Council Tax Benefit regulations.

## **7 Background documents**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report of Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive**

**Report to Executive Board**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> December 2012**

**Subject: Consultation outcomes on Local Council Tax Support scheme**

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

**Summary of main issues**

1. A public consultation exercise has been carried out seeking views on options for a local Council Tax Support scheme to replace Council Tax Benefit in April 2013.
2. The outcomes from the consultation are inconclusive with the majority of respondents who are non-benefit recipients preferring a scheme that limited spend to Government funding levels and the majority of respondents who are benefit recipients preferring a scheme that required additional funding from the council and precepting authorities.
3. There was, however, much greater consistency from both benefit recipients and non-benefit recipients for protecting vulnerable groups for reductions in support.
4. A range of options are set out in this report for Executive Board to consider. The options take account of both the consultation outcomes and the budget position facing the council.

**Recommendations**

1. Executive Board is asked to note the information in this report and approve a local Council Tax Support scheme that:
  - a) Protects vulnerable groups as set out in para 3.6 a) and b);

- b) Continues the current local scheme of disregarding in full Armed Forces Compensation Payments;
- c) Provides additional funding to cover the cost of protecting these vulnerable groups; and
- d) Reduces support for the remaining working age customers by a set percentage (currently estimated between 17% and 19%) for the remaining working age customers with the intention of containing overall scheme spend so that it does not exceed Government funding plus the additional funding for protected groups.

2. Executive Board is also asked to agree that:

- a) The report to Full Council is updated with a final figure for the percentage reduction for non-protected working age customers that reflects the Government Funding decision following the Autumn Statement and Local Government Settlement announcement in December 2012;
- b) The report to Full Council is updated with the outcome of the consultation on the Second Adult Rebate scheme.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

**1.1** The report provides information to enable the Executive Board to recommend a local Council tax Support scheme for adoption by full council by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013. A range of scheme options has been set out that reflects both the consultation feedback and budget position facing the council. The requirement to adopt a local scheme by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 is contained within the Local Government Finance Act 2012.

## **2 Background information**

**2.2** Regulation 10(1)(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 2012 requires that each billing authority must put in place a Council Tax Reduction scheme. The deadline for adopting a scheme is set by regulation 4(6) of Schedule 1A to the Act which states that a default scheme will apply where billing authorities fail to adopt a scheme. The default scheme is equivalent to the current Council Tax Benefit scheme.

**2.3** Government funding for local schemes will be reduced by 10% in comparison to spending on Council Tax Benefit schemes. The baseline for the funding reduction will use the Office for Budget Responsibility's (OBR) estimates for what Council Tax Benefit spend would have been in 13/14 if that scheme had continued. Based on the last OBR estimate for CTB spend in 13/14, Leeds City Council and the precepting authorities would have received £48.35m against a current year spend of £54.57m. This is a shortfall of £6.2m and represents an 11.4% reduction in funding. A revised OBR estimate of CTB spend for 13/14 is expected in December 2012 and this will form the basis for the Government's funding allocation.

**2.4** In June 2012 Executive Board approved consultation on a scheme proposal that would see reductions in support for working age customers capped at 10% with some groups of customers fully protected from reductions. In September 2012, following consultation with the major precepting authorities, Executive Board approved an amendment to the consultation to seek views on:

- a) Option 1: A scheme option that would see the reductions in funding passed on to working age customers in full. This would be achieved by reducing support by up to 30% for non-protected working age customers; and
- b) Option 2: A first year scheme option that would limit the reduction in support for non-protected working age customers to 10%.

**2.5** Other than the percentage reduction for non-protected working age customers, both schemes shared the same features. These were:

- a) No reduction in support for protected groups. These were
  - customers who qualify for a severe or enhanced disability premium;
  - lone parents with a child under 5
  - customers in receipt of a War Widow (er)s Pension or War Pension
- b) Support for people moving into work through the continuing application of the 4-week run on
- c) Removal of the Second Adult Rebate scheme.

**2.6** The consultation exercise was launched on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2012 alongside the publication of a draft scheme (Appendix 1) that would see the reductions in funding passed onto working age customers.

**2.7** On 16<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the Government announced that it was making an additional £100m available to local councils for local Council Tax Reduction schemes. The additional funding is available for 1 year only and is available to councils who:

- a) cap reductions in support under their local schemes to no more than 8.5% for customers who currently qualify for 100% support;
- b) do not increase the rate at which support is withdrawn for additional income to above 25%; and
- c) do not have sharp reductions in support for those entering work.

The additional funding that would be available to Leeds and the precepting authorities if the scheme met these requirements would be £1.3m.

**2.8** Neither of the scheme options 1 or 2 meets the criteria for the additional funding available from the Government. However, if the '10% cap' scheme option was amended to cap the reduction at 8.5% for all non-protected groups, the scheme would qualify for the additional £1.3m. The net effect of the additional funding

would mean that the cost to the Council and preceptors of capping the reduction at 8.5% (between £1.96m - £2.72m using above assumptions) would be less than the cost of capping the reduction at 10% (between £3.0m and £3.7m). Legal advice suggests that there would be no need to re-consult if this scheme was adoption by Full Council.

**2.9** Appendix 2 sets out estimated cost implications for the scheme options that formed the basis of the consultation. The main factors that will determine the final costs of the scheme are:

- *Government funding levels:* paragraph 2.2 explains why funding arrangements are uncertain at the moment. Two sets of costs are shown with one set based on a straight 10% reduction in funding based on current spend and the other using indicative figures based on the OBR's latest estimates as provided by DCLG;
- *Council Tax levels:* changes to Council Tax levels change the costs of the Council Tax Reduction scheme. The costs implications set out in appendix 4 are based on Council Tax levels not changing in 13/14
- *Caseload changes:* Appendix 3 provides information about caseload trends in Leeds for the last few years. This shows a significant rise in working age caseload numbers between 2008 and 2010 slowing down to a more stable position over the last few months. The caseload trend for pension age claims over the same period shows a reduction in caseload. Subsidisable Council Tax Benefit expenditure is forecast to be less in the current year than in the previous year. On the basis of these trends, the costs analyses in Appendix 4 are based on no change to caseload levels in Leeds.

### **3 Main issues**

**3.1** The public consultation exercise started on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2012 and concluded on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012. A copy of the consultation document is attached at Appendix 4.

**3.2** There were 5,615 responses to the consultation with 4,225 responses coming from Council Tax Benefit recipients, 953 responses from the Citizens Panel and 437 responses from the open-access public online survey. The main results from the consultation are set out below:

- a) Overall there was more support for additional funding being put into the scheme to limit the reduction for working age customers (55%) than there was for restricting spend to the level of Government support (32%)
- However, there were differences in views depending on whether the respondent was a benefit recipient or a not.
    - 54% of non-recipients agreed that funding for the local scheme should be limited to the Government funding levels while only 24% of benefit recipients agreed with this.

- 29% of non-recipients disagreed that funding should be limited to the Government funding levels and 59% of benefit recipients also disagreed that funding should be limited to Government funding levels;
  - 58% of benefits recipients agreed that the council should put money into the scheme to cap the reduction customers face while only 41% of non-recipients agreed with this.
  - 42% of non-recipients disagreed that the council should put money into the scheme and 19% of benefits recipients disagreed with this.
- b) There was, however, consistent support from respondents, whether in receipt of Council Tax Benefit or not, for protecting vulnerable groups as set out in the draft scheme and including carers following the inclusion of a question about carers in the consultation document. Table 1 shows the results for both scheme option 1 and scheme option 2;

**Table 1 – level of agreement that certain groups should be protected**

	Non Benefits - % respondents agreeing with protection		Benefits - % of respondents agreeing with protection	
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2
Carers	70	67	80	81
Disabled people	76	74	95	90
Lone parents with child u5	53	52	74	76
War disablement Pension	73	71	80	85
War Widows/Widowers	60	58	73	79

- c) Respondents also suggested other groups that should be protected. These ranged from people on low income (20% of comments) through to families (2%);
- d) Around three-quarters of respondents agree the council should continue to support people moving into work

**3.3** A more detailed summary of the consultation results is provided at Appendix 5. It should also be noted that representation was received from the Royal British Legion seeking assurances that war pensioners and people in receipt of Armed Forces Compensation Payments would be protected.

**3.4** The consultation outcomes are one of the factors the Council needs to take into consideration when deciding on the local Council Tax Support scheme to put in place. The financial implications for the Council of the local Council Tax Support scheme also need to be considered in context of the overall financial situation faced by the council. A separate report is before Executive Board today dealing with budget issues.

### *Scheme recommendation*

**3.5** The consultation results are inconclusive on support for additional funding being put into the scheme with the majority of non-benefit recipients preferring that funding is limited to the Government funding, while the majority of benefit recipients prefer additional funding to be put into the scheme to limit the impact on working age recipients. There is majority support from both benefit recipients and non-benefit recipients for protecting carers, disabled customers, lone parents and people in receipt of war pensions and war widows pensions. There is also support for continuing to support people moving into work.

**3.6** On this basis, and given the financial and budget position facing the Council which is set out in a separate report, it is recommended that the scheme put to Full Council for adoption is as follows:

- a) Protects lone parents, carers<sup>1</sup> and customers in receipt of severe or enhanced disability premium from reductions in support. There is consistent support from respondents for protecting these groups ;
- b) Protects people in receipt of War Widows Pension or War Pensions. Again there is consistent support from respondents for protecting this group from reductions in support. This would also continue a longstanding policy whereby the Council has exercised its discretion to disregard war pensions in full;
- c) Passes on the reduction in Government funding to non-protected working age customers. However, the preference of the Administration is for the costs of protecting vulnerable groups to be met by the council and preceptors instead of also being passed onto customers. This would see non-protected customers facing a lower reduction in support of between 17% and 19% (depending on assumptions set out in paras 2.9) rather than 22% to 25%.

The costs of funding the protections would be between £1.2m and £1.46m based on current estimates of numbers in protected groups and these costs are lower than the options of capping reductions in support to 10% or the alternative 1-year option of capping support to 8.5% and more affordable with fewer pressures on other services given the budget pressures,. Table 2 shows the comparison in costs between the options. Full costs for both the 8.5% scheme and the recommended scheme with protections funded by the Council and preceptors are shown at appendix 6

This option recognises the support for protecting vulnerable groups among both benefit and non-benefit recipients and recognises that while there is no conclusive support for providing additional funding, there is stronger support

---

<sup>1</sup>A carer is defined as

- a householder (or their partner) who is entitled to a carers allowance; or
- a householder (or their partner) who makes a claim for carers allowance and would be entitled but for overlapping benefits. The person for whom care is provided must continue to receive attendance allowance or the middle or highest rate of the care component of disability living allowance.

for putting additional funding into the scheme to reduce the impact on other working age customers.

It is also recognised that the costs of capping the support to 10% or 8.5% are not affordable in the current climate without impacting on other services for vulnerable people. Neither is it possible to protect other groups without increasing the costs and therefore the impacts on other service provision. It should be noted that the current scheme recognises age, children, disability and low income and these aspects will also be recognised in the recommended scheme with people on lower incomes getting more support than people on higher incomes.

Table 2

Options	Impact on customers		Costs for council and preceptors	
	From	To	From	To
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reductions capped at 10%</li> <li>• Vulnerable groups protected</li> </ul>	10%	10%	£3.0m	£3.7m
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reductions capped at 8.5%</li> <li>• Vulnerable groups protected</li> <li>• Additional Govt funding of £1.3m</li> </ul>	8.5%	8.5%	£1.9m	£2.7m
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reductions in funding passed onto customers</li> <li>• Vulnerable groups protected</li> <li>• Cost of protections funded by Council and preceptors</li> </ul>	17%	19%	£1.2m	£1.46m

d) Continues to support people moving into work. This would be done by continuing to apply the current run-on scheme which sees qualifying people who move into work continuing to receive the same level of support for the first 4 weeks of work. There is clear support from respondents for supporting people moving into work.

**3.7** Appendix 7 shows the average reduction in support for non-protected working age customers of all the scheme options including the recommended scheme.

#### *Second Adult Rebate*

**3.8** The published draft scheme contains an intention to remove the Second Adult Rebate scheme. The Second Adult Rebate scheme is a scheme where single customers can receive up to 25% off their Council Tax where they are not eligible for a Single Person Discount because another adult who is not their partner lives with them and:

- they have income levels too high to qualify for mainstream Council Tax Benefit; or
- they have income levels which would qualify for mainstream Council Tax Benefit but they would be better off getting a Second Adult Rebate.
- Awards are based on the income levels of the other adult in the property.

**3.9** Further consultation is currently underway with customers getting Second Adult Rebate as it is felt that more needs to be done to ensure the views of those

affected have been taken into account. There are around 550 recipients of Second Adult Rebate (less than 1% of the overall Council Tax Benefit caseload) and spend on Second Adult Rebate is around £110k (around 0.2% of overall Council Tax Benefit spend).

- 3.10** The outcome of this further short consultation on Second Adult Rebate will be included in the report to Full Council in January 2013 alongside Executive Board's preferred Council Tax Support scheme.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 A public consultation exercise has been undertaken details of which are set out at appendix 5

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 4.2.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and is attached at appendix 8.

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.3.1 The local Council Tax Support scheme is one of a number of welfare reforms that come into effect from April 2013. Others include the Benefit Cap, new under-occupancy rules in social sector housing and new local welfare schemes to be out in place by local councils. These changes, added together, have implications for key priorities around debt, housing and health.

### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 The scheme options set out in this report have resource implications for the Council and precepting authorities. A scheme option that sees the full reduction in Government funding requires no additional funding from the Council or precepting authorities but would have implications for the collection fund and council tax base as a result of increased levels of Council Tax arrears. A scheme option that sees the reduction in support capped through the provision of additional funding from the council and precepting authorities, has direct resource implications but is likely to reduce Council Tax arrears and lessen impacts on the collection fund.
- 4.4.2 The options set out in this report are also expected to have implications for customer contact. Appendix 9 provides more detail on the potential impact on customer contact and makes reference to other welfare reform changes, some of which will take effect at the same time.
- 4.4.3 Whilst it is impossible to predict exactly when and where individuals will contact us, the conclusion is that there will be a significant increase in customer contact occurring during the 2013/14 financial year and that there will be particular spike occurring between the period March 2013 to July 2013 . In recognition of this increase in demand, the appendix also includes information on some of the actions being pursued in preparation for this additional contact.

## **4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

- 4.5.1 The decision on the Council Tax Reduction scheme is a decision of the Full Council and needs to be taken by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013. Failure to put in place a local scheme by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 will see the default scheme imposed on the council. The default scheme, to all intents and purposes, replicates the current Council Tax Benefit scheme and imposition of this scheme in Leeds would require the council and major precepting authorities to meet the costs of the scheme over and above the Government's funding contribution. Based on current year scheme and taking into account the funding issues set out in paragraph 2.2, the additional contribution from the council and major precepting authorities would be between £5.4m and £6.2m. The final cost of failing to adopt a scheme by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 could be reduced by £1.3m if the Department for Communities and Local Government accepted that the default scheme qualified for the additional funding

### **Risk Management**

- 4.5.1 There are a number of risks associated with local Council Tax Reduction schemes.

#### *Council Tax collection issues*

- 4.5.2 The adoption of a scheme that reduces financial support for working age customers increases the risks of non-payment of Council Tax. An assessment of the impact of non-payment needs to be built into the calculation of the council tax base and will impact on the amount of Council Tax income for the council and the major precepting authorities.

#### *Scheme spend risks*

- 4.5.3 The costs analyses are based on assumptions that Council Tax and caseload factors remain the same in 13/14. Once a scheme is adopted it cannot be varied in year. Variations in Council Tax and/or caseload levels, including variations in numbers of customers in vulnerable groups, could lead to an increase in costs which would have to be met by the council and major precepting authorities. Similarly, variations that result in scheme costs reducing could not be used to increase support for working age customers in-year. The current arrangement of monitoring benefit spend will continue for the local Council Tax Support scheme.

#### *Scheme implementation*

- 4.5.4 There is a risk that the adopted scheme may not be implemented in time for the 13/14 Council Tax bills. This risk is minimised by adopting a scheme that retains most of the elements of the current Council Tax Benefit scheme.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The results of the consultation exercise on local council tax support scheme options are inconclusive. However, there is clear support for protecting vulnerable groups including carers.

**5.2** The Government has not yet announced the available funding for local Council Tax schemes and this means that neither the final costs implications for councils and preceptors nor details of the full reductions faced by customers can be provided at this stage.

## **6 Recommendations**

**6.1** Executive Board is asked to note the information in this report and decide the scheme of local Council Tax Support to propose for adoption by full council in January 2013.

## **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

**7.1** None

### **Appendices**

- **1: Draft scheme**
- **2: Scheme costs analysis**
- **3: Caseload trend**
- **4: Consultation document**
- **5: Consultation analysis**
- **6: Recommended scheme costs and 8.5% scheme costs analysis**
- **7: Average reductions for working age customers**
- **8: Equality Impact Assessment**
- **9: Impact on Customer Contact Centre**

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

## **Appendix 1 – published draft scheme**

### **Leeds City Council Draft Council Tax Support Scheme**

#### **Background**

On 1 April 2013, Council Tax Benefit, the current method of supporting low income households to pay their Council Tax, will be abolished by the Government. It will be replaced by a new local scheme of Council Tax Support defined and administered by each Local Authority.

The government has stated that pensioners will be protected from these changes and entitlement will be subject to the provisions of nationally defined regulations, similar to that of the current Council Tax Benefit scheme.

Working age claimants will be subject to the provisions of a new local scheme of Council Tax Support determined by Leeds City Council.

#### **Introduction**

This document outlines the proposed scheme of Council Tax Support in Leeds for 2013/2014 and should be read in conjunction with consultation documents seeking your views.

This Scheme sets out a number of proposals that will be dependent upon:

- The outcome of a consultation on this scheme;
- The passing of the Local Government Finance Bill and subsequent secondary legislation;
- Implementation of the Welfare Reform Act 2012 and any secondary legislation.

#### **Classes of Persons**

This draft Scheme sets out proposed rules for working age claimants. The government has concluded that support for pensioners should be delivered through a national framework of criteria and allowances. As such regulations will prescribe a scheme for claimants of state pension credit age. They will also prescribe certain classes of persons who are not eligible to claim Council Tax Support, principally those citizens from abroad and refugees who do not have leave to remain in the country.

It is proposed that eligibility for Council Tax Support will be means tested and determined by reference to the household composition, income and capital of the claimant and any partner; and by the income, capital and number of non dependants in the household.

This draft scheme proposes that the key principals and methods set out within the government's draft default scheme regulations issued in September 2012 be used to determine Council Tax Support.

#### **Key Features of the Scheme**

Our draft Scheme is based on the following principles:

- Working age claimants will have their Council Tax Support reduced by 30% of entitlement calculated under the draft national default scheme.
- people with disabilities (entitled to a disability premium or disabled child premium) should be protected from this requirement;
- people with dependant children under 5 should be protected,
- people in receipt of a war disablement / war widow(er)s pension should also be protected,

### **Classes of Reduction**

It is proposed that Council Tax Support be calculated as a means tested discount, defined in principle by the terms of the government's draft default scheme with the exceptions as identified below:

- The Council Tax Award calculated in line with the provisions of the draft default national scheme will be reduced by 30%.
- Second adult rebate will be abolished

As such most claimants of working age will be expected to contribute some payment towards their Council Tax bill the amount of which will be, dependent upon individual financial circumstances.

### **Protected Classes**

These people will not be subject to the reduction in benefit of 30% and will continue to receive Council Tax Support equivalent to 100% of their entitlement under the draft national default scheme for working age customers.

A customer falling within the protected classes will:

- be a lone parent with a child under the age of 5 or
- qualify for a severe disability premium or enhanced disability premium or
- be in receipt of a War Pension or War Widows Pension

The three conditions that qualify for a severe disability premium are:

- The householder must be in receipt of the high or middle rate care component of disability living allowance or receive Attendance Allowance and
- The householder must not be being looked after by someone who receives carer's allowance for looking after them and
- The householder must have no one living with them aged over 18 years unless that person is registered blind or in receipt of high or middle rate care component of disability living allowance or receive Attendance Allowance.

The qualifying criteria for an enhanced disability premium are:

- The householder (or their partner if they have one) are aged under 60yrs and
- The householder (or their partner if they have one) receive the highest rate of the care component of disability living allowance or
- A child or young person in the family receives the highest rate of the care component of disability living allowance.

**Backdating**

The backdating rules in the draft national default scheme, which allow claims to be backdated for up to 6 months will apply.

**Applications**

New applications should be made in accordance with the draft national default scheme. Claimants currently in receipt of Council Tax Benefit will transfer onto the new Council Tax Support scheme.

**Evidence**

Leeds City Council may request such evidence as it requires to determine entitlement. Claimants will be given one month to provide any information requested.

**Amendment and Withdrawal of Application**

Claimants may amend any application before Leeds City Council has made a decision on it.

Claimants can withdraw an application at any time.

**Claimant's Duty to Notify Change in Circumstances**

Claimants have a duty to notify Leeds City Council of any changes in their circumstances that may affect entitlement, in the same manner as within current Council Tax Benefit regulations.

**Overpayments**

Any overpayment of Council Tax Support granted to which a claimant was not entitled to receive will be recovered by an adjustment to the Council Tax bill.

**Appeals Process**

Leeds City Council will give all claimants the opportunity to make written representation where they believe their claim has been dealt with incorrectly and we will look at this decision again. Where a claimant remains unhappy with a decision following the above process, they may appeal to the Valuation Tribunal.

This is a draft document and as such may be subject to change following public consultation, Government statute or any other means deemed appropriate by Leeds City Council.

## Appendix 2- costs of draft schemes

	Number of claimants	12/13: Anticipated scheme spend £000s	13/14 option: 'no cost scheme' with funding reduced by 10% £000s	13/14 option 'no cost scheme' with funding reduced by 11.4% £000s	13/14 option 10% cap with funding reduced by 10% £000s	13/14 option 10% cap with funding reduced by 11.4% £000s
Total Benefit spend <sup>1</sup>		£54,455	£54,455	£54,455	£54,455	£54,455
Government funding <sup>2</sup>		£54,571	£49,114	£48,355	£49,114	£48,355
Shortfall		£0	£5,341	£6,100	£5,341	£6,100
<b>Total caseload</b>	<b>78,850</b>					
<b>Pension Age caseload</b>	<b>31615</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>
<b>Working Age protected groups<sup>3</sup></b>						
- Lone parent with child u5	6452	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243
- Relevant Disability Premium	4265	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114
- War Pension	38	£28	£28	£28	£28	£28
- Carers	869	£683	£683	£683	£683	£683
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>11,624</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>
<b>Working Age non-protected</b>						
- Other working age	35611	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387
- Required reduction		£0	£5,341	£6,100	£2,438	£2,438
<b>Net spend on non-protected</b>		<b>£24,387</b>	<b>£19,046</b>	<b>£18,287</b>	<b>£21,949</b>	<b>£21,949</b>
% reduction for non-protected			22	25	10	10
<b>Total scheme costs</b>		£54,455	£49,114	£48,355	£52,017	£52,017
<b>Costs to Council and preceptors</b>		<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£2,902</b>	<b>£3,662</b>

### Appendix 3 - Council Tax Benefit caseload and expenditure trend

#### Caseload

The table below shows the total Council Tax Benefit caseload mid financial year and the percentage change from the same point in the previous financial year:

Year	CTB Caseload	Change
2008	66,060	
2009	70,791	+7.16%
2010	75,485	+6.63%
2011	77,405	+2.54%
2012	78,635	+1.58%
May 2012	78,252	
Nov 2012	78,560	+0.4%

The caseload increased sharply between 2008 and 2010 and the rate has reduced considerably since then. In 2012 the caseload has been stable.

The table below shows the Council Tax Benefit caseload split between pension age and working age and the percentage change from the same point in the previous financial year:

Year	Pensioners	Change	Working Age	Change
2008	33,402		32,658	
2009	33,457	+0.16%	37,334	+14.31%
2010	33,485	+0.08%	42,000	+12.5%
2011	32,640	-2.54%	44,765	+6.58%
2012	31,740	-2.76%	46,931	+4.83%
May 2012	32,079		46,173	
Nov 2012	31,631	-1.4%	46,929	+1.6%

After a period of stability, the pension age caseload has reduced in the last 2 years. This is believed to be because of the equalisation of retirement age for women which is being phased in over a 5 year period. The pensioner caseload is expected to continue to reduce for a further 3 years until equalisation is complete.

Following a sharp increase in the working age caseload between 2009 and 2010, the rate of increase has slowed and is largely offset by the reduction in pensioner caseload.

The increase in working age caseload is driven by increase in the numbers of claims from in-work customers. Council Tax Benefit awards for in-work customers are less than awards for out of work customers.:

Year	Earners	Change
2008	3,461	
2009	4,158	+20.13%
2010	6,637	+59.62%
2011	8,239	+24.13%
2012	9,453	+14.73%

## Expenditure

The table below shows Council Tax Benefit subsidisable expenditure over the last few years.

Year	Subsidy Claimed from DWP	Change
2008/09	£45.2m	
2009/10	£50.9m	+12.61%
2010/11	£54.8m	+7.67%
2011/12	£55.4m	+1.09%
2012/13	£55.3m*	-0.18%

\*Projected at October 2012

Again, this shows that the sharp increase in expenditure between 2008 and 2010 has been replaced by a more measured increase since 2010 with expenditure forecast to drop slightly in the current year

## Forecasts for 2013/14

The statistics suggest that Council Tax Benefit expenditure is likely to remain stable in 13/14. This assessment is based in the fact that the unemployment level in Leeds is currently stable at around 4.5%, Council Tax Benefit caseload has stabilised and subsidisable Council Tax Benefit expenditure in the current year is forecast to reduce slightly in comparison to last year.



## Changes to Council Tax Benefit - Consultation 2012

### Why we are consulting

Under planned welfare reform, the government is abolishing their Council Tax Benefit scheme from April 2013. Instead the government requires that all councils develop their own local Council Tax Support Scheme which must be in place by April 2013.

Government funding for the new scheme will be reduced by around 10%. Based on the Council Tax Benefit paid in Leeds in 2011/12, a 10% reduction in government funding £5.5 million, but the final figure could be much more than this. This is because the government will use estimates of how much would have been spent on Council Tax Benefit in 2013/14 when deciding how much to give councils. This could see the shortfall in funding increase to more than £6 million.

Also, if demand for Council Tax Support increases, for example, if people lose their jobs or their income reduces, we do not expect the government to give us any more money. Therefore, we will need to make some challenging decisions about the scheme we choose to operate and the amount of Council Tax Support people will receive.

The government said that people of state pension age must be protected from the changes, so they will continue to receive the same help they get now. This means that the full cost of the reduction in funding will fall on people who are of working age.

We want to hear from you to help us decide what to do about the funding shortfall and who should be protected. We are already facing cuts of £40m and may need to find additional money to fund the shortfall for the Council Tax Support scheme. The costs of funding the shortfall for the Council Tax Support scheme will also affect the West Yorkshire Police Authority and West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Services. This is because they also raise income through Council Tax and will need to contribute to the costs of local Council Tax Support schemes.

We need to understand people's views before we decide what to do. Everything you tell us will be held in confidence in line with the Data Protection Act so no person can be identified and what you tell us will have no effect on your current benefit

Our draft scheme is available at [www.leeds.gov.uk/LCTS](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/LCTS)

## Who currently gets Council Tax Benefit

Council Tax Benefit is claimed by over 76,000 households in Leeds. 31,000 householders claiming benefit are pensioners and will not be affected by this change, the other 45,000 households include:

1. Carers
2. Disabled People
3. Jobseekers
4. Lone parents
5. Vulnerable students
6. Workers with a low income

The reduction in funding could affect these households.

Most people who claim Council Tax benefit live in band A properties and pay the lowest rate of Council Tax. The table below shows how many people live in each band

Band	Working age	Pensioners
A	34026	19841
B	6928	6105
C	2721	3760
D	687	1035
E	293	358
F	97	116
G	41	58
H	1	0

The timescales that we are working to are very challenging and we will need to make changes to our IT systems, letters, bills and claim forms.

### The new Council Tax Support Scheme options

We want to ask your opinion on two options in Leeds.

Under both options we would keep most of the features of the current scheme. We would work out your Council Tax Support in the same way that we work out your Council Tax Benefit now, but we would reduce your benefit by a certain percentage.

#### Option One

We face a funding gap across all council services. This means that we will have to make some very difficult decisions about how money is spent. If we are to avoid funding the shortfall in Council Tax Support from money that could be spent on other services, we will need to limit the amount of Council Tax Support we pay out to equal the money we receive from the government. This means **we won't put any more of our money towards it.**

Option One means:

- **Council Tax Support for most working age people will be reduced by as much as 30%** depending on the level of government funding and possible changes in how many people are claiming
- We could protect some working age people from cuts in their support.  
These may be:
  - People getting war widow/ers or war disablement pensions
  - Lone parents with a child or children under five
  - People receiving severe or enhanced disability premium.

The table on the back page shows what people pay now, and what they might pay under Option One.

**Q1. How far do you agree or disagree that the amount we spend on Council Tax Support should be limited to what we get from the government and that we don't put any of our money towards it?**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree or disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree          | <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know        |

**Q2. The costs of protecting certain groups without the council putting extra money into the scheme, means that other working age claimants face a larger reduction in support. Do you agree that the council should protect certain groups from cuts in support in this way?**

	Agree	Disagree
Carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lone Parents with a child/children under five	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
War disablement pension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
War widows/widowers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q3. Are there any other groups of people you think we should consider protecting?**

**Q4. Please tell us why you think they should be protected**

**Option 2**

In this option, **we could put extra money into the scheme** for the first year to reduce the cuts that people face in their Council Tax Support. This option would **limit the cut in Council Tax Support to 10% for most working age claimants.**

Limiting the cut in the first year may help people adjust to the changes in Council Tax Support as well as other changes that the government is making to welfare benefits from April 2013.

The cost to the council of limiting the cut to 10% could be between £3.8m and over £5m depending on the level of government funding and demand for Council Tax Support. This is money that could be spent on other services.

Option Two means:

- The reduction in Council Tax Support for most working age people would be limited to 10% but this may change depending on what we receive from the government and how many people claim Council Tax Support;
- We will protect some working age people from cuts in support. These are:
  - Lone parents with a child or children under five
  - People getting the severe or enhanced disability premium.
  - People getting war widows or war disablement pensions

The table on the back page shows what people pay now, and what they might pay under the Option Two

**Q5. How far do you agree or disagree that the council should limit the cuts people face by putting more money to support the shortfall in government funding?**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree          | <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |

**Q6. Protecting certain groups increases the costs to the council. Do you agree or disagree that the council should protect these groups from cuts in their support in this way?**

	Agree	Disagree
Carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lone Parents with a child/children under five	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
War disablement pension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
War widows/widowers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q7. Are there any other groups of people you think we should consider protecting?**

**Q8. Please tell us why you think they should be protected**

**Q9. Is there anything you would like to say about either option one or option two?**

## Other issues affecting council tax support

### **Moving into work**

The current Council Tax benefit scheme supports people moving into work by protecting the level of benefit they receive for the first four weeks of work. We would like our Council Tax Support Scheme to do the same.

### **Q10. Do you agree or disagree that we should continue to support people moving into work?**

- Strongly agree     Neither agree nor disagree     Strongly disagree  
 Agree     Disagree     Don't know

### Wider council tax changes

The government will allow councils to decide when we will charge Council Tax for the empty properties. These changes would increase our income and we would use this money to help provide services in the city, for example we could put more money into helping people move into work. The properties we could increase charges for are:

- Properties that are empty, unfurnished and undergoing major building work.

Currently the owners of these properties don't have to pay Council Tax for up to 12 months and then have to pay 100% Council Tax after 12 months. From April 2013 we will be able to decide **whether** these properties should be charged Council Tax and **how much** they should be charged. For example, we could choose to charge 100% Council Tax from the first day that the property is empty.

- Properties that are empty and unfurnished.

Currently the owners of these properties don't have to pay Council Tax for up to six months and then have to pay 100% Council Tax after six months. From April 2013, we will be able to vary both the period that owners/landlords don't have to pay and the amount charged. For example, we can decide **when** and **how much** we should start charging the owners of these properties.

- Long term empty properties. These are properties that have been empty for two years or more

Currently, long-term empty properties are charged 100% Council Tax. From April 2013, we will be able to charge up to 150% of Council Tax for long-term empty properties.

- Second homes. These are properties that are furnished but the owner's main home is elsewhere.

Currently, second home owners receive a 10% discount on their Council Tax for their second home. From April 2013, we will be able to charge 100% Council Tax for second homes.

We believe that charging for empty properties will encourage more empty properties back into use sooner.

**Q11: How far do you support us using the new rules for these empty properties?**

	Strongly Support	_____				Don't Support At all	Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5		
A. Properties that are empty, unfurnished and undergoing major building work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
B. Properties that are empty and unfurnished	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
C. Long term empty properties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D. Second homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

**Q12. Is there anything else you'd like to say about Council Tax in Leeds**

**About you**

We would like to ask some questions about you so we can check that the consultation has included people's views from a wide range of backgrounds.

**We will keep your information safe in line with the Data Protection Act.** What you tell us is in confidence and will only be used to help us understand the results of this consultation. The questions are voluntary, but it will help us to know as much about you as you feel comfortable with.

**Q13. Are you:**

- Male     Female

**Q14. How old are you?**

- Under 18 years     25-34 years     45-54 years     65-74 years  
 18-24 years     35-44 years     55-64 years     75 years and over

**Q15. Please tick one option that best describes your ethnic background.**

**White**

- British     Irish     Any other White background  
(Please write in below)

**Mixed Race**

- White and Black Caribbean     White and Black African     White and Asian     Any other mixed background  
(Please write in below)

**Asian or Asian British**

- Indian     Pakistani     Bangladeshi     Kashmiri     Any other Asian background  
(Please write in below)

**Black or Black British**

- Caribbean     African     Any other Black background  
(Please write in below)

**Other Ethnic Group**

- Chinese     Arab     Gypsy/Traveller     Any other background  
(Please write in below)

**Q16. Do you have any long term illness, health problem or disability that limits your daily activities?**

- Yes     No (if No, please go to 18)

**Q17. If Yes how would you describe your type of impairment?  
(Tick all that apply to you)**

- Physical Impairment  
(such as a wheelchair to get around and/or difficulty using your arms)
- Sensory Impairment  
(such as being blind/having a serious visual impairment or being deaf/having a serious hearing impairment)
- Mental Health Condition  
(such as depression or schizophrenia)
- Learning Disability  
(such as Down's syndrome or dyslexia) or cognitive impairment (such as autism or head injury)
- Long standing illness or health condition  
(such as cancer, diabetes, chronic heart disease or epilepsy)

**Q18 Please tick one box that best describes your religion or belief**

- Buddhist       Hindu       Muslim       No Religion  
 Christian       Jewish       Sikh       Other  
(Please write in below)

**Q19. Please tick one box that describes your sexual orientation**

- Hetrosexual/  
Straight       Lesbian/  
Gay Woman       Gay man       Bisexual       Prefer not  
to say

**Q20. Do you consider yourself to be a carer? (A carer is someone who, without payment, provides help and support to a friend, neighbour or relative who could not manage otherwise because of frailty, illness or disability)**

- Yes  No

**Q21. How many adults and children under the age of 16 live in your house, including yourself?**

- 1 adult no children       2 adults with 1 or more children  
 2 adults, no children       Other - (Please write in below)  
 1 adult with 1 or more children

**Q22. Please tell us the first part of your postcode (for example, LS10)**

 - 

Thank you for taking the time to give us your views. We will take all responses into account before we decide which Council Tax Support option is best for Leeds. Simply put your completed survey in the Freepost return envelope and post back to us before **8th November 2012**. There is no need to add a postage stamp to the envelope.

If the return envelope is missing, send your survey in an envelope addressed to:

Freepost Plus RSCS-ZTJU-CLXH  
Leeds City Council  
Merrion House  
110 Merrion Centre  
Merrion Way  
Leeds LS2 8ET

Please mark the envelope 'Council Tax Consultation'

What do the two options mean to average benefit claimants

Household	Monthly Income	Council Tax Band and Charge	Monthly amount of Council Tax to pay		
			Current Benefit scheme	Option one (-30%)	Option two (-10%)
Couple + 2 children	Family Income £1,577.55	Band A £72.37	£38.48	£48.65	£41.87
Disabled couple	Joint Income £2,117.05	Band C £98.02	£11.70	£11.70	£11.70
Couple + 3 children	Family Income £1,815.49	Band C £96.50	£18.16	£41.66	£25.99
Lone parent + 3 children (Youngest child under 5)	Family Income £1,658.28	Band B £63.31	£23.57	£23.57	£23.57
Single Person (age 45)	£307.67 Jobseekers Allowance	Band A £54.30	£0.00	£16.29	£5.43
Single Person (age 24)	£243.75 Jobseekers Allowance	Band A £54.30	£0.00	£16.29	£5.43
Couple	£482.95 Jobseekers Allowance	Band C £96.50	£0.00	£28.95	£9.65



Report author: Matthew Lund  
Tel: 24 74352

---

### Summary report on consultation on the Council Tax Support local scheme options

#### 1 Purpose of this report

**1.2** This short research report sets out key findings from consultation by Leeds City Council on options for a local Council Tax Support scheme, and a number of other Council Tax issues.

#### 2 Background information

**2.3** The consultation was designed to present information on the changes taking place, and on two proposed options for the Local Scheme:

##### Option One

Limit the amount of Council Tax Support we pay out to equal the money we receive from the government. This means we won't put any more of our money towards it.

Council Tax Support for most working age people will be reduced by as much as 30% depending on the level of government funding and possible changes in how many people are claiming.

We could protect some working age people from cuts in their support.

##### Option 2

We could put extra money into the scheme for the first year to reduce the cuts that people face in their Council Tax Support. This option would limit the cut in Council Tax Support to 10% for most working age claimants but this may change depending on what we receive from the government and how many people claim Council Tax Support.

The cost to the council could be between £3.8m and over £5m depending on the level of government funding and demand for Council Tax Support. This is money that could be spent on other services.

We will protect some working age people from cuts in support.:

**2.4** A survey was provided with this information to allow people to have their say. This was delivered in three ways:

- To the Leeds Citizens' Panel
- To all current Council Tax Benefit claimants
- As an open-access public online survey on the council website

**2.5** It was decided that, while results from these three surveys could be combined (and overall results are shown below), it is very important to show the results of each survey separately as well, treating each one as a 'cohort of respondents. This reduces the risk that the results be dominated by the views of any one interest group.

## 2.6 Responses to the survey were as follows:

Survey	Response
Leeds Citizens' Panel	953
Council Tax Benefit claimants	4225
Open-access public online survey	437
<b>Total</b>	<b>5615</b>

### 3 Main issues

**3.7** The tables overleaf set out key findings from the survey. **Table 1** shows overall results from the 'closed' or 'tick box' questions, and the separate sets of results from each 'cohort' (Panel, public survey, claimants). **Table 2** shows the results by current CT Benefit claimants and non-claimants (some respondents to the open access public survey told us that they were Council Tax benefit claimants, and these have been added to the responses from the Claimant survey). **Table 3** sets out thematically-grouped results from the 'open-response' questions in the survey, where respondents were free to write their responses.

#### Summary of key findings

**3.8** Claimants are less likely to support Option 1 (no council financial input) than non-claimants (24% v 54%)

**3.9** The difference between claimants and non-claimants is less significant when it comes to Option 2 (council putting some money in to meet the shortfall), although claimants are more likely to support it (58% v 41% of non-claimants).

**3.10** There is strong support for protecting the groups set out in the consultation, although non-benefit claimants are weaker in support for protecting lone parents with child/ren under 5.

3.5 Respondents also suggest protecting:

- People on low income in general
- Unemployed people in general
- People on benefits
- Sick people
- Lone parents in general
- People with mental disabilities

3.6 Reasons why groups should be protected centred on their vulnerability, both personally and financially.

3.7 Around three-quarters of respondents support the council continuing to support people moving into work

3.8 Respondents are more likely to support than oppose all four proposed changes to Council Tax rules for empty properties.

**Table 1 – results for ‘closed’ questions – all surveys**

No	Question	Overall	Panel survey	Claimant survey	Public survey	Score components
1	How far do you agree or disagree that the amount we spend on Council Tax Support should be limited to what we get from the government and that we don't put any of our money towards it?	32	55	25	38	Strongly Agree + Agree
2	The costs of protecting certain groups without the council putting extra money into the scheme, means that other working age claimants face a larger reduction in support. Do you agree or disagree that the council should protect the following groups from cuts in support?					
2a	...Carers	77	71	80	69	Agree
2b	...Disabled people	91	79	89	81	Agree
2c	...Lone parents with a child/ children under 5	68	49	75	56	Agree
2d	...War disablement pension	79	75	83	74	Agree
2e	...War widows / widowers	69	58	77	60	Agree
5	...How far do you agree or disagree that the council should limit the cuts people face by putting more money to support the shortfall in government funding?	55	39	58	39	Strongly Agree + Agree
6	Protecting certain groups increases the costs to the council. Do you agree or disagree that the council should protect these groups from cuts in support in this way?					
6a	...Carers	77	66	35	70	Agree
6b	...Disabled people	91	75	90	81	Agree
6c	...Lone parents with a child/ children under 5	67	48	76	57	Agree
6d	...War disablement pension	79	71	85	75	Agree
6e	...War widows / widowers	69	55	79	60	Agree
10	Do you agree or disagree that we should continue to support people moving into work?	77	70	75	73	Strongly Agree + Agree
11	We are likely to use the government's new rules to charge Council Tax for empty properties. How far do you support us using the new rules for these empty properties:					
11a	Properties that are empty, unfurnished and undergoing major building work	52	63	80	58	Strongly Agree + Agree
11b	Properties that are empty and unfurnished	60	76	57	68	Strongly Agree + Agree
11c	Long term empty properties	64	82	63	76	Strongly Agree + Agree
11d	Second homes	64	85	66	80	Strongly Agree + Agree

**Table 2 - results for 'closed' questions – Current CTB claimants and non-claimants**

No	Question	Claimant score	Non-claimant score
1	How far do you agree or disagree that the amount we spend on Council Tax Support should be limited to what we get from the government and that we don't put any of our money towards it?	24	54
2	The costs of protecting certain groups without the council putting extra money into the scheme, means that other working age claimants face a larger reduction in support. Do you agree or disagree that the council should protect the following groups from cuts in support?		
2a	...Carers	80	70
2b	...Disabled people	89	76
2c	...Lone parents with a child/ children under 5	75	53
2d	...War disablement pension	83	73
2e	...War widows / widowers	77	60
5	...How far do you agree or disagree that the council should limit the cuts people face by putting more money to support the shortfall in government funding?	58	41
6	Protecting certain groups increases the costs to the council. Do you agree or disagree that the council should protect these groups from cuts in support in this way?		
6a	...Carers	35	67
6b	...Disabled people	90	74
6c	...Lone parents with a child/ children under 5	76	52
6d	...War disablement pension	85	71
6e	...War widows / widowers	79	58
10	Do you agree or disagree that we should continue to support people moving into work?	75	57
11	We are likely to use the government's new rules to charge Council Tax for empty properties. How far do you support us using the new rules for these empty properties:		
11a	Properties that are empty, unfurnished and undergoing major building work	80	55
11b	Properties that are empty and unfurnished	57	61
11c	Long term empty properties	63	63
11d	Second homes	66	63

**Table 3 - Open-response question results** (Showing the themes of responses made by more than 1% of respondents)

Who else should be protected	% of comments relating to Option 1	% of comments relating to Option 2
People on low income	19%	20%
Unemployed	16%	15%
People on benefits	9%	11%
Sick people	8%	7%
Lone parents (generally - not just those with children under 5)	8%	7%
People with mental disabilities	8%	7%

Pensioners	6%	4%
Elderly	5%	6%
Parents (generally - not just lone parents)	4%	5%
Single people or people living alone	3%	3%
Students	3%	2%
Young people	2%	2%
<b>Why people should be protected</b>	<b>% of comments relating to Option 1</b>	<b>% of comments relating to Option 2</b>
Unable to work	34%	10%
Cost of living is high	14%	6%
Benefits are not enough	10%	4%
Can afford less than they currently have	9%	3%
They deserve it	9%	5%
They are vulnerable	7%	9%
Not their fault they're in the situation they are in	6%	3%
Worked all their life or contributed to the system	4%	2%
Do not have enough money or struggling as it is	4%	31%
Lack of or need for support or care	2%	14%
Cannot manage or survive otherwise	1%	8%
Struggle to find a job, work enough hours or earn enough	1%	4%
<b>Other Comments</b>		
<b>Theme of comment</b>	<b>% of all comments</b>	
Prefer Option 2.	12%	
General negative comment on government or council.	10%	
The cuts will cause hardship.	8%	
People cannot afford to pay the difference.	6%	
Protect other/all groups.	6%	
Charge employed people more.	6%	
Don't protect other/all groups.	5%	
Should be no change to council tax benefits.	5%	
Make cuts elsewhere instead.	4%	
Council tax should be means tested.	4%	
General negative comment on Option 1.	4%	
Protect disabled people.	4%	

General negative comment on Option 2.	3%
Don't protect young/lone parents.	3%
Prefer Option 1.	3%
Protect those on low incomes.	3%
Don't understand the changes.	2%
Protect carers.	2%
Protect families.	2%

### Differences by communities

**3.11** This section sets out key differences in the views of different sections of the respondents, based on initial analysis. Further data is available in Excel tables on request.

3.11.5 Men are more likely than women to support option 1 (31% against 26%)

3.11.6 Women are more likely than men to support protection of the following:

- Carers (98% against 74%)
- Lone parents with child/ren under 5 (90% against 61%)
- War disablement pension (98% against 77%)
- War widow/ers (85% against 69%)

3.11.7 There is no consistent relationship between the ethnicities or ages of respondents and their level of support for either Local Scheme option

## 4 Conclusions

**4.12** The main driver of differences of opinion on the Local Scheme Options is whether someone is a current Council Tax Benefit claimant or not.

**4.13** Current claimants are more likely to support the council putting some funds towards a local scheme, while non-claimants are more likely not to.

**4.14** There is support for protecting certain vulnerable groups regardless of the Local Scheme options

**4.15** There is also support for supporting people back into work through the Local Scheme, and for changing rules regarding empty properties and Council Tax.

**4.16** There is concern in communities about the potential impact on vulnerable groups of any changes in financial support. The statistical presentation of written responses from respondents should not detract from the emotional content of many of the original comments.

## 5 Appendices

Organisations invited to take part in the consultation:

Organisation Name  
Advocay Support  
Advonet  
Age UK Leeds  
Archway  
ASHA Neighbourhood Centre  
BARCA-Leeds  
BPP Law School  
Bradford Law Centre  
Burley Lodge Centre Advice Service  
Carers Leeds  
Chapelton CAB  
D.I.A.L. (Leeds)  
East North East Homes  
Ebor Gardens Advice Centre  
Economic Policy - LCC  
GIPSIL  
Henry Hyams Solicitors  
LATCH  
Leeds Citizens Advice Bureau  
Leeds Credit Union  
Leeds Law Centre  
Leeds Tenants Federation  
LUU Student Advice Centre  
NHS Leeds (Public Health)  
Pay & Employment Rights Service  
Racial Equality Council  
Refugee Council  
Regeneration Service - LCC  
School of Law Legal Advice Clinic  
Shelter  
Sign Health  
St Vincent Support Centre  
Welfare Rights Unit  
West North West Homes Leeds

## Appendix 6 – scheme variations

	Number of claimants	12/13: Anticipated scheme spend £000s	13/14 option: '8.5% scheme' with funding reduced by 10% £000s	13/14 option '8.5% scheme' with funding reduced by 11.4% £000s	13/14 option funding for protecting vulnerable groups with funding reduced by 10% £000s	13/14 option Options 1a: extra funding for protecting vulnerable groups with funding reduced by 11.4% £000s
Total Benefit spend <sup>1</sup>		£54,455	£54,455	£54,455	£54,455	£54,455
Government funding <sup>2</sup>		£54,571	£49,114	£48,355	£49,114	£48,355
Additional Govt funding			£1,300	£1,300	-	-
Shortfall		£0	£4,041	£4,800	£5,341	£6,100
<b>Total caseload</b>	<b>78,850</b>					
<b>Pension Age caseload</b>	<b>31615</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>	<b>£22,000</b>
<b>Working Age protected groups<sup>3</sup></b>						
- Lone parent with child u5	6452	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243	£4,243
- Relevant Disability Premium	4265	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114	£3,114
- War Pension	38	£28	£28	£28	£28	£28
- Carers	869	£683	£683	£683	£683	£683
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>11,624</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>	<i>£8,068</i>
<b>Working Age non-protected</b>						
- Other working age	35611	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387	£24,387
- Required reduction		£0	£2,073	£2,073	£4,145	£4,633
<b>Net spend on non-protected</b>		<b>£24,387</b>	<b>£22,314</b>	<b>£22,314</b>	<b>£20,242</b>	<b>£19,753</b>
% reduction for non-protected			8.5	8.5	17	19
<b>Total scheme costs</b>		£54,455	£52,382	£52,382	£50,310	£49,821
<b>Costs to Council and preceptors</b>		<b>£0</b>	<b>£1,968</b>	<b>£2,727</b>	<b>£1,196</b>	<b>£1,466</b>

<sup>1</sup> CTB spend net of Second Adult Rebate

<sup>2</sup> Funding based on CTB spend inclusive of Second Adult Rebate

<sup>3</sup> Figures are minimum numbers based on current caseload information

## Appendix 7 – examples of scheme options for customers

Household	Monthly Income	Council Tax Band and charge	Monthly Council Tax to pay				
			Current scheme	25% reduction	10% reduction	8.5% reduction	19% reduction
Couple + 2 children	Family Income £1,577.55	Band A £72.37	£38.48	£46.95	£41.87	£41.36	£44.92
Disabled couple	Joint Income £2,117.05	Band C £98.02	£11.70	£11.70	£11.70	£11.70	£11.70
Couple + 3 children	Family Income £1,815.49	Band C £96.50	£18.16	£37.75	£25.99	£24.82	£33.04
Lone parent + 3 children (Youngest child under 5)	Family Income £1,658.28	Band B £63.31	£23.57	£23.57	£23.57	£23.57	£23.57
Single Person (age 45)	£307.67 Jobseekers Allowance	Band A £54.30	£0.00	£13.58	£5.43	£4.62	£10.32
Single Person (age 24)	£243.75 Jobseekers Allowance	Band A £54.30	£0.00	£13.58	£5.43	£4.62	£10.32
Couple	£482.95 Jobseekers Allowance	Band C £96.50	£0.00	£24.13	£9.65	£8.20	£18.34

# Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment



## Appendix 8

<b>Directorate: Resources</b>	<b>Service area: Revenues and Benefits</b>
<b>Lead person: Jane McManus</b>	<b>Contact number: 0771 221 4105</b>
<b>Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment: 27 November 2012</b>	

<b>1. Title: Local Council Tax Support Scheme</b>
Is this a:
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy /Policy</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
<b>If other, please specify</b>

### 2. Members of the assessment team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist</b>
Jane McManus	Revenues and Benefits	Project Manager
Pauline Ellis	Equality Team	Specialist advisor
Steve Carey	Revenues and Benefits	Chief Officer

<b>3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:</b>
<p>The Local Government Finance Act 2012 provides that local authorities must put in place a local scheme of Council Tax Support from 1 April 2013 in place of the national Council Tax Benefit scheme.</p> <p>Government funding for the new local council tax support schemes is to be reduced by 10% although the final reduction could be more than this as funding will be based on the Office for Budget Responsibility forecasts and not actual expenditure. Expenditure on Council Tax Benefit in Leeds in 2012/13 is expected to be around £55m. Therefore Leeds expects the funding shortfall to be in excess of £5.5m</p> <p>The Act states that Local Authorities must adopt a national prescribed Council Tax Support scheme for pensioners. Under the national prescribed scheme regulations, pensioners must receive the same amount in Council Tax support that they would have received under Council Tax Benefit rules. This means that the burden of funding reductions falls disproportionately upon those of Working Age.</p>

Regulations also provide a default Council Tax Support scheme for working age claimants which must be adopted where Local Authorities fail to adopt a local support scheme for working age claimants by 31 January 2013. Under the default scheme regulations working age claimants would also receive the same amount in Council Tax support that they would have received under Council Tax Benefit rules. Any Council required to operate the default scheme would be required to meet the funding gap in full.

Local Authorities can choose to:

- Limit their expenditure to the level of funding received from government which means that we must redesign a working age scheme that will cost in excess of £5.5m less than the current Council Tax Benefit Scheme
- Make up the shortfall and deliver the same level of Council Tax Support that was provided under Council Tax Benefit. Protecting all recipients would impact negatively upon the authority's budget and the budget of those that levy a precept to it (Fire and Police Authorities and Parish Councils). An adverse effect on service provision might result in us having to stop, reduce or levy additional charges for services with a disproportionate effect on the most vulnerable,
- Partially fund the shortfall and limit the extent to which support will be reduced for those claiming support. This would also impact on the Council's and precepting authorities budgets but to a lesser extent than fully funding the shortfall.

The government have also made additional funding available in the form of a transitional grant. The grant is available only to Local Authorities in 2013/2014 where the reduction in support for the poorest household is limited to 8.5% or less. If the scheme that Leeds adopts complies with the requirements of the transitional grant Leeds could receive an additional 1.3m funding.

<b>4. Service, function, event</b>	
please tick the appropriate box below	
The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service (by contract or grant) (please see equality assurance in procurement)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please provide detail:</b>	
The design and delivery of a Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2013	

## **5. Fact finding – what do we already know**

### **How equality, diversity, cohesion and integration has been considered**

As a Local Authority we have responsibilities under:

- The public sector equality duty in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
- The Child Poverty Act 2010, which imposes a duty to have regard to and address child poverty
- The Disabled Persons (Services, Consultation and Representation) Act 1986, and Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, which include a range of duties relating to the welfare needs of disabled people;
- The Housing Act 1996, which gives local authorities a duty to prevent homelessness with special regard to vulnerable groups;

These responsibilities have been and will continue to be considered as the Local Council Tax Support scheme is developed and implemented.

During the planning and development of the proposals we have also considered all the following information and data:

- The current Council Tax Benefit Scheme
- Department of Work and Pensions equality impact assessment for welfare reform
- Government funding for a local scheme – including, the amount potentially available, length of time the funding is available for, timescales set out by Government to develop and implement a local scheme and the impact of the default scheme
- Stipulations set out by Government that state support to pensioners must be maintained and that indicate existing and potential claimants of working age will be affected
- Conditions set out by the Department of Work and Pensions that applies to nationally administered means tested welfare support
- Information available about current claimants – number of claimant, benefits receiving, profile of claimants (equality monitoring data) and personal circumstances (family, which council tax band living in)
- Different types of benefits claimants are accessing – for example, Council Tax Benefit and Second Adult rebate

After considering a number of options Leeds published a draft local Council Tax Support Scheme on 17 September 2012.

The scheme is means tested and continues to include a system of allowances, premiums and income disregards as set out in the national default scheme that reflect the circumstances of the households claiming Council Tax Support. Additional allowances, premiums and disregards are awarded in respect of:

- dependant children,
- age,
- disability: and
- caring responsibilities of the household.

All of these features are to be retained in the Leeds Local Council Tax Support scheme.

However, in order to make the required savings once support has been calculated in line with the provisions in the default scheme there will be a % reduction applied to the award.

The % reduction will be calculated so that the cost of the Leeds scheme would fall within the available funding for the scheme.

The % reduction will apply equally to all working age claimants with the exception of the groups set out below. These groups would continue to have their support calculated without a reduction.

The groups that have been suggested should be protected are:

- Households that qualify for a severe or an enhanced disability premium (4,265)
- War widow(ers) and War Disablement Pensioners (38)
- Lone parents of children under the age of five (6,452)

The rationale behind protecting these groups is that it would be more difficult for these groups to increase their income through work, in the same way it would be unreasonable to expect pensioners to return to work. This is consistent with the conditionality that Department of Work and Pensions applies to nationally administered means tested welfare support in that these groups are not required to be available for work, nor are they required to provide evidence that they are seeking work in order to receive assistance.

The % reduction that it will be necessary to make to Council Tax support award of the remainder of working age claimants depends on:

- the number of people who claim Council Tax Support;
- the number of people who claim who are either of pension age or who fall into the agreed protected groups;
- the level of benefit that people are entitled to based on their income and circumstances;
- the level of Council Tax charge;
- Government funding levels.

The option which sees no additional funding put into the scheme could see a reduction of up to 30% in support for non-protected working age customers. An alternative option under consideration is to limit the reduction in support that claimants will face in 2013/2014 to 10%. Based on current caseload and Council Tax levels, the Council would need to put between £2.9 and £3.6 million into the scheme to limit the reduction to 10% which would put pressure on funding from other services the council provides.

Second Adult rebate is awarded to single householders who do not qualify for benefit in their own right because their income and/or capital is too high, but they have adult(s) living with them who have a low income and cannot afford to contribute towards the council tax of the household. The draft scheme also proposes to remove Second Adult Rebate for working age claimants. 568 working age households are currently in receipt of second adult rebate and the average weekly award for these households is £3.95 per week. These householders would be assessed under Council Tax Support criteria where we hold sufficient information and awarded support if their circumstances mean that they qualify. However anyone who does not qualify for Council Tax support will not be entitled to a reduction from 1 April 2013. Where we do not hold sufficient information to make an assessment for Council Tax Support, we will terminate the Second Adult Rebate award and invite an application for Council Tax Support.

Council Tax Benefit is claimed by a wide range of people with varying circumstances. It is a means tested benefit and in order to qualify for support households must have a low income in relation to the needs of the household, a large proportion of claimants are not in work, some are unable to work because of disability and / or caring responsibilities for young children, though there are an increasing number of claimants who are in part time and low paid work who receive support. Currently there are around 8,000 claimants who are in work who will face a reduction in support from 1 April 2013.

Benefit is calculated by comparing the household's income with standard allowances that reflect the household's needs. Additional allowances are awarded to households with children, with disabled people and with caring responsibilities, and some incomes paid to disabled people and children are not taken into account when working out Council Tax Benefit awards (i.e child benefit and disability living allowance). These features will remain in the local support scheme.

In accordance with the Act, pensioners are unaffected which means that the required savings must be borne only by 47,803 working age claimants

The impact of protecting the 10,755 customers in the protected groups is that less funding would be available for the remaining working age customers

Council Tax Support continues to be based on the householder's Council Tax liability. Council Tax Discounts granted to persons who are severely mentally impaired or who have had adaptations made to their home to meet the needs of a physical impairment of one of the occupiers will continue.

The proposals under consideration mean that support will be reduced by a set percentage. Consequently householders with higher council tax liabilities are likely to have higher awards and as such face higher reductions when the % reduction is applied to the award

75% of the persons affected live in properties in Council Tax Band A properties. These have the lowest Council Tax charge and so are affected to a lesser degree than households who reside in properties that are in the higher Council Tax Bands, whose properties have a higher market value.

Households currently in receipt of the maximum level of awards who currently have nothing to pay will also face larger reductions than those who receive partial awards. Households who reside in a band A property who currently receive a full award and have nothing to pay, will pay £1.67 per week under the 10% scheme and single occupiers will pay £1.25 because their liability is 25% lower. Under the 30% scheme a 2+ adult household would pay £5.01 per week and a single adult household, £3.76 per week.

Claimants entitled to partial awards will have their benefit reduced to lesser extent which supports the government's wider welfare reform agenda of increasing work incentives to ensure that people are better off in work.

All households under pension age are equally impacted under both reduction options (10% or 30%)

The needs of disabled people are already reflected in the assessment by the award of

additional premiums and income disregards. Additionally the proposal to protect 4,456 claimants who receive the severe and enhanced disability premium from reductions will further reduce the impact for disabled people. Work will be undertaken once the scheme and any protections are agreed to identify people not already identified who are entitled to the additional premiums and the protection from reductions in Council Tax Support.

The needs of families are already reflected in the assessment by the award of additional personal allowances for each child, and the disregard of child benefit. The proposal to protect 6,452 lone parents with children under the age of 5 from reductions will further reduce the impact for these families. Work will be undertaken once the scheme and any protections are agreed to identify people not already identified who are entitled to the protections.

The Local Government Finance Act also provides that any Local Authority that fails to publish its own scheme by 31 January 2012 would be required to operate the default scheme. Under the default scheme support would continue at the same rate as the council Tax Benefit scheme and no-one would face a reduction in support. However the shortfall between the cost of the scheme and the government contribution which is likely to be up to £6.2m would need to be met locally. This would mean that the council would need to cut services or increase Council Tax for all household.

**Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information  
Please provide detail:**

Information relating to religious belief, sexuality and gender reassignment is not collected as this is not required to determine eligibility or entitlement.

**Action required:**

Consider where equality monitoring (for all equality characteristics) would add the most value to determine the effectiveness of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme.

Undertake appropriate monitoring of the scheme once implemented, analyse available data and take appropriate action.

**6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested**

Yes

No

**Please provide detail:**

Members are engaged with the development of the process through the formal decision making processes within the council.

The major precepting authorities (Fire and Rescue Service and West Yorkshire Police) are also engaged with the development of a local scheme and have stated their preference for a scheme that did not have financial implications for their services.

In addition to this consultation and engagement, Leeds City Council has carried out a

public consultation to gather views on the options being considered by the council.

The consultation focused on the main options being considered :

- Designing a scheme where expenditure would fall within the government contribution. This option would mean that claimants had more to pay.
- The council could put some money into the scheme to limit the reduction in support to 10% in the first year. This option would mean that claimants still had more to pay, but not as much as if no money were put into the scheme.
- Whether the vulnerable groups should be protected from facing a reduction in support
- Introducing technical reforms to Council Tax also laid out in the Local Government Finance Act which would increase income to the council by charging more Council Tax for empty properties and second homes.

A survey was posted to the homes of all 45,138 working age households claiming Council Tax Benefit in Leeds who are likely to be directly impacted by the change.

3,200 members of the citizens panel were consulted and wider publicity was issued about the on line consultation which was open to all Leeds residents.

The consultation ran from 17 September to 8 November 2012 and was promoted widely:

Information was available in One stop centres, Libraries, Sports centres, GP Surgeries, ALMO and BiTMO. There were press releases and articles in ALMO newsletters, Adult Social Care newsletter, School Matters, Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust Staff Magazine, Voluntary Action Leeds, Volition newsletter and e-mails sent to the Advice Leeds partnership network and local and national landlord and housing association groups.

### **Key findings from all the consultation activities with the public**

A total of 5,615 responses were received, 4,225 responses to the Council tax Benefit claimant survey, 953 from the citizens panel and 437 from the public on-line survey.

Claimants are less likely to support the option where the council does not put money into the scheme than non-claimants (24% v 54%)

The difference between claimants and non-claimants is less significant when it comes to the option where the council puts some money into the scheme to meet the shortfall), although claimants are more likely to support it (58% v 41% of non-claimants).

There is strong support for protecting the groups set out in the consultation, although non-benefit claimants are weaker in support for protecting lone parents with children under 5.

Respondents also suggest protecting:

- People on low income in general
- Unemployed people in general
- People on benefits
- Sick people
- Lone parents in general
- People with mental disabilities

Reasons why groups should be protected centred on their vulnerability, both personally

and financially. As the draft options are means-tested and built around allowances that reflect disability and family status, unemployed people are likely to receive more support than people in work and people on low income are likely to receive more support than people with higher incomes. Similarly people with disabilities that are recognised and reflected in national benefits are likely to receive more support and lone parents are likely to receive more support than single people. Protecting these groups further would have significant financial implications for the council and precepting authorities that could impact on the provision of other services to vulnerable people.

Around three-quarters of respondents support the council continuing to support people moving into work

**Action required:**

A fuller report on the responses will be made available on-line.

**7. Who may be affected by this activity?**

**Equality characteristics**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carers             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex (male or female)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Jobseekers, low paid workers, part time workers) |  |  |

**Please specify:**

The Local Council Tax Support scheme will impact on all low income working age claimants irrespective of their equality characteristics.

**Stakeholders**

- |  |   |                                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services users | <input type="checkbox"/> Employees          | <input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partners       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Members | <input type="checkbox"/> Suppliers    |

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other please specify</b>	
<b>Potential barriers.</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Built environment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Location of premises and services</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Information and communication</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Customer care</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Timing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Stereotypes and assumptions</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Cost</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consultation and involvement</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function</b>	

<p><b>8. Positive and negative impact</b>  Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers</p>
<p><b>8a. Positive impact:</b></p> <p>The Local Council Tax Support Scheme will continue to have a positive impact on pensioners as there is a requirement that pensioners must receive the same amount in Council Tax support that they would have received under Council Tax Benefit rules.</p> <p>The draft scheme is built around allowances and premiums that continue to recognise disability, age, family status and low income</p> <p>There should also be a positive impact for those groups that it is suggested the local scheme protects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Households that qualify for a severe or an enhanced disability premium</li> <li>• War widowers) and War Disablement Pensioners</li> <li>• Lone parents of children under the age of five</li> </ul> <p>Limiting funding required from the Council and precepting authorities places less pressure on other services for vulnerable people.</p>
<p><b>Action required:</b></p> <p>Consider where equality monitoring (for all equality characteristics) would add the most value to determine the effectiveness of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme.</p>

Undertake appropriate monitoring of the scheme once implemented, analyse available data and take appropriate action.

**8b. Negative impact:**

The change will mean that in excess of 35,000 households will face a reduction in the amount of help they receive towards their Council Tax. People will have more to pay towards their Council Tax from limited income.

**Action required:**

Ongoing monitoring of impact on groups with protected characteristics as suggested in 8a

**9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?**

Yes  No

**Please provide detail:** The draft options treat all groups and communities equally and will not have an impact on relationships between communities

**Action required:**

**10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?**

Yes  No

**Please provide detail:** The draft proposals retain the characteristics and requirements of the current scheme albeit with reduced entitlement for many and will have no impact on the level of contact between communities.

**Action required:**

**11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?**

Yes  No

**Please provide detail:**

The Local Government Finance Act 2012 requires that pensioners are not affected by the reductions. This means that the burden of funding reductions falls disproportionately on working age customers. Protecting other vulnerable groups without additional funding from the council and precepting authorities means that there is less funding available to support non-protected working age households.

**Action required:**

Consider where equality monitoring (for all equality characteristics) would add the most value to determine the effectiveness of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme.

Undertake appropriate monitoring of the scheme once implemented, analyse available data and take appropriate action.

**12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan**

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
<p>Continue to monitor the impacts of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme alongside the other welfare reforms on households with protected characteristics in comparison with the wider general public. Consider where equality monitoring (for all equality characteristics) would add the most value to determine the effectiveness of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme.</p> <p>Undertake appropriate monitoring of the scheme once implemented, analyse available data and take appropriate action.</p>	Throughout 2013/14	Regular review of available equality data	Jane McManus
Work with welfare and advice agencies to signpost households who are adversely impacted to organisations that can provide help and support.	Throughout 2013/14	Welfare Reform Group activity	Jane McManus
Ensure that the Local Council Tax Support scheme continues to be administered fairly with due regard to the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.	Throughout 2013/14	Regular review of available equality data	Jennifer Ellis
Ensure that the Council Tax Support scheme is advertised widely and is accessible to all who may qualify for assistance. This will include providing information aimed at organisations, agencies and services who provide direct support to individuals.	Throughout 2013/14	Take-up activity	Jennifer Ellis

<b>13. Governance, ownership and approval</b> State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment		
Name	Job Title	Date
Steve Carey	Chief Officer	

<b>14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions</b> (please tick)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As part of Project monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board Please specify which board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

<b>15. Publishing</b>	
This Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration impact assessment will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given.	
If this impact assessment relates to a <b>Key Delegated Decision, Executive Board, full Council</b> or a <b>Significant Operational Decision</b> a copy should be emailed to Corporate Governance and will be published along with the relevant report.	
A copy of <b>all other</b> Equality and Diversity, Cohesion and Integration impact assessment's should be sent to Equality Team . For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).	
<b>Date screening completed</b>	
If relates to a Key Decision – <b>date sent to Corporate Governance</b>	
Any other decision – <b>date sent to Equality Team (equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk)</b>	

## Appendix 9

### Council Tax support scheme – Impact on Customer Contact

#### Introduction

The purpose of this appendix is to summarise

- a) the potential customer contact impact of implementing the new Council Tax Support Scheme.
- b) the potential customer contact impact of other Welfare Reform changes taking place.
- c) actions being pursued to enable the Council to best respond to the above changes

Given that the Council's Contact Centre and the network of 16 One Stop Centres are the first point of contact for many customers, this appendix will focus particularly on the impact in those areas.

#### Current contact volumes for Council Tax / Benefit customers

In the 2011/12 financial year, the Council's customer services team handled over 1.9 million contacts across the three main access channels, telephone, face to face and email as shown below:

Channel	No. of contacts	Percentage
Telephone – including self service and IVR	1,294,523	67%
Face to Face – booth & reception	545,545	28%
E-mail	94,415	5%

#### Estimated impact of the Council Tax Scheme and associated Council tax changes on the above .

It is estimated that up to 44,332 people will have more Council Tax to pay as a result of the introduction of the Council Tax Support Scheme . For planning purpose we assume that this will lead to *on average* at least one additional contact per household affected. The figures detailed below detail the likely channel through which these contacts will take place.

Channel	Council Tax Scheme
Phone - 67%	29,702
Face to Face – 28%	12,413
Email – 5%	2,217

When identifying the impacts on increased customer contacts of the new Council Tax Support Scheme, consideration must also be given to impacts from other changes such as the Council tax technical reforms (ie: changes to charges/exemptions for empty properties) and the increased amount of recovery action which may be required.

### **The impacts of increased debt recovery action for Council Tax arrears**

Of the 44,332 people in Leeds who will have to pay more council tax under the new Scheme, up to 16,000 will see a reduction in the amount of relief they received as compared to 2012/13 and will therefore have to pay more council tax. A significant number of these will ring/ visit the Council to query why they have to pay more, particularly if otherwise their Council Tax liability would not have increased. Up to 28,000 households in Leeds will receive a bill in late March 2013 where they will have to make a payment for the first time.

Given that the above people will comprise lower income households, it is reasonable to assume that a number of them may experience difficulty in paying the additional Council Tax demanded of them. We therefore predict that additional debt recovery will take place on top of the levels undertaken this year which will lead to further additional customer contact via telephone, email or face to face.

### **Council Tax Technical Reforms**

The number of second / empty properties in a city the size of Leeds means that changes to the charging arrangements will result in additional contact. Whilst it is difficult to predict the number of additional contacts the Council will receive, we are aware that customer queries regarding this issue are often long and complex. Work is underway to provide detailed information on the Councils website in order to maximise the proportion of customers that can find out information for themselves on this subject.

### **Preparing for the additional customer contact**

The first 3 months of the financial year are in our experience the peak months for Council Tax and benefit related issues for both the telephony and Face to Face areas. They also see a significant peak in customer contact in the days following a Bank Holiday. The timing of the Easter holiday weekend in 2013 ( 29 March to 1<sup>st</sup> April ) is likely to be a factor in increased contacts as this will follow closely on the despatch of 2013/14 Council Tax bills.

Whilst we have made good progress in relation to understanding the total impact of the above Welfare Reform changes, it is much more difficult to predict exactly when people will contact us, by what method and particularly whether they will be contacting us about one or more than one issue.

Having said the above, it is likely that the Council is going to receive significant levels of contact and certainly much more than it currently does and thus we need to look at a range of options to help us handle this. An action plan detailing a variety of options for handling the anticipated increased contact through the customer services team has been prepared.

The plan identifies a range of actions including , making best use of existing skill mix within the Contact Centre, maximising use of automated information provision, use of a specialist third party to bolster call handling capacity, greater flexibility as to when emails are responded to, extending the range of officers that can handle emails, reviewing service opening hours during peak periods , updating Web content and encouraging more use of Web based information/functionality etc.

In addition , Customer Services are also actively engaging with service partners across the Council in order to ensure a collective response to the Welfare Reforms more generally so we are best placed to support citizens and the additional contact expected.

The Council Tax changes detailed above are part of a wider package of Welfare Reforms which will result in the need for people to contact the Council at various times.

### **Other welfare reform changes happening at the same time**

**Under occupation rule in the social rented sector :** The latest information indicates this will impact on 8,500 households in Leeds , being 6,700 Council Tenants and 1,350 Registered Social Landlord tenants (Housing Associations). It is expected that many of these people affected will contact the Council via telephone or face to face.

ALMO's have put in place a proactive visiting programme to make their tenants aware of the changes and discuss potential options with them. Particular attention is being given to tenants who do not wish to move home but recognise they will not have the available income to pay the increased rental charge. Tenants who have stated they are prepared to move are being contacted to ensure they fully understand the lettings process and are being made aware of issues which they need to consider when selecting potential properties.

Mutual Exchanges will be encouraged and the ALMO's are looking to actively link tenants together to facilitate exchanges and options of how to access Housing Association properties will also be provided.

ALMOs are also organising more intensive support for their tenants around financial issues such as budgeting advice, setting up payments by Direct Debit , debt advice and referral to specialist debt support agencies, assistance and advice with establishing bank accounts including referral to Leeds City Credit Union, etc

#### **Benefit Cap**

The cap will come into affect from 1<sup>st</sup> April where the average working family income after tax is expected to be over £500 a week and £350 a week for single people. Latest information provided by the DWP showed 510 households in the Leeds area potentially affected by the cap. Cases where the household is identified as working with the Families First Team are receiving joint visits with the team and an officer from the Benefits Service to ensure a joined up, cohesive approach.

For completeness there are 2 other changes occurring at the same time being the introduction of a Local Welfare Assistance Scheme (replacing the previous DWP administered Social Fund scheme) and changes to the process for uprating the Local Housing Allowance. In relation to the former , the new scheme is in the process of being

developed and whilst it is not possible to predict the customer impact at this stage we understand that over 33,000 applications are made annually in Leeds under the current DWP administered scheme. In relation to the second item whilst there are 19,000 households in Leeds claiming the Local Housing Allowance, this change is not expected to generate significant additional contact.

### **Future welfare reform changes impacting on customer contact**

#### **Replacement of Disability Living Allowance (DLA)**

DLA will be replaced with a new benefit called Personal Independent Payment (PIP). This will involve the introduction of revised assessment criteria to decide eligibility. DWP statistics suggest around 21,000 DLA recipients in Leeds aged between 16 and 64 will be reassessed. The reassessments will not however commence until October 2013 in Leeds and will be a gradual process up to March 2016. Increased customer contact is not expected on this in the short term.

#### **Introduction of Universal Credit**

This will be a major change from October 2013 for all new benefit claims. Existing benefit claims will “migrate” to Universal Credit over a 4 year period. At the moment the DWP are indicating that managed migration will not commence until spring/summer 2014 , focusing initially on Working Tax Credit customers. This will have the potential for significant additional customer contact of a complex nature in the medium to longer term.

## **Appendix 2 - Consultation on Proposal to end Second Adult Rebate**

### **Background**

The draft Council Tax Support scheme states that In addition to reducing Council Tax Support for many working age claimants, that we will also end Second Adult Rebate for all working age claimants.

Second Adult Rebate is awarded to householders who have no partner, but have at least one other adult with a low income living with them. Their own income and capital is not taken into account, but depending on the income of the second adult(s) a reduction of either 25% 15% or 7.5% is awarded. In 2012/13 around £116k in Second Adult Rebate will be paid to 573 households.

We received 5,615 responses to the main Council Tax Support consultation and a report of the responses was presented to the Executive Board on 12.12.12. However, it was felt that the proposal to end Second Adult Rebate for working age was not sufficiently explored in the main consultation, and to address this concern a further consultation on Second Adult Rebate specifically has since been carried out.

### **The consultation**

A consultation questionnaire was issued on 7 December 2012 to 573 working age households who currently receive Second Adult Rebate. The consultation closed on 4 January 2013.

113 Responses were received to two questions that were asked.

1) How far do respondents agree or disagree that the council should end Second Adult Rebate for working Age households?

Response	Number of responses	% of respondents
Strongly Agree	5	4%
Agree	1	1%
Neither agree nor disagree	6	5%
Disagree	20	18%
Strongly Disagree	74	66%
Don't Know	7	6%
Total	113	100%

2) Is there anything respondents want to say about the proposal to remove Second Adult Rebate for working age households?

The responses were grouped into main themes (Some customers commented on more than one theme)

Comment	Number
Householder felt that they would suffer financial hardship	50
The second adult is a jobseeker and has been unable to find work	14
The second adult is a pensioner and so should be protected from any reductions	12
The second adult is disabled and the householder provides their care	12
The second adult would receive support if they moved out and lived independently	7
Miscellaneous comments	15
No Comment	37

### **Analysis**

84% of respondents disagree with the proposal compared to 5% that agree with the proposal. The remaining 11% either did not know or had no opinion either way.

The comments provided by respondents were grouped into key themes. The greatest number of comments (50) referred to the financial hardship that the householder feels that they will suffer if Second Adult Rebate is withdrawn. There were also a number of comments that low paid workers would suffer the greatest.

A number of comments (45) referred to the status on the second adult and their inability financially to contribute to the Council Tax of the household.

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 12TH DECEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors J Blake, A Carter, M Dobson,  
S Golton, P Gruen, R Lewis, L Mulherin,  
A Ogilvie and L Yeadon

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

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during the 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) Appendix 3 to the report referred to in Minute No. 130 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the information contained within the Appendix relates to the proposed share of procurement costs between Leeds City Region (LCR) partner local authorities. It is in the public interest not to disclose this information at this stage as sensitive negotiations are taking place with all LCR partner authorities and disclosing information that relates to the financial or business affairs of other local authorities, at a time when all authorities face budget pressures, could have a negative impact upon such negotiations.
- (b) Appendix 2 to the report referred to in Minute No. 132 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the information within the Appendix contains details relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), which if disclosed to the public would, or would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of that person or of the Council.

**123 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no interests declared at this stage of the meeting, however, an interest was declared later in the meeting (Minute No. 129 refers).

**124 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012 be approved as a correct record.

## **HEALTH AND WELLBEING**

### **125 Health and Wellbeing of People Living in Hyde Park and the Need for Local Schools and Community to Access Decent Sports Facilities**

The Director of Public Health submitted a report outlining the key issues impacting upon the health and wellbeing of the residents of the Hyde Park area in respect of the role of the Council as the lead organisation to improve health and reduce health inequalities locally. In addition, the report highlighted how the availability of the green space provided by Victoria Road playing fields was central when considering the needs of the community. The submitted report was in response to the issues raised by the deputation presented to Council on 12th September 2012 by the Hyde Park Olympic Legacy Committee.

**RESOLVED** – That following receipt of concerns which related to the submitted report, the consideration of this matter be deferred to a future Executive Board meeting, in order to enable further work to be undertaken to address such concerns.

## **RESOURCES AND CORPORATE FUNCTIONS**

### **126 Strategic and Financial Plan 2013/14 to 2016/17 including Initial Budget Proposals 2013/14**

The Director of Resources submitted a report presenting the Council's initial budget proposals for 2013/2014. Such proposals were within the context of developing a longer term financial plan for the Council, as the report also set out how resources would be aligned to the Council's "Best Council" ambitions for the 4 year period up to 2016/2017.

Members highlighted the difficult decisions which would need to be taken in order to achieve the proposed budget, and emphasised the constructive and collective approach which needed to continue in order to address those issues that the current financial situation posed.

Emphasis was placed upon the need for the consultation exercise which accompanied the budget setting process to be genuine, with the outcomes from it being reflected within the final proposals wherever possible. Following a Member's enquiry, the Board received clarification on the Council's expected levels of funding which would be received from Government for 2013/14.

In conclusion, the Chief Executive highlighted the value of the consultation exercise which would continue in respect of the budget proposals, and formally thanked all Council employees for their continued efforts during the current challenging climate.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the submitted report be agreed as the initial budget proposals, and that approval be given to the proposals being submitted to Scrutiny for consideration and also for the proposals to be used as a basis for wider consultation with stakeholders.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillors A Carter and Golton required it to be recorded that they both abstained from voting on the decisions taken above)

(The matters referred to within this minute were not eligible for Call In, as decisions regarding the Council's budget were ultimately reserved to Council)

**127 Financial Health Monitoring 2012/2013 - Month 7 Report**

The Director of Resources submitted a report presenting the Council's projected financial health position for 2012/2013 after seven months of the financial year.

**RESOLVED** – That the projected financial position of the authority after seven months of the financial year be noted.

**128 2012/2013 Quarter 2 Performance Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report presenting a summary of the quarter one and two performance data for 2012/2013, and which provided an update upon the progress made in delivering the Council Business Plan 2011-15 and City Priority Plan 2011-15. In addition, the report highlighted the Council's key performance issues.

Responding to a Member's enquiry, the Board received an update on the current protocol regarding the Children's Services Ofsted inspection procedure.

**RESOLVED** –

(a) That the progress made in delivering the Council's priorities, as well as the ongoing performance issues identified within the submitted report be noted.

(b) That the current target for percentage of service users and carers with control over their own care budget be amended to 70%, in line with the revised national target.

(c) That the target for library usage be revised to 2,800,000, in line with national and core city trends.

**129 Consultation Outcomes on Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

Further to Minute No. 72, 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the Director of Resources submitted a report inviting the Board to make a recommendation to Council regarding the formal adoption of a Local Council Tax Support Scheme by 31st January 2013. The report provided a range of scheme options which reflected both the feedback received from the consultation undertaken and also the budget position facing the Council.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the information contained within the submitted report be noted, and that Council be recommended to adopt a local Council Tax Support scheme that:
- Protects vulnerable groups, as set out within paragraphs 3.6 a) and b) of the submitted report;
  - Continues the current local scheme of disregarding in full Armed Forces Compensation Payments;
  - Provides additional funding to cover the cost of protecting these vulnerable groups; and
  - Reduces support for the remaining working age customers by a set percentage (currently estimated between 17% and 19%) for the remaining working age customers with the intention of containing overall scheme spend so that it does not exceed Government funding plus the additional funding for protected groups.
- (b) That the report to Full Council be updated with a final figure for the percentage reduction for non-protected working age customers that reflects the Government Funding decision following the Autumn Statement and Local Government Settlement announcement in December 2012.
- (c) That the report to Full Council be updated with the outcome of the consultation on the Second Adult Rebate scheme.

(Councillor A Carter declared an Other Significant Interest in respect of this matter, due to the fact that his step daughter was in receipt of Council Tax Benefit)

## **ENVIRONMENT**

### **130 Green Deal - Leeds City Region Project**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing an update on the Leeds City Region (LCR) Business Case for the long term delivery of the Green Deal, for which Leeds City Council had acted as the anchor authority. In addition, the report recommended the authorisation of expenditure to procure a framework of Green Leeds providers and also to create a local Green Deal loan fund.

Responding to a Member's suggestion on the potential for the scheme's set up costs to be factored into the financial model, which could enable the initiative to become cost neutral to the Council, officers advised that although a final decision on this matter was yet to be taken, it was confirmed that factoring in such costs may make the scheme less competitive.

Members highlighted the proposed 7.5% interest rate on the associated loan to householders, and requested that further work was undertaken around this matter, in order to ascertain whether there were any alternative options available, with such information being submitted to the Board in due course.

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

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the LCR Business Case, be endorsed.
- (b) That the use of the LCR Investment Fund be promoted in order to provide the initial circa £1,750,000 of revenue expenditure required to procure a Green Deal partner and subsequently to provide up to circa £59,000,000 of capital investment for loans.
- (c) That if the LCR Investment Fund is not available for either the revenue or capital requirements, then assurance be provided that Leeds City Council will contribute a share of the investment needed, subject to other participating authorities also committing a share of the investment. With this matter being clarified in the further Executive Board reports, in line with resolution (g) below.
- (d) That approval be given for Leeds to continue to be the anchor authority for the forthcoming procurement.
- (e) That approval be given to Leeds committing a minimum of 6,000 homes to the procurement exercise, subject to other LCR authorities committing a further 6,000 properties.
- (f) That other LCR authorities be encouraged to sign a Memorandum of Understanding, committing them to this collective approach.
- (g) That a further report be submitted to the Board in late spring 2013, which will update Executive Board on learning from the Green Deal Demonstrator, detail the progress made on the LCR Investment Fund, provide information on the progress made with the sign up of LCR authorities to a joint procurement and the establishment of a detailed and fully costed procurement timetable, whilst also considering any potential alternatives in respect of the proposed 7.5% interest rate on the associated loan to householders.

**131 Bulk Fuel Purchasing**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report setting out the response to recommendation 20 of the recent Inquiry undertaken by Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities) into Fuel Poverty. The recommendation suggested that the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods should take a lead on undertaking a cost-benefit and risk analysis for the Council to bulk purchase domestic heat fuel for householders. In addition, the report provided an update on the proposed bulk fuel purchasing grant submission that had been submitted to the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), in partnership with CO2 Sense.

The Executive Member for Environment thanked the Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities) for all of the work which it had undertaken on this issue.

**RESOLVED** – That the funding application which has been submitted to DECC to deliver a bulk fuel purchasing scheme for Leeds be supported.

**132 Design & Cost Report for the Improvement and Development of Visitor Services at The Arnold and Marjorie Ziff Tropical World in Roundhay Park**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report setting out the progress made in respect of the development of plans to enhance and improve the Arnold and Marjorie Ziff Tropical World in Roundhay Park. In addition, the report detailed proposals to phase the works, set out a programme for implementation of the proposals and sought approval for the injection of further money into the Capital Programme, which would be funded via prudential borrowing.

The Board thanked the Ziff family for their continued and valued contribution towards the artistic and cultural development of the city.

Following consideration of Appendix 2 to the submitted report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3), which was considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting, it was

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That approval be given to the following improvements at Tropical World:
- Development of a new entrance space and bespoke education / children's zone.
  - Provision of the new crocodile enclosure.
  - Construction of café extension.
  - Development of the new aquarium.
  - Enhancement of the nocturnal zone.
  - New interpretation and educational information.
  - New toilet and baby changing facilities.
- (b) That the positive feedback received from the consultation process be noted, along with the endorsement it provides for the proposals included within the submitted report.
- (c) That the increase in the provisional cost estimate for this scheme be noted, and that approval be given to the injection of a further £120,000 into capital scheme 16504 000 000.
- (d) That the proposals to split the capital project into two distinct phases, in order to facilitate the commencement of capital improvements in the 2012/13 financial year be supported, and that the necessary authority required to spend £60,000 against capital scheme 16504 000 000 in the 2012/13 financial year, be approved.

- (e) That a subsequent Design and Cost Report be submitted to Executive Board upon the completion of the detailed design work associated with phase 2 of this scheme for further comment and approval.

**133 Queen Elizabeth II Fields Scheme**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing information on the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Scheme, the principal objectives of it and the associated nomination process. In addition, the report detailed the opportunities within the Parks and Countryside service to develop volunteering, highlighted the positive impacts of such volunteering and detailed the growth in corporate volunteering facilitated by the service. The report also sought approval to submit nominations for a selection of sites vested within Leeds City Council for inclusion within the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Scheme.

A request was made that consideration be given to the utilisation of the LDF Core Strategy as a means of ensuring that all playing fields held by the Council were designated as having a similar protected status. In addition, responding to a Member's enquiry regarding the proposed boundaries for the West Park playing fields application, officers undertook to look into the matter as to whether the boundaries could be extended to incorporate the greenspace immediately next to the centre.

**RESOLVED** - That the content of the submitted report be noted, and that the nomination of the selected sites for inclusion within the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Trust Scheme be approved, subject to the outcomes of the further consideration to be given to the West Park application, as discussed during the meeting.

(The matters referred to within this minute were not eligible for Call In, as the deadline for nominations to the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Trust scheme was the 31st December 2012. Therefore, the decision relating to this matter was considered to be urgent, as any delay would seriously prejudice the Council's ability to successfully nominate the sites)

**134 Ash Dieback (Chalara Fraxinea)**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the background to Ash Dieback (Chalara Fraxinea) and highlighted the potential impact of the spread of the disease in Leeds.

Responding to a Member's specific enquiries, the Board received an update on the current situation of the trees at Water Haigh Park and also in respect of the potential to sell the wood from infected trees as firewood.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the submitted report be noted.

## **DEVELOPMENT AND THE ECONOMY**

### **135 Response to Deputation from Burley Park Residents to Preserve Yorkshire Paving Stones**

The Director of City Development submitted a report responding to the deputation presented to Council on 12th September 2012 from Burley Park Residents regarding the preservation of Yorkstone paving in highways. In addition, the report considered similar concerns to those of the Burley Park Residents' Group which had been received in relation to other areas of the city.

Prior to the meeting, Board Members had received copies of correspondence which had been submitted by local residents in respect of this issue for their consideration.

Responding to the issues raised by the deputation and the contents of the submitted report, Members emphasised the value of such matters being resolved at a local level, whilst also highlighting the importance of effective consultation together with Ward Member engagement.

#### **RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report be noted.
- (b) That the concerns of residents be acknowledged.
- (c) That additional resident engagement be undertaken on the remaining 2012/13 planned maintenance schemes which contain stone products and that the progress of those schemes be delayed until such engagement has concluded.
- (d) That greater Elected Member and resident engagement be undertaken in a timely fashion at the planning stage and prior to the commencement of works on streets outside of conservation areas which contain stone products. This will be before any planned maintenance is undertaken.
- (e) That an appropriate accounting mechanism be established for the reclamation and re-use of natural stone highway materials which are removed and/or replaced within the highway.

## **NEIGHBOURHOODS, PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES**

### **136 Tenancy Strategy for Leeds 2013 - 2015**

Further to Minute No. 13, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2012, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing an update on the consultation undertaken on the draft Tenancy Strategy and how responses to the consultation had been taken into account in developing a final version of the Tenancy Strategy, which was presented for the purposes of formal approval.

In introducing the report, the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services advised that it was intended for a report to be submitted

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 9th January, 2013

to a future Board meeting regarding the Council's use of the private rented sector.

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods highlighted a minor amendment proposed to be made to the Strategy document, namely that, in paragraph 8, the minimum length of a private rented tenancy should read 24 months, rather than 12.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the outcome of the consultation exercise undertaken on the draft Tenancy Strategy be noted.
- (b) That the Tenancy Strategy, as appended to the submitted report, be approved subject to the inclusion of the minor amendment to paragraph 8, as detailed above.

**137 Lettings Policy Review 2012/2013 - Approval to Commence Consultation**

Further to Minute No. 13, 20th June 2012, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report setting out proposed changes to the Council's Lettings Policy, as required by the Localism Act 2011 and outlining proposals which would enable the Council to assist social housing tenants affected by forthcoming Welfare Reform changes. In addition, the report provided an update on the interim measures being taken within the scope of the current Lettings Policy to support tenants affected by Welfare Reform and to mitigate, as far as possible, the impact upon tenants and the Council. The report also detailed the timescales for the implementation of a new Policy and sought approval for the proposed consultation process.

In discussing the report, the Board considered the current 25% 'Date of Registration' quota, a Member placed specific emphasis upon the need for housing stock to be managed in a localised manner and a suggestion was made that further work was undertaken in respect of the housing waiting list, in order to identify those with a genuine need.

In conclusion, it was noted that the comments made during the consideration of the report would be fed into the associated consultation process and the Board thanked the Housing Support Team for their ongoing work in this field.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report, together with the actions being taken to support tenants affected by the changes to housing benefit, be noted.
- (b) That an Equality Impact Assessment be undertaken on the potential impact of the proposed letting policy changes.
- (c) That the proposals contained within the submitted report be consulted upon, with a view to a revised Lettings Policy being prepared by March 2013. (Following the resolution of Council in November 2012, a cross party

working group will be established to oversee and inform the consultation process).

- (d) That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods prepare a report for the March 2013 Executive Board setting out the results of the consultation exercise, detailing an equality impact assessment and seeking approval for the implementation of the revised Lettings Policy.

**138 Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 - Election Results and Update**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing information on the results from the recent West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner elections, which included details of the winning candidate's key pledges. In addition, the report highlighted the ongoing work which was being undertaken to prepare the city for potential changes to local partnership, scrutiny and commissioning arrangements.

Members discussed the scrutiny function which would operate as part of the new arrangements.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the submitted report be noted.
- (b) That further updates be provided to the Board, as and when appropriate, on the implications to Leeds arising from the appointment of Mr. Mark Burns-Williamson as the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

**139 Review of Area Working Findings and Recommendations**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report setting out the key issues arising from the review of area working arrangements which had been undertaken, having regard to the agreed aspirations set out in the locality working design principles and the emerging 'Best City' and 'Best Council' ambitions. In conclusion, the report sought approval to a number of recommendations which would further develop and embed locality working in Leeds.

Members highlighted the potential role for Town and Parish Councils with respect to localised decision making, considered issues regarding the optimum number of Wards which an Area Committee should cover and emphasised the importance for those services which were delegated to be genuinely delivered locally. In addition, the Board highlighted the importance of ensuring that the correct balance was struck between the formalities around the Committees' decision making processes, whilst also ensuring that the Committees were flexible enough to prioritise and respond to local issues in a timely manner.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the commitment and ambition to drive forward a step change in locality working with the role of Area Committees being key to ensuring

more locally responsive and accountable services, be endorsed and supported.

- (b) That the development of more locally responsive and accountable services generally be endorsed and supported and that priority action in the following areas be agreed, with further reports being prepared on how these services can be more locally focused or delegated:
- Youth services
  - Neighbourhood planning
  - Employment and skills
  - Local parks and green space
  - Local highways maintenance
- (c) That the principle of Area Committee Members taking an "Area Lead" approach on a specific area of Council policy or business, to provide Area Committee based leadership on key issues, be supported.
- (d) That the Board further supports the Area Lead working closely with the relevant Executive portfolio holder and the relevant Director on issues to better align city wide and local policy making, share best practice and help embed the locality working design principles.
- (e) That a detailed proposal for the introduction of the Area Lead role be prepared for agreement and implementation in the new municipal year.
- (f) That partnership structures be mapped in each of the three administrative areas with roles, responsibilities and links documented, discussed and agreed with Area Committees and area leadership teams. With each Area Committee agreeing who represents them on each partnership body.
- (g) That the proposal for Area Committees to forge links and develop good working relationships with the new Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to exploit opportunities for collaboration within the health and wellbeing agenda, be supported.
- (h) That Member Management Committee be requested to review the mechanism for appointing Elected Members to Children's Services clusters.
- (i) That the outcome of the review of locality-based funding arrangements be noted, and that the Board commits to the continued allocation of the well-being grant as per existing arrangements (a ratio of 50:50 in terms of population and deprivation), with further thought being given to how new funding regimes can be locally provided/influenced as they come on-stream.
- (j) That the proposal to look at delegating more funding to local decision making in support of the developing council's budget strategy 2013-2017, be supported.

- (k) That the review's conclusion, that no changes are necessary to the Area Committee boundaries at this time, be noted.
- (l) That the concerns expressed regarding the Inner West Area Committee and it consisting of only two Wards be noted, and in order to help respond to the capacity issue, the Board requests that consideration be given to utilising the current option of co-optees to enhance the membership of the Area Committee.
- (m) That the issue of how Area Committees operate relative to officers attending; for what purpose and their general administration, be looked at further (e.g. agreeing agendas, papers and other similar issues) with new arrangements being developed and proposed in time for the new municipal year.
- (n) That a further report be prepared on options for improving locality based consultation and engagement activities.

### **CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

#### **140 School Funding 2013/2014**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report advising of the new arrangements for Schools Funding which were scheduled to come into effect from April 2013 and which sought approval for the introduction of a new simplified formula to fund Leeds schools, including Academies. In addition, the report outlined the decisions of the Schools Forum in respect of the de-delegation of services to schools and the provision of a growth fund intended to support those schools which had expanded due to increased admission limits. Finally, the report advised of the Schools Forum decision to support the continued funding of School based Children's Services Clusters at £5,200,000 per year over the next three years.

Responding to a Member's specific enquiry regarding changes to the funding arrangements for split site schools, officers undertook to provide the Member in question with further information on this issue outside of the meeting.

Having discussed matters relating to Children's Services clusters, Members highlighted the vital role played by Elected Member representation on each cluster.

#### **RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the decisions of the Schools Forum regarding the de-delegation of newly delegated services, and the wish to establish a growth fund, be noted.
- (b) That the decision of the Schools Forum to support the continued funding for Children's Services Clusters from the Dedicated Schools Grant at £5,200,000 per year over the next three years, be noted.

- (c) That the simplified funding formula, as approved by the Schools Forum on 25th October 2012, be approved.

**141 Basic Need Programme 2014 - Outcome of consultation on proposals for expansion of primary provision in 2014**

Further to Minute No. 42, 18<sup>th</sup> July 2012, the Director of Children's Services submitted a report providing details of the outcome of the public consultation exercise undertaken on proposals regarding the expansion of primary school provision across the city and which made a series of recommendations regarding the next steps for each of the proposals.

In presenting the report, the Executive Member for Children's Services confirmed that any proposals regarding Tranmere Park Primary School had been put on hold, in order to enable further work to be carried out on this matter, prior to it being submitted to Executive Board for formal consideration.

Members highlighted the scale of the challenge which faced the Council in respect to its statutory requirements around school place provision. In response, it was confirmed that this report was one of a number aimed at tackling the issue which would be submitted to the Board in due course, whilst Members were also reassured that an all party working group had been tasked with considering matters in respect of basic need requirements, and that this together with the multi-directorate approach now being taken, looked to ensure that all wider implications arising from this issue were being addressed.

In conclusion, Members highlighted the need to ensure that developers made appropriate contributions towards the provision of schools and the need for Elected Members to be fully briefed on such matters.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Little London Primary School from 210 to 630 pupils be approved.
- (b) That the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Rufford Park Primary School from 210 to 315 pupils be approved.
- (c) That the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Sharp Lane Primary School from 420 to 630 pupils be approved.
- (d) That further work be undertaken in relation to the proposal to expand Tranmere Park Primary School, prior to further consideration by Executive Board.

**LEISURE AND SKILLS**

**142 Delivering the City Deal on Skills**

Further to Minute No. 43, 18<sup>th</sup> July 2012, the Director of City Development and the Director of Children's Services submitted a joint report providing an update upon the activity being undertaken by the Council to deliver the Skills

element of the City Deal. Specifically, the report provided details of the work undertaken to deliver three key elements, namely, the Leeds Apprenticeship Training Agency, the Apprenticeship Hub and the Devolved Youth Contract.

Responding to enquiries regarding a challenge which Members had been set aimed at encouraging Small and Mediums Enterprises (SME's) in their Ward to engage with apprenticeships, the Board was provided with an update on the actions being taken to raise SMEs' awareness of the initiatives in place to make apprenticeships more accessible. Emphasis was also placed upon the ways in which Elected Members could raise the profile of apprenticeships via their other roles, such school governorships.

With regard to the statistics within the submitted report around the number of young people across the city in receipt of unemployment benefits and those categorised as Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET), officers undertook to ensure that Board Members were provided with the latest figures at the earliest opportunity.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the progress on implementing the current activity under the Skills element of the City Deal, be noted.
- (b) That the programme of activity developed through the Apprenticeship Training Agency and the Apprenticeship Hub to increase the number of apprenticeship opportunities, be supported.
- (c) That the programme of activity developed to support young people re-engage with education, employment and training through the devolved Youth Contract, be supported.
- (d) That in principle support be given to seeking further freedoms and flexibilities and resources to facilitate the development of local skills programmes to aid the implementation of the Leeds Growth Strategy in the context of the emerging Leeds City Region Skills Plan.

#### **ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

##### **143 Design and Cost Report for the Replacement of Rothwell Fulfilling Lives Building**

Further to Minute No. 65, 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report seeking authority to commit expenditure to fund the rebuilding of the Rothwell Fulfilling Lives Centre (West building) on Holmsley Lane, Woodlesford.

The Board welcomed the proposals detailed within the submitted report, whilst the Executive Member for Adult Social Care thanked all officers who had been involved in the development of this project.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the progress being made city wide on the modernisation of day services for adults with learning disabilities and the positive feedback being received from customers and their carers, be noted.
- (b) That the plan to replace the existing Rothwell Fulfilling Lives (West) with a new build facility on the same site, rather than refurbishing the existing building as had been originally planned, be noted.
- (c) That the authority to spend a total of £2,025,000 for this development, be approved.

**144 Better Lives Explained - Leeds Local Account of Adult Social Care 2012/13**

Further to Minute No. 195, 10<sup>th</sup> February 2012, the Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report which introduced the Leeds Local Account of Adult Social Care Services for its citizens. In addition, the report highlighted the requirement for Local Authorities to produce a Local Account and provided an explanation of the new responsibilities placed upon Councils, and the Local Account's contribution towards enhancing local accountability to the public and as a tool to support sector led service improvement. Finally, the report offered a highlighted summary of the main areas of achievement for Adult Social Care and indicated some areas of service identified within the Leeds Local Account as requiring further development to sustain or improve performance.

The Board welcomed the content of Leeds' Local Account for 2012/2013, whilst the Executive Member for Adult Social Care thanked all officers who had made a contribution towards it.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the Local Account for Leeds, entitled "Better Lives Explained", as appended to the submitted report, be noted.
- (b) That the Local Account for Leeds be referred to the Scrutiny Board (Health and Wellbeing and Adult Social Care) for the Board's oversight of performance.

**DATE OF PUBLICATION:** 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2012

**LAST DATE FOR CALL IN OF ELIGIBLE DECISIONS:** 21<sup>ST</sup> DECEMBER 2012 (5.00P.M.)

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00 p.m. on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2013)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (RESOURCES AND COUNCIL SERVICES)**

**MONDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors S Bentley, J L Carter,  
N Dawson, R Grahame, J Hardy, A Lowe,  
C Macniven and R Wood

### **47 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the November meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services).

### **48 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **49 Declarations of Interest**

In accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the Members Code of Conduct, the following declaration was made by Councillor Ron Grahame in relation to Agenda item 8 as a local authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (minute 53 refers).

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

There were no apologies.

### **51 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** -That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **52 Executive Board Minutes - 17th October 2012**

**RESOLVED** -That the minutes of the Executive Board held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be noted.

### **53 Financial Strategy 2013 to 2017**

The Director of Resources presented to the Board a report updating Members on the development of the Council's financial strategy.

The following were in attendance:

Councillor Peter Gruen - Executive Member Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services  
Alan Gay – Director of Resources  
Doug Meeson– Chief Officer (Financial Management)

In brief summary, the main issues of discussion were;

- The development of a 'Budget Plus' approach to financial planning
- The need for Directorates to look at how services are delivered including in collaboration with partners and to offer challenge where appropriate
- The forecast of a £63m reduction in resources by 2016/17
- The need to look at income generation opportunities
- The robustness of the population data available and the methodology used by the Council to monitor population movement
- The impact service redesign will have on the deployment of staff and overall staff numbers
- The need to ensure the Council has an 'enabling corporate centre' supporting frontline staff
- The financial consequences of an increased number of Academy schools
- The robustness of the assumptions made in respect of growth in business rates, the Council tax base and levels of reserves
- The ability of the Council to capitalise on the New Homes Bonus
- Opportunities to access available European funding

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) To note the contents of the report
- (ii) To request a further report on the Councils strategy to access the New Homes Bonus
- (iii) To receive the Executives initial budget proposals at the Board's December

## 54 Welfare Reforms Preparations

The Director of Resources submitted a report providing information on the preparations underway for the welfare reforms that come into effect from April 2013.

The following were in attendance:

Councillor Peter Gruen - Executive Member Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services

Steven Carey – Chief Revenues and Benefits Officer

Jill Wildman – Director of Housing Services, East North East Homes, Leeds

Paul Broughton – Chief Customer Access Officer

In brief summary, the main issues of discussion were;

- The development of a local council tax support scheme for Leeds.
- The Social Sector Size Criteria and the management of the consequences of its implementation
- The capacity of Council services to implement the required changes and to manage the consequential impact and the budget implication of any additional resources required

The Board congratulated Steven Carey and his team for the work carried out in this area.

### **RESOLVED**

- (i) To note the expected impact of the benefit changes coming into effect from April 2013
- (ii) To undertake further work in relation to the management of the Social Sector Size criteria and to authorise the Chair and Head of Scrutiny and Member Development to programme this work into the Board's work schedule

## 55 Work Schedule

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a copy of the Board's work schedule. A discussion on potential work items was held.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To add to the work schedule the following items;

Social Sector Size Criteria  
Payment of Staff off-payroll

- (ii) To authorise the Chair and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development to refine and schedule these items as appropriate.

**56 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the date of the next meeting as Monday 17<sup>th</sup> December at 10am

(All meetings to take place in the Civic Hall, Leeds, commencing at 10.00am)

**(The meeting concluded at 12.05 pm)**

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (RESOURCES AND COUNCIL SERVICES)**

**MONDAY, 17TH DECEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors S Bentley, J L Carter,  
N Dawson, R Grahame, J Hardy, A Lowe,  
C Macniven and R Wood

### **57 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the December meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services).

### **58 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **59 Declarations of Interest**

In accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the Members Code of Conduct, the following declaration was made by Councillor Ron Grahame in relation to Agenda item 9 as a local authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (minute 64 refers).

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

There were no apologies for absence

### **61 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** -That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **62 Executive Board Minutes - 7th November 2012**

**RESOLVED** -That the minutes of the Executive Board held on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012 be noted.

### **63 Personal Service Companies**

The Chief Officer HR presented to the Board an overview of the key issues in relation to personal service companies and how the Council engages for short term work.

The following were in attendance:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 21st January, 2013

Daniel Hartley – Deputy Chief Officer HR and Head of HR Children’s Services  
Alex Watson – Head of HR

In brief summary, the main issues of discussion were;

- The progress made to ensure that no permanent member of staff is being paid off payroll
- Why such arrangements were not challenged in the past
- The issue of ensuring guidelines are in place for senior officers to enable them to sensibly decide how to fill interim positions
- Long term skill planning to reduce the need for relying on external expertise
- The proposed changes to the Contract Procedure Rules
- The need to reflect revised arrangements in the Senior pay policy statement to be agreed by Full Council in 2013

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) To note the contents of the report and endorse the proposals there in
- (ii) To recommend that the implementation of the proposals is a high priority for HR and Procurement and that HR, in conjunction with Audit and Procurement, report back to this Board by April 2013 on the implementation and adherence to the new arrangements.

### **64 Strategic and Financial Plan 2013/14 to 2016/17 Including Initial Budget Proposals for 2013**

The Director of Resources presented a paper setting out the Initial Budget proposals for 2013/14 within the context of developing a financial plan for the period 2013/14 to 2016/17

The following were in attendance

Councillor Keith Wakefield – Leader of Council  
Alan Gay – Director of Resources  
Doug Meeson – Chief Officer (Financial Management)

In brief summary, the main issues of discussion were;

- An explanation on the make-up of the funding reductions for 2013/14 totalling £51.3m.
- Changes in the Council Tax Base and the governments Council Tax freeze grant
- The Welfare Reform changes and the management of the consequences of their implementation
- Assumptions around council tax collection and the consequences of not meeting targets
- The capacity for the Council to generate income either through increased trading of the raising of charges
- The capacity for shared services
- Grants to voluntary organisations and value for money
- The targeted pupil premium funding and its use.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (i) To note the Initial Budget proposals
- (ii) To submit any comments along with those from other Scrutiny Boards to the Executive as part of the Budget and Policy Framework procedure.

#### **65 2012/13 Quarter Two Performance Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) introduced a summary of performance against the strategic priorities for the council.

The following were in attendance:

James Rogers – Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance)

Doug Meeson - Chief Officer (Financial Management)

Daniel Hartley – Deputy Chief Officer HR and Head of HR Children’s Services

In brief summary, the main issues of discussion were;

- The Council Business Plan – Cross Council priorities
- The Council Business Plan – Directorate Priorities and Indicators

Specific discussion was held on;

- Sickness levels

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 21st January, 2013

- Processing time for Council Tax benefit/Housing Benefit new claims and updates
- Council Tax collection rates and Universal Credit
- Consultation on Key delegated decisions

**RESOLVED** – To note the Q2 performance information and the issues highlighted.

(Councillor R Wood left at the start of this item at 11.30 am  
Councillor R Grahame left during the discussion on this item at 11.40am)

## **66 Work Schedule**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a copy of the Board's work schedule. A discussion on potential work items was held.

**RESOLVED** –

(i) To add to the work schedule the following items;

- Personal Service Companies (update on implementation)
- Grants Income generation

(ii) To authorise the Chair and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development to refine and schedule these items as appropriate.

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

**RESOLVED** – To note the date of the next meeting as Monday 21st January at 10am

(All meetings to take place in the Civic Hall, Leeds, commencing at 10.00am)

**(The meeting concluded at 12 noon)**

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CHILDREN AND FAMILIES)

THURSDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors C Gruen, A Hussain, A Khan,  
A Lamb, P Latty, M Rafique, K Renshaw,  
A Sobel and B Urry

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

Mr E A Britten – Church Representative (Catholic)

Ms A Craven – Parent Governor Representative (Primary)

Ms J Ward – Parent Governor Representative (Secondary)

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

Ms C Foote – Teacher Representative

Ms C Raftery – Teacher Representative

Mrs S Hutchinson – Early Years Representative

Ms J Morris-Boam – Young Lives Leeds

#### **70 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the November meeting of Scrutiny Board (Children's and Families).

#### **71 Late Items**

In accordance with her powers under Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to accept the following supplementary items, which were not available at the time of agenda despatch:

- Briefing Note – Early Intervention Grant and Funding for the provision of the Free Nursery education entitlement for Vulnerable 2 Year Olds prepared by the Head of Finance (Children's Services) (Agenda Item 7)(Minute 75 refers)
- Learning Skills and Universal Services – Powerpoint presentation slides (Agenda Item 7)(Minute 75 refers)
- 2011/12 Early Years Foundation Stage Profile outcomes by cluster (Agenda Item 7)(Minute 75 refers)

The documents were not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website prior to and after the meeting.

#### **72 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor B Gettings, Ms T Kayani (Co-opted Member) and Ms J Morris-Boam (Co-opted Member).

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser also informed the meeting that Councillor J Blake, Executive Member (Children and Families) and Mr N Richardson,

Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

Director of Children's Services had also conveyed their apologies due to prior engagements.

**74 Minutes - 11th October 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved as a correct record.

**75 Scrutiny Inquiry - Foundation Years - providing the best start in life for Children to succeed – Session 3**

Referring to Minute 66 of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which provided information relating to session 3 of the Board's inquiry into looking at foundation years (age 0-5) and how services in Leeds were provided to promote the best start in life for children, to equip them with the skills to succeed and promote their social mobility.

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

- Domestic Violence Action Plan for Leeds 2012/13 (Appendix A refers)
- Foundation Years – providing the best start in life for children to succeed – Session 3 – Report of the Director of Children's Services (Appendix B refers)

In addition to the above documents, copies of the following supplementary information was also circulated at the meeting:

- A copy of a briefing note entitled 'Early Intervention Grant and Funding for the provision of the Free Nursery education entitlement for Vulnerable 2 Year Olds prepared by the Head of Finance (Children's Services)
- Learning Skills and Universal Services – Powerpoint presentation slides
- 2011/12 Early Years Foundation Stage Profile outcomes by cluster

The Chair welcomed the following officers to the meeting:-

- Sue Rumbold, Chief Officer (Partnership, Development and Business Support), Children's Services
- Andrea Richardson, Head of Early Years Help Services, Children's Services
- Liz Bradley, Early Years and Foundation Stage Improvement Manager, Children's Services
- Neil Warren, Head of Finance, Children's Services
- Lisa Smith, Children's Centre Manager, Children's Services
- Collette Kurylo, Children's Centre Manager, Chapeltown, Children's Services
- Michelle de Souza, Community Safety Manager, Children's Services
- Joanna Smith, 4Children who ran the City and Hunslet Children's Centre

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser informed the meeting that Session 3 of the inquiry would focus on the following specific areas:

- Leeds Education Challenge – Foundation Stage: Children’s Services and Cluster approach to the three prime development areas:
  - personal, social and emotional development
  - communication and language and
  - physical development
- Progress since the Education Standards – Entering the Education System inquiry 2009
- Early Years Foundation Stage (September 2012) Legislation changes
- Free early education – take up of places for 3 and 4 year olds, increasing take up and engaging parents
- Extension of free early education to 2 year olds (September 2013) – Preparation, promotion and strengthening the quality of providers

Prior to discussing Session 3 of the inquiry, the Chair invited Michelle de Souza, Community Safety Manager to briefly discuss the domestic violence support question raised at the last meeting.

She focused on the following three specific areas:

- The fact that domestic violence was triggered when women become pregnant and the support available from midwives and health visitors in this regard
- The work undertaken with the Children’s Centres and the information available on domestic violence
- The therapeutic support available for children who had emotional problems as a result of domestic violence

The key areas of discussion were:

- Clarification of the high risk factors and the support available for siblings with specific reference to the work undertaken in this area by MORAC
- Clarification if domestic violence was more evident in areas of deprivation or high unemployment
- Clarification of the work undertaken to date towards verbal and physical violence to teenage girls who were seen as a vulnerable group in this area
- The mental and emotional support available for children and young people who have witnessed domestic violence

Liz Bailey, Early Years and Foundation Stage Improvement Manager presented a brief powerpoint presentation on ‘Learning Skills and Universal Services’ which focused on the attainment gap in Leeds.

Andrea Richardson, Head of Early Years Help Services highlighted the key issues contained within the report and supporting documents and to assist the

Board with their deliberations of the inquiry, representatives from three Children's Centres were present to provide additional information.

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser read out a statement from Jane Middlebrook, Manager of Kaleidoscope from the Private Nursery sector regarding the relationship/involvement between private providers and clusters.

The key areas of discussion were:

- Concerns expressed that there was not enough early years spaces available, especially in East Leeds
- The need for the Board to be supplied with more information on the Early Year's take up
- The concerns expressed that families were struggling to pay travelling expenses to transport children to other areas of the city for childcare
- Clarification of the three questions relating to the attainment gap in Leeds and the need for the Board to be supplied with more details on the proportion of settings and on what challenges were available as part of the representations being made by the Core Strategy  
*(The Head of Early Years Help Services responded and agreed to provide a breakdown of data on a ward by ward basis in relation to 2, 3 and 4 year olds)*
- The need for a working group to be established to address the information raised at today's meeting
- Clarification of the SEN's involvement within the process
- Clarification of the number of 4 year olds who would be in the 20% cohort of low attainment.  
*(The Head of Early Years Help Services responded and commented on the assessment criteria. She agreed to provide more information on the figures via the Principal Scrutiny Adviser)*
- Clarification of the support available to parents in relation to the 5 year old provision
- The concerns expressed about the language and literacy issues that existed for children and how the authority engaged with parents
- The funding issues for free early years provision within the different sectors of Leeds
- The need for the Board to be supplied with more detail on cross sector meetings to include numbers of attendees, information on provides and the evaluation criteria  
*(The Early Years and Foundation Stage Improvement Manager responded and agreed to provide this information via the Principal Scrutiny Adviser)*
- Clarification of the pilot take up figures
- Concern about attainment gap data in the JESS and C.H.E.S.S clusters
- The need for a Health Visitor to inform parent of the 'Breeze' at the nine month assessment stage and for records to be undertaken
- The need for developers to be make contribution via Community Infrastructure Levy to the Early Years provision

- Clarification if there were enough Outreach Workers within the area's of need

Neil Warren, Head of Finance to made a brief presentation on the Early Intervention Grant and Funding for the provision of the Free Nursery education entitlement for Vulnerable 2 Year Olds.

The key areas of discussion were:

- Clarification of the protocol in relation to the two year old grant money going into the Dedicated Schools Grant  
*(The Head of Finance responded and outlined the estimated figures and agreed to report back further information on this issue via the Principal Scrutiny Adviser)*
- Clarification of the protocol for the two year old grant being identified for vulnerable children for two years and what would happen in year three
- Concern about the overall requirement to provide an expanded service without any additional funding
- Clarification if the Core Offer was guaranteed for a year or by term .
- The need to consider devising a standard form for any child who was accepted into a school as apart of the transition arrangements

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report, appendices and supplementary information be noted.
- b) That a vote of thanks be conveyed to those officers in attendance for their contribution and input into Session 3 of the inquiry.
- c) That a working group be established in either December 2012/January 2013 to address the specific issues raised at today's meeting and that in the interim period, Board Members be requested to forward any further/ or unanswered questions to the Principal Scrutiny Adviser for dissemination to relevant officers.

(Councillor A Khan joined the meeting at 10.15am during discussions of the above item)

(Councillor A Hussain left the meeting at 12.10pm during discussions of the above item)

#### **76 Recommendation Tracking – Improving School Attendance**

(Due to time restraints, this item was withdrawn until the next meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012)

#### **77 Recommendation Tracking – External Placements**

(Due to time restraints, this item was withdrawn until the next meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012)

## 78 **Draft Scrutiny Inquiry Final Report – Safeguarding Children – Private Care Homes**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which requested that the Board consider and agree their report following its inquiry into Safeguarding Children – Private Care Homes.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Draft Scrutiny Inquiry Final report Safeguarding Children – Private Care Homes – 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012' for the information/comment of the meeting.

The Chair welcomed the following officers to the meeting:-

- Sue Rumbold, Chief Officer (Partnership, Development and Business Support), Children's Services
- Martin Sellens, Head of Planning Services, City Development

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

The key areas of discussion were:

- To remind the Board that some planning constraints are a national issue  
*(The Chair confirmed that representation had already been made to the Children's Minister on this issue)*
- Clarification that the Childrens Residential Home Charter was being progressed under the banner of being a Child Friendly City  
*(The Chief Officer (Partnership, Development and Business Support), Children's Services responded on this issue)*

### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That approval be given to the Board's report following its inquiry into Safeguarding Children-Private Care Homes as now outlined.

## 79 **Work Schedule**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which detailed the Scrutiny Board's work schedule for the current municipal year.

Appended to the report for Members' information was the current version of the Board's work programme; a copy of Executive Board minutes of a meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and an extract from the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

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

In her presentation, the Principal Scrutiny Adviser referred to the working group established to look into outstanding issues in relation to the Board's

Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

Inquiry on 'Foundation Years – Providing the Best Start in Life for Children to Succeed – Session 3' (Minute 75 refers) and confirmed that she would contact Board Members to arrange a convenient date and time in December 2012/January 2013.

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser also referred to the Youth Review Working Group to consider the views and recommendations of the group in response to the report of Damien Allen, NOHA Associates 'The Leeds 'Youth Offer' – findings and propositions. She requested any further suggestions/recommendations on the notes of the meeting to prepare a report for submission on this issue to the Executive Board at the January 2013 meeting.

The key areas of discussion were:

- With regard to Foundation Years, the need for the Board to be more challenging towards the attainment gap in Leeds and as a result the working group should focus on the issue of knowing where the quality of settings were located. In addition the need for the working group to look a research work undertaken by the universities  
*(The Principal Scrutiny Adviser responded and agreed to look into this issue)*
- The need for the Board to see copies of the minutes of the Children's Trust Board

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the work schedule be approved.
- b) That the copy of Executive Board minutes of a meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and an extract from the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be noted.
- c) That the Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to prepare a report to the Executive Board at the January 2013 meeting on 'The Leeds 'Youth Offer' – findings and propositions' in accordance with the recommendations made by the Youth Review Working Group.
- d) That the Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to include minutes of the Children's Trust Board within the work schedule.

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

Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 at 9.45am in the Civic Hall, Leeds with a Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.15am.

(The meeting concluded at 12.30pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CHILDREN AND FAMILIES)

THURSDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors B Gettings, C Gruen,  
A Hussain, A Khan, A Lamb, M Rafique,  
K Renshaw and B Urry

Co-opted members Voting – E A Britten, A Craven and J Ward

Co-opted Members Non-Voting – C Foote, C Raftery, S Hutchinson,  
T Kayani and J Morris-Boam

### 81 **Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda however the following supplementary documents had been despatched to the Board:  
Item 8 Financial Health & Budget proposals – a copy of a letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2012 sent to Mr M Gove, Secretary of State for Education from the Leaders of the three main political groups on Leeds City Council in respect of Early Intervention Funding (minute 86 refers)  
Item 10 Children's Social Work: Improvement Plan – Appendix B of the report (minute 88 refers)

### 82 **Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of interest

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Latty and Sobel and also from Ms N Cox (Parent Governor Representative)

### 84 **Minutes - 8th November 2012**

Minute 72 – The Board noted a request to delete reference to the declaration of interest recorded in the minutes as Councillor Urry stated he was not a Governor of Roundhay St Johns C of E School

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to a revision to minute 72 to read “there were no declarations of interest”, the minutes of the meeting held 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012 were agreed as a correct record

### 85 **The Implications of Academies for the Local Authority and Education in General**

The Board received the report of the Director Children's Services in response to a request to provide information on the impact of academy school developments upon the work of the Local Authority and education in general. The report set out the current position in the primary and secondary school phases both in Leeds and nationally and provided details on how academies differ from local authority maintained schools, associated corporate

implications and raised awareness to the Board for other options for structural change of schools

The Board welcomed Councillor J Blake, Executive Member for Children's Services and the following officers to the meeting to present the report:  
Mr N Richardson, Director of Children's Services  
Ms I Atraszkiewicz – Lead officer, Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances  
Ms G Webb – Head of Learning Improvement

Details were provided in respect of Government Policy which supports academisation, the number of schools in Leeds and the proportion of those which were Academies, (219 Primary Schools, including 6 Academies and 38 Secondary Schools including 8 Academies) and academy types.

(Councillor Khan joined the meeting at this point)

The following key issues were discussed:

Information and data sharing – highlighting the need to encourage academy schools to provide relevant data to the authority

The Freedoms afforded to academies to determine curriculum and the length of school day and whether there was any evidence to suggest that academies employed curriculums which were significantly different from the National Curriculum; and whether this improved performance and outcomes for the pupils

Funding and resources – in terms of conversion costs, the Board was aware that Academy Schools were funded directly from Central Government however were surprised to learn the associated costs to the Local Authority (LA) of the conversion process and the fact that a schools' deficit budget balance was assumed by the LA, but a surplus balance was carried forward to the new Academy. Members were pleased to note that officers were in discussions with the DofE regarding the possibility of reclaiming some of the costs of conversion and also to request a percentage of the £25k funding given to schools which have achieved academy status towards conversion costs.

In terms of Services - Academy Schools could engage with the open market. Members were pleased to note that Children's Services had established a strong service delivery and marketing position with the Leeds academies

In terms of the impact on clusters – Academy Schools could choose whether to sign up to the local cluster partnerships which could have an impact on cluster funding

(Councillor Hussain joined the meeting at this point and Councillor Khan withdrew for a short while)

Policies and Admissions – the need for Academy Schools to fully participate with the LA in terms of school admissions, Fair Access and Exclusions policies

Land and Buildings – the status of land and buildings utilised by Academy Schools and schools with Trust status

Leeds Sponsors - the aims and philanthropic/business background of the Leeds external sponsors

Partnership Working – the links established with the academies and the 8 Leeds Academy sponsors. A sponsor network had been established to promote partnership working.

The Board agreed that further investigation was required in order to assess the impact of school status changes on children and the community, and agreed to incorporate further scrutiny of Academy Schools into the Work Schedule for the new Municipal Year

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the information contained within the report be noted.
- b) That, Children's Services officers are requested to undertake further investigations which take into account all options for schools considering or being expected to consider becoming an academy and the impact upon the school and the wider community that it serves in order to:
  - appreciate the full implications of costs and resources on Leeds Children's Services
  - inform the development of a comprehensive Leeds position statement on structural change that guides improvements in schools' standards and effectiveness and meets the needs of all young people educated in Leeds.
- c) That a further session to consider the outcome of investigations as detailed above relating to Academy Schools be incorporated within the Scrutiny Board Work Schedule, to commence early in the New Municipal Year

**86 Financial Health and Budget Proposals 2013/14 - Children's Services**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report advising the Board of the financial health of Children's Services after seven months of the current 2012/13 financial year. The report also presented the initial 2013/14 budget proposals relevant to this Scrutiny Board which were due to be considered by Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services) on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2012. Observations and comments from the Board were sought which could be reported to Executive Board in due course where the final decision would be made.

The following officers attended the meeting to present the report:

Mr N Richardson – Director, Children's Services

Mr N Warren – Head of Finance, Children's Services

Mr S Darby – Team Leader, School Funding and Initiatives

The following key issues were noted:

- The department had maintained a balanced budget and was in a stronger position than the same period last year
- The budget challenges ahead in terms of maintaining service delivery and the initiatives to mitigate against the likely impact of the local government financial settlement

- The intention of central government to directly fund all schools by 2015 and the impact of the national schools funding formula

The Board raised concerns in respect of the involvement of Private/Voluntary sector in service provision, the funding available to them and the impact of budget constraints on youth service provision and transport services,

(Councillor Khan withdrew from the meeting for a short while at this point)

The Board noted receipt of a letter dated to Mr M Gove, Secretary of State for Education in respect of cuts to the Early Intervention Grant. Referring to the letter, Members went on to discuss the impact of the loss of this funding alongside the implementation of the Welfare Reform changes and the impact this would have on those families and children in greatest need.

In conclusion the Board thanked officers for the approach taken in presenting the information contained in the report

**RESOLVED –**

- To note the projected financial position of Children's Services after seven months of the financial year 2012/13
- To note the contents of the initial 2013/14 budget proposals relevant to the Scrutiny Board's portfolio
- To note the reformed school funding arrangement for 2013/14

(Ms T Kayani left the meeting at this point)

**87 Quarter 2 Performance Report 2012/13**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) and Director of Children's Services submitted a report presenting a summary of the Quarter 2 performance data for 2012/13 which also provided an update on the progress made in delivering the relevant priorities in the Council Business Plan 2011-15, the Children and Young People Plan 2011 -15 and the City Priority Plan 2011 -15.

Mr N Richardson, Director of Children's Services; and Mr P Storrie, Head of Performance and Improvement attended the meeting and highlighted the overall positive progress made throughout the Department and the following key points:

- Improvement in Primary school attendance figures
- Reduction in the number of Looked After Children
- Information provided in respect of young people Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs)
- Information provided in respect of Children's Homes Inspections

In response to a query regarding complaint response times, it was noted that the statistics reflected the complexity of complaints made due to the variety of services the Department provided

**RESOLVED –** To Note the contents of the Quarter 2 performance report and the issues highlighted

(Councillor Renshaw withdrew from the meeting at this point)

#### **88 Children's Social Work: Improvement Plan**

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report in order for the Board to consider and identify areas of work which could provide support and challenge to the "Supporting Children, Strengthening Social Care" Action Plan. The Action Plan set out the next phase of improvement within the Children's Social Care and Safeguarding Service.

Mr S Walker, Deputy Director, Safeguarding, Specialist and Targeted Services, attended the meeting to respond to queries, with Councillor J Blake and Mr N Richardson

The Board noted the Action Plan set out the progress made and key priorities for the Service and agreed that a review of this area of work would be appropriate. The following matters were highlighted:

- The work undertaken by the Department to audit cases dealt with since January 2012 and the assurance that monitoring was undertaken regularly. The intention to present updated progress information to a future Board meeting to enable Members to undertake scrutiny of the process was noted.
- The number of social workers and issues in respect of recruitment of new and retention of existing staff. It was noted that the reliance on agency social workers had reduced

In response to a query regarding the consultation performance data, the Board received assurance that the Action Plan had ensured the idea of "voice and influence" for children and young people was promoted, however the Department needed to better articulate the work undertaken, achievements and outcomes in the future.

**RESOLVED** –The Board considered where work could be undertaken to support and challenge the "Supporting Children, Strengthening Social Care" Action Plan and noted the intention to present audit information to a future Board meeting to enable Members to undertake scrutiny of the process

#### **89 Recommendation Tracking - External Placements**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report setting out the progress made in responding to the recommendations arising from a previous Scrutiny review of External Placements, published on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012.

The tracking system affords Members the opportunity to monitor progress and identify completed recommendations. Appendix 2 of the report provided details of the progress made in responding to the recommendations made during the Scrutiny review for Members consideration. The Board noted the current Status of the recommendations and no changes to the proposed recommendation status were proposed.

Mr S Walker, Deputy Director, Safeguarding, Specialist and Targeted Services, attended the meeting to respond to queries, with Mr N Richardson and Councillor J Blake.

The Board discussed the following:

- The timescale for improvement on those recommendations indicated as Status level 4, noting that a further Tracking report would be presented in due course when the recommended Status levels could be reconsidered
- The reported decrease in the number of looked after children in external residential placements
- The fact that several external foster carers had applied to join the Leeds Foster Carers Service, and that such applications were being fast tracked

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the Tracking report and to

- a) Agree to those recommendations as set out in the report which no longer require monitoring
- b) Note those recommendations where satisfactory progress has been identified

## **90 Recommendation Tracking - Improving School Attendance**

The Scrutiny Adviser presented a setting out the progress made by Children's Services in responding to the recommendations arising from the previous Scrutiny review of Improving School Attendance, published in April 2012. Appendix 2 of the report detailed the progress made through the responses for consideration.

Ms J Andrew, West North West Area Head of targeted Services attended the meeting to respond to queries, with Mr N Richardson and Councillor J Blake

Ms Andrew provided additional information in respect of the Family First Initiative which had enabled the service to improve information sharing with neighbouring authorities. The Board noted the progress made in respect of recommendation 9 (engaging with neighbouring local authorities) and agreed the revision of this target from Status 3 to Status 1 – no further monitoring required

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the Tracking report and to

- c) Agree to those recommendations as set out in the report which no longer require monitoring
- d) Note those recommendations where satisfactory progress has been identified

## **91 Work Schedule**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which detailed the Work Schedule for the Board for the remainder of the Municipal Year. The report included minutes of the Executive Board held 7<sup>th</sup> November

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 17th January, 2013

2012 for Members consideration along with the List of Forthcoming Key Decisions covering the period 10<sup>th</sup> September to 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser highlighted the additions made to the schedule at this meeting in respect of:

- The implications of Academies for the Local Authority and education in general – further work to be scheduled after June 2013
- Children’s Social Work Improvement Plan – report from the Director of Children’s Services on the monitoring progress.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the draft Work Schedule, including the addition of a Scrutiny Inquiry “Implications of Academies” and a report monitoring Children’s Social Work cases, be approved
- b) That the copy of the Executive Board minutes dated 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and the List of Forthcoming Key Decisions covering the period 10<sup>th</sup> September to 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012 be noted

**92 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED –** To note the date and time of the next meeting as Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 9.45 (with a pre-meeting at 9.15am)

(The meeting concluded at 12:20 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**THURSDAY, 1ST NOVEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Rafique in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, D Cohen, M Lyons,  
R Harington, M Ingham, J McKenna,  
B Urry, J Procter, B Anderson and  
S Bentley

### **57 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **58 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **59 Late Items**

There were no formal late items submitted to the agenda. However supplementary information relating to Agenda Item 6 – ‘Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy – Appendix 2 maps’ had been previously circulated and published.

Also circulated at the meeting were summarised comments from the Scrutiny Board (Health and Wellbeing and Adult Social Care) on Leeds’ draft Local Development Framework Core Strategy. It was noted that this document was only received immediately prior to the meeting and as such had not been fully considered by Members present.

### **60 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations made.

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

Apologies were received from Councillors P Wadsworth (J Procter substituting), J Chapman (S Bentley substituting) and J Marjoram (B Anderson substituting).

### **62 Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which presented the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Core Strategy) to the Board. The Core Strategy forms part of the Council’s budget and policy framework and the Board was invited to make formal comments

before the final draft is considered by the Executive Board for recommendation to full Council.

Present to discuss the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy with Members were:

Cllr P Gruen – Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services;

Cllr N Taggart – Chair of Development Plan Panel;

Cllr J Illingworth – Chair of Scrutiny Board (Health & Wellbeing and Adult Social Care); and

Steve Speak – Deputy Chief Planning Officer.

Councillor Gruen introduced the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy to the Board. He highlighted the challenges faced by the Council both currently and in the future. He highlighted that new homes will be built across Leeds but that the Council had an opportunity to make sure that these properties are built in the right places.

Steve Speak went on to take Members of the Board through the chronology of the development of the Leeds Local Development Framework Core Strategy from its inception in 2006. Further to this Councillor Taggart confirmed that this Strategy has been scrutinised throughout its development through the work of the Development Plan Panel.

Councillor Illingworth addressed the Board and voiced his concerns about the importance of the links between spatial planning and public health. It was highlighted to the Board that deprivation is a serious issue in Leeds which is often masked by the affluence of outer suburbs.

Members went on discuss the report in detail firstly welcoming the Core Strategy and highlighting the importance of the Strategy being approved and adopted as soon as possible, and given a chance to succeed.

The Board expressed concern about the potential for confusion and future dispute arising from the current format of the key diagram, particularly in relation to the indicative depiction of potential new housing locations.

Having been informed that the diagram was a required element of the strategy, Members welcomed the support of the Executive Member and officer present to the proposal to add an appropriate note to the diagram and to emphasise the overriding importance of policy SP7 (Distribution of Housing Land and Allocations).

Members considered it important that the Core Strategy should be able to stand up to legal challenges and appeals that might occur in the future. The Board were informed of the engagement that had taken place with Counsel in the preparation of the strategy.

Members also commented that there were a number of drafting issues with the Core Strategy and thought it important that such documents are proof read before they are published.

Members debated the meaning of sustainable development and how this can be achieved economically, environmentally and in terms of education. At this point Members also highlighted the importance of maintaining allotments as green spaces and suggested that the Core Strategy should make more significant references to this issue. It was also suggested that specific reference to Leeds as a Child Friendly City needed to be included.

Public health was discussed by the Board, specifically that of the inner city, and it was agreed that the comments from the Scrutiny Board (Health and Wellbeing and Adult Social Care) should be included with the comments sent to the Executive Board.

Members also discussed the Site Specific Allocation process which is currently being progressed, and stressed that Member views needed to be taken into account.

The Chair sought reassurance that the core strategy reflected the Board's previous recommendation to include employment and skills obligations in planning applications over a certain threshold.

Discussions concluded with the Chair summarising the meeting stating that Members welcomed the Core Strategy and accepted the need for it to move forward.

#### **RESOLVED –**

(a) that the Board's comments be drafted by the Principal Scrutiny Adviser and agreed by email correspondence.

(b) that the comments of the Board be submitted to the Executive Board alongside the comments of the Scrutiny Board (Health and Wellbeing and Adult Social Care) in their entirety.

#### **63 Date and time of next meeting**

10 am, Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012, Civic Hall, Leeds. (A pre-meeting will take place for Members at 09:30am.)

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**THURSDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Rafique in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, D Cohen,  
P Wadsworth, R Harington, M Ingham,  
J McKenna, B Urry, J Chapman and  
M Harland

**64 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

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

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

**66 Late Items**

There were no late items added to the agenda.

**67 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

Councillor Urry declared a significant other interest in Agenda Item 7 – Scrutiny Inquiry – Bus Services in Leeds as a Member of the Leeds Passenger Consultative Committee.

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

Apologies for Absence were received from Cllr Lyons , Cllr Harland was present as substitute.

**69 Minutes - 18th October and 1st November 2012**

The minutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> October and 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 were approved as a correct record.

**70 Scrutiny Inquiry - Bus Services in Leeds**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which introduced the first formal session of the scrutiny inquiry into bus services in Leeds.

In attendance were:

Andrew Hall (Acting Head of Transport Policy);and  
Dave Pearson – West Yorkshire Metro.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 20th December, 2012

The Acting Head of Transport Policy took Members through the report of the Director of City Development which provided background information on Bus Services in Leeds.

Members opened the discussion by giving consideration to the reasons behind the decrease in usage of bus services and the increase of rail services in Leeds. Members were informed that the bus network in Leeds had shrunk and that the focus was now on a number of busy core routes. The changing economy, and Leeds being part of a wider city region which has resulted in people commuting further distances, were also factors.

A major issue highlighted by the Board for the reduction in patronage on Leeds buses was the above inflation increases to ticket prices, making bus travel expensive. It was noted that this is particularly an issue for short journeys within the City, these have seen the sharpest reduction in passenger numbers. The Green Zone which aims to make sure short journeys are cheaper was highlighted by Members and it was suggested that this be extended so that more people can take advantage of it.

Members commented that due to the number of differing bus companies operating within Leeds, ticketing was confusing and not integrated, meaning that unless a premium was paid you could not use all the buses that might be running on the routes you wish to travel.

At this point Members also raised the potential of increasing the usage of smart cards and put it to witnesses present that work should be done to make the Breeze Card, issued to young people in Leeds, a half fare pass that could be used to travel on buses.

Frequency and punctuality of bus services was brought up by Members and that more work needs to be done to improve this so that bus services can be relied upon by the residents of Leeds. Officers responded that more work is still to be done on increasing bus lanes, bus priority at traffic lights and reducing boarding time for passengers. The real time bus information system was brought up and its merits were discussed, in that it enables tracking of where buses are but that it can also be frustrating for passengers.

Members brought up the issues surrounding funding of bus services and the effect that the Quality Bus Contracts might have on funding received from Central Government.

Discussion took place on the possibilities of looking at examples of transport systems outside of the UK and that lessons could be learned in terms of integration. It was confirmed that examples of other transport systems in Europe were considered by Metro, although the differing legislative frameworks and subsidy systems also needed to be considered.

Members also asked questions about how and on what basis bus services were allocated to areas. The representative from Metro described some work

taking place in Kirklees where consideration was given to local issues and hubs across the City to enable the most effective use of buses.

Members sought clarification on the number of stops permitted when purchasing a £1 ticket.

At this point in discussion the Chair referred to the introduction of free travel for children and young people in London and suggested that if possible it would be a real advantage to children in Leeds in being able to attend events and become involved in a range of activities.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the report be noted; and
- (b) that information requested with regards to the number of stops permitted with a £1 ticket be provided to Members.

**71 Draft terms of reference - Scrutiny Board inquiry on flood risk management**

The Principal Scrutiny Advisor presented a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which asked Members to comment on and agree the terms of reference for the inquiry. It was reported that the Directorate had proposed that Neighbourhood Management/Locality Teams be included in the inquiry due to their responsibility for gully maintenance.

**RESOLVED –** that the Board agree the terms of reference for the inquiry, subject to the addition of input from Neighbourhood Management/Locality Teams regarding gully maintenance.

**72 Work Programme**

The Board received a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which considered the Board's work schedule for the forthcoming municipal year.

Concern was raised that the December agenda is very crowded and that this might not allow Members to thoroughly scrutinise the reports in the detail that they would like to.

It was proposed by the Chair that a working group should be set up in January 2013 to provide an additional session of the inquiry on bus services, with all members of the Board invited to attend.

It was also confirmed that the meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2012 will commence at 9:45am with a pre meeting for Members starting at 9:15am due to the number of items on the agenda.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the work schedule be noted;
- (b) that the Executive Board minutes and the Forward Plan attached to the report be noted;
- (c) that a working group be set up for January 2013 to provide an additional session of the inquiry on bus services; and
- (d) that the start time of the December Board meeting be brought forward to 9.45am.

**73 Date and time of next meeting**

9.45am, Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

The meeting closed at 12:10pm

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES)**

**MONDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors A Blackburn, N Buckley,  
P Davey, R Grahame, M Harland,  
P Harrand, G Hyde, J Jarosz, S Lay,  
K Mitchell and N Walshaw

### **38 Late Items**

The following late items were submitted to the Agenda:

- Agenda Item 6 – Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2012
- Agenda Item 12 – West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority Consultation – Comments from Scrutiny

### **39 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other interests**

Councillor R Grahame declared an interest in Agenda Item 10, Scrutiny Review of the New Grounds Maintenance Contract due to his membership of GMB and Agenda Item 12, West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority Consultation due to his membership of the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.

### **40 Minutes -22 October 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **41 Recommendation Tracking - Fuel Poverty Inquiry**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development provided the Board with an update on progress made in responding to the recommendations arising from the previous scrutiny inquiry into fuel poverty.

The following were in attendance for this item:

- Neil Evans – Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods
- Robert Curtis – Environment Policy Team
- Kathy Kudelnitzky – Chief Officer, Localities and Partnerships
- Dr Beth Logan – Policy and Performance Manager, Leeds Initiative
- Dawn Bailey, Healthy Living Manager, NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds Cluster
- Brenda Fullard, Consultant in Public Health, NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds Cluster

Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

The draft status categories assigned to each recommendation within the report were agreed by the Board.

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

- Appointment of Fuel Poverty Champions at Area Committees. A decision was made at the Area Chairs Forum in July 2012 to await the outcome of the Council's area review given that this covered the general role of Area Committee Champions and their support needs. However, it was noted that some Area Committees had already appointed a Fuel Poverty Champion prior to this decision. A report setting out the findings and recommendations of the Council's area review is expected at the December meeting of the Executive Board.
- Involvement of Locality Health and Wellbeing Managers at Area Committee level.
- It was noted that the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) made £2.59m available to Leeds City Region to spend on a 'Green Deal Go Early' project. The Council submitted a proposal for c£1.28m with the intention of delivering grants to public and private sector properties in deprived hard to treat areas and 0% interest loans to less deprived private sector properties.
- That a report was due to go to Executive Board in December regarding the Leeds City Region long-term Green Deal project.
- Partnership working with private landlords
- Options for bulk fuel purchasing – a funding opportunity had been announced by DECC to help coordinate and conduct a bulk fuel purchasing initiative. In line with this, a proposal is to be presented to Executive Board in December.
- Development of the Winter Plan for Leeds and partnership work with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to achieve this. Members requested a copy of the Winter Plan.
- As part of Winter Plan, Leeds City Council, with support from NHS Leeds Public Health and CCGs submitted a proposal to the Department of Health's 'Warm Homes Healthy People Fund' to increase energy saving advice and measures to vulnerable people. The Board was pleased to note that this had been successful.
- It was noted that the Member Seminar on Fuel Poverty will take place on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2012.
- Ongoing projects and schemes – outreach work with Groundwork; work with Leeds Federated Housing; and a pilot scheme with the Citizen's Advice Bureau to offer joint fuel tariff, debt and income maximisation advice over the winter period.
- That the Recycling and Energy Recovery Facility would be enabled for heat and power and there was a clear intention for a district heating scheme.

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

## 42 Provision of Allotments in Leeds

The report of the Chief Officer of Parks and Countryside set out the context of allotment provision in Leeds with particular reference to demand for food growing space. It discussed options and related issues in providing additional allotment space to fulfil demand.

Sean Flesher, Chief Officer, Parks and Countryside and Joanne Clough, Trading and Operational Manager, Parks and Countryside were in attendance for this item.

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

- The report only referred to allotments managed by Leeds City Council and not those under Town or Parish Council control.
- Allotments at High Ash Drive – work was ongoing with a private landowner regarding vehicular access to the site.
- Over 300 plots had been brought into use since 2007 to help meet increased demand, with a further 22 planned in the near future.
- The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment for Leeds, published in July 2011, identified a total of 143 allotment sites (108 of which are in council ownership) covering 145 hectares. However, it had been assessed that an additional 39 hectares of allotment land was needed to meet demand. Core Strategy Planning officers had been asked to identify land. However, there was no capital funding currently allocated for the development of new sites. There was a reliance on Section 106 funds, funding from Town and Parish Councils and contributions from Area Committees and Ward Members.
- Around 4,000 questionnaires were sent out during the summer of 2012 to all plot holders who currently have an allotment and to those on waiting lists to gain an understanding of the demographic profile of allotment users.
- Management of waiting lists – it was reported that a new full time Community Food Growing Officer would have responsibility for managing allotments as well as encouraging community food growing projects across the city.
- Members requested for further information of allotment provision in Leeds including those belonging to Town and Parish Councils and comparisons with core cities. This information is to be considered by a working group of the Board early in the new year.

**RESOLVED** – (a )That the report and discussion be noted.

(b) That the additional information requested by Members be considered by a working group of the Scrutiny Board early in the new year.

## 43 Provision of Bereavement Services in Leeds

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods set out the role and responsibilities of Bereavement Services within Parks and Countryside and considered capital investment requirements and overall resource implications in managing cemeteries and crematoria across the city.

Sean Flesher, Chief Officer, Parks and Countryside and Joanne Clough, Trading and Operational Manager, Parks and Countryside were in attendance for this item.

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

- All 23 cemeteries operated by the Council were multi faith. In addition to this, there were also a number of privately run cemeteries across the City.
- An out of hours service is provided for specific faith groups with the exception of Christmas Day.
- Security improvements including installation of CCTV at Harehills Cemetery and improvements at Hunslet were welcomed. It was reported that these had not been funded through Area Committees.
- Combined use of heat and power from crematoria – some work had been done at Rawdon and heat exchange was used for the chapel building and offices. At other crematoria there was limited opportunity to do this due to the location of buildings.
- Costs of services and comparisons to other core cities. It was reported that costs were reviewed annually and full price and service details were available on the Council's website.
- Cemeteries and Crematoria and the Leeds Quality Park Standard. It had been noted that improvements had been made at 13 of the sites since the last assessment although only one had achieved the Leeds Quality Park Standard. It was estimated that the cost, excluding building works, to bring cemeteries and crematoria sites up to the Leeds Quality Park standard is around £550k and there was a current reliance on funds from Section 106 monies.
- Capital investment for mercury abatement measures– it was reported that the new equipment had been installed at Rawdon that would contribute towards meeting targets in relation to the abatement of mercury emissions. The mercury waste was collected and disposed of by contractors.

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

#### **44 Scrutiny review of the new Grounds Maintenance Contract - draft report**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development presented the Board's draft report following its review of the grounds maintenance contract.

**RESOLVED** – That the Board's report following its review of the new grounds maintenance contract be agreed.

**45 Recycling review - draft terms of reference**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development presented draft terms of reference in relation to the Scrutiny Board's forthcoming recycling review. The review was aimed at improving recycling through effective communication and education.

**RESOLVED** – That the terms of reference for the forthcoming recycling review be agreed.

**46 West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority Consultation - comments from Scrutiny**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development presented the draft response of the Board in relation to the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority's consultation on proposals to changes to emergency cover in West Yorkshire.

**RESOLVED** – (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That the draft response of the Scrutiny Board be agreed and submitted to the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority as part of its public consultation process.

**47 Work Schedule**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development informed the Board of its forthcoming Work Programme. Recent Executive Board minutes were also appended to the report.

Members were reminded of forthcoming work for the Board including the Parish and Town Council Review and items for the next agenda including Performance Management and the co-ordination of services between Parks and Countryside and Environmental Action Services.

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

**48 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday, 10 December at 10.00 a.m. (Pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES)**

**MONDAY, 10TH DECEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors A Blackburn, N Buckley,  
R Grahame, M Harland, P Harrand,  
G Hyde, J Jarosz, S Lay, K Mitchell, B Urry  
and N Walshaw

### **49 Late Items**

The following late item was admitted to the Agenda:

- Agenda Item 9 – Financial Health Monitoring

### **50 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor R Grahame declared a personal interest in Agenda Item, 10, Co-ordination between Parks and Countryside and Environmental Action Services due to his membership of GMB.

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

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor P Davey. Councillor B Urry was in attendance as substitute.

### **52 Minutes - 12 November 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **53 Safer Leeds Community Safety Business Plan**

The report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods provided the Board with the final version of the Safer Leeds Business Plan which was agreed by the Safer Leeds Executive in September 2012. The report also advised how the plan had been used to inform the newly elected West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) of the city's priorities in relation to crime reduction and policing. The plan would be developed further in early 2013 before being submitted for approval as the city's statutory Crime and Disorder Strategy to full Council in July 2013.

The following were in attendance for this item:

- Councillor Peter Gruen, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 14th January, 2013

- Neil Evans, Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods
- Superintendent Keith Gilert, Chief Officer, Community Safety

It was reported that the Board's comments regarding the draft Community Safety Business Plan had been taken on board prior to it being agreed by the Safer Leeds Executive.

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

- Policing challenges that go beyond the force boundaries, with reference to the new Strategic Policing Requirement; .
- It was suggested that the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) be invited to a future Board meeting. It was reported that he would be attending the next meeting of the Safer Leeds Executive.
- The PCC was now developing a West Yorkshire Police and Crime Plan, in liaison with the Chief Constable, based upon identified local priorities. .
- Funding that would be made available to local authorities. The PCC had indicated that 2013/14 would be a transitional year.
- A deputy to the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner had not yet been appointed.
- Families First Programme – the first funding streams had become available and the highest priority families were being identified.
- Success of the focus on reducing burglaries and the partnership approach involved. Domestic Violence had also been identified as a priority area.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That the Board take an updated version of the Safer Leeds Business Plan in April 2013 for comment, prior to it being submitted for approval as the city's statutory Crime and Disorder Strategy by full Council in July 2013.

#### **54 2012/13 Quarter 2 Performance Report**

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance)/Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods provided Members with a summary of performance against the strategic priorities for the council and City related to the Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities).

**RESOLVED –** That the Quarter 2 performance information be noted.

#### **55 Financial Health Monitoring**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development informed Members of the financial health of the Environment and Neighbourhoods

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 14th January, 2013

Directorate after seven months of the financial year 2012/13 and also presented the initial 2013/14 budget proposals relevant to the Scrutiny Board's portfolio.

The following were in attendance for this item:

- Councillor Peter Gruen, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services.
- Councillor Mark Dobson, Executive Member for Environment
- Neil Evans, Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods
- Richard Ellis, Head of Finance, Environment and Neighbourhoods

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

- There was a projected overspend of £903,000 across the directorate.
- Overtime and use of agency staff, particularly in waste management had been a contributor to the overspend.
- Due to weather conditions there had been additional volumes of garden waste collected (around 3,200 tonnes)
- Net expenditure of the directorate was £95 million. This included Parks and Countryside. Attendance management – absence was currently over-running at about 14 days in the refuse service. Budgets were based on 11 days but figures had historically been over 20. There had been several factors that had contributed to improving absence performance including improvements to the return to work process, improving protective clothing and improved links with occupational health.
- Pressures on the 2013/14 budget. These included the disposal of Quarry Hill car park, an increase in landfill tax, cessation of the asylum contract and reduction in other areas of income.
- The cost of agency staff in comparison to directly employed staff. Whilst agency staff did not cost when off sick or on holiday, approximately 45 days per year cover had to be provided for permanently employed staff in the refuse service in terms of sickness and annual leave.
- Areas of saving were highlighted. These included the following:
  - Removal of subsidies
  - Procurement savings
  - Identification of appropriate costs that could be charged to the Housing Revenue Account
  - Alternate week collection of recyclable and residual waste.
  - Proposals to close Middleton Park and Gotts Park golf courses.
  - Bowling greens – possible transfer to bowling associations.
  - Changes to bulky waste collection – potential involvement of third sector organisations.
  - Stopping commercial waste being disposed of at household waste sites.

- Bulk purchase of fuel – the Council would act as a broker and savings would be passed on to residents and to the Council.
- Food waste/anaerobic digestion – a piece of work was ongoing but this would not generate savings for next year if any scheme was to go ahead.
- Proposals to end the subsidisation of bereavement charges would enable the service to break even.
- There was an over-supply of golf courses and these could be returned to parkland.
- Grounds maintenance contract and savings on original contract price and charges to Housing Revenue Account.
- Activity in reducing fuel poverty.
- Costs of allotment provision

It was reported that there would be a working group meeting on 8 January 2013 to provide a further opportunity for Board Members to consider the initial budget proposals.

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

#### **56 Co-ordination between Parks and Countryside and Environmental Action Services**

The report of the Chief Officer, Parks and Countryside considered the progress made in co-ordinating Environmental Action Services with Parks and Countryside, along with further plans to improve the way services are co-ordinated in a way that utilised resources more effectively and improved the level of service achieved.

Sean Flesher, Chief Officer, Parks and Countryside was in attendance for this item. Members discussed issues surrounding the mapping of and requirements for a work schedule for ginnels. Further issues discussed in relation to this included rights of way legislation and involvement of Parish and Town Councils.

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

#### **57 Work Schedule**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development informed the Board of its forthcoming Work Programme. Recent Executive Board minutes were also appended to the report.

Members were informed of forthcoming items for the next agenda which included updates on the working group meetings undertaken in November and December regarding the Board's reviews on recycling and strengthening relationships with local Parish and Town Councils. There would also be updates following the Board's reviews on Dog Control Orders and the new Grounds Maintenance contract.

**58 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday, 14 January 2012 at 10.00 a.m. (pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (HOUSING AND REGENERATION)

TUESDAY, 30TH OCTOBER, 2012

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

Councillors D Collins, P Grahame,  
R Grahame, M Harland, A Khan, S Lay,  
D Nagle and G Wilkinson

Mr G Hall – Co-opted Member

### 43 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the October meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration).

### 44 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

The following other significant interests were declared at the meeting:-

- Councillor R Grahame in his capacity as a Director of East North East Homes ALMO (Agenda Item 8) (Minute 49 refers)
- Councillor R Grahame in his capacity as a Director of East North East Homes ALMO (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 52 refers)

### 45 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors B Atha, J Cummins, M Iqbal and C Towler.

Notification had been received for Councillor A Khan to substitute for Councillor J Cummins; Councillor R Grahame to substitute for Councillor M Iqbal and Councillor M Harland to substitute for Councillor C Towler.

### 46 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012 be approved as a correct record.

### 47 Matters Arising from the Minutes

- a) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Progress on the Leeds Economic Viability Study (Minute 34 refers)

Mr G Hall referred to the above issue and in particular to the fact that the Council would have to publish a list (known as the Regulation 123 list) outlining the infrastructure projects or types that it intends to fund through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It was noted that this issue would be discussed later in the meeting under a separate agenda item.

b) Bringing Forward Brownfield Sites – Information Requested (Minute 37 refers)

Mr G Hall referred to the above minute and to the fact that the Board had not received the clarification it had sought on the number of houses that could be built on the brownfield sites listed.

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser responded and agreed to circulate the information that had been requested by email to all Members of the Board.

**48 SHLAA 2012 (Leeds' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment)**

Referring to Minute 36 of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report with regards to SHLAA 2012 (Leeds' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment).

Appended to the report was a copy of a report entitled 'SHLAA 2012' which had been produced by the Director of City Development for the attention of the Board.

The report described the preparation of the SHLAA 2012 update and responded to a number of concerns raised by the Board as to the process and membership of the SHLAA..

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

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Councillor N Taggart, Chair of the SHLAA Partnership
- Mr Steve Speak, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, City Development

At the request of the Chair, Mr S Speak outlined the role and remit of the SHLAA Partnership.

Detailed discussions ensued on the contents of the report and appendices which included.

- Whether the SHLAA process was actually fit for purpose and in particular whether it had been robust enough to challenge sites listed in the SHLAA but classified as sites not achievable for *development*? As a consequence 8,000 units were not achievable for development and the Board stated that it would want to see the supporting papers which had led to this classification
- Concern as to whether the balance of membership on the SHLAA partnership was right between Elected Members/developers and the community?
- What the current status was of the SHLAA 2012 update in the light of the Board's concerns?

The Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services acknowledged the Board's concerns and stated that a review would be undertaken of the current membership of the SHLAA Partnership and whether the SHLAA Partnership was 'fit for purpose' in its current form. He confirmed that the review would also explore best practice. A report would be submitted to this Scrutiny Board for consideration once the review had been completed.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the positive intervention by the Executive Board Member Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services on this matter was welcomed.
- c) That a further report on the SHLAA Partnership be submitted to this Scrutiny Board for consideration once the review had been completed.
- d) To note that as a consequence of the review being undertaken the status of the current 2012 SHLAA update was not complete.

**49 Update on Locality Approach to Private Sector Housing Regulation and Empty Homes**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on an update on the Locality Approach to Private Sector Housing Regulation and Empty Homes.

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

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Mr J Statham, Head of Housing Partnerships, Environment and Neighbourhoods

In his presentation of the report, Mr J Statham informed the meeting that there was a mistake in the report in so far as the implementation date should have referred to April 2013 and not 2012 as stated.

Detailed discussions ensued on the contents of the report.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification of the location of a pilot that was underway within Burmantofts as referred to in 3.5 of the report  
*(The Head of Housing Partnerships responded and confirmed that the pilot was located at Nowell Mount)*
- Clarification of the criteria/procedure for enforcement in relation to compulsory purchase orders regarding empty properties or properties in disrepair
- Clarification if the Council had any powers to enforce a private owner of a property which had been vacant for a long period to bring it back into use

- Clarification of the number of properties that could be brought back into use under the New Homes Bonus scheme  
*(The Head of Housing Partnerships responded and confirmed that approximately 3,200 properties per annum were not eligible for the New Homes Bonus which was now part of a performance indicator)*
- Clarification of the number of empty properties that existed in the city  
*(The Head of Housing Partnerships responded and confirmed that approximately 15,000 properties were currently empty with the majority of those being within the private sector)*

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Board notes and welcomes the progress made against recommendation 1 from the Safer, Stronger Communities Scrutiny Board inquiry report into the Private Rented Sector (2012).

**50 Non-Council Owned Brownfield Sites**

Referring to Minute 37 of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the Director of City Development submitted a report on progress in relation to Non-Council Owned Brownfield Sites.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Non-Council Owned Brownfield Sites' (Appendix 1 refers) for the information/comment of the meeting.

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

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Ms Christine Addison, Acting Chief Asset Management Officer, City Development
- Mr Adam Brannen, Programme Manager, City Development

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification of the total number of non-Council owned Brownfield sites identified within the appendix  
*(The Programme Manager responded and informed the meeting that the total number was 19,500)*
- Clarification of how many of these brownfield sites were included in the SHLAA  
*(The Programme Manager responded and informed the meeting that the department had tried to incorporate every site they were aware of apart from windfall sites)*
- Clarification of the latest position with regards to the former library buildings on York Road and Mount St Mary's church

*(The Acting Chief Asset Management Officer responded that the former library buildings on York Road had been discussed at the Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services). It was the general consensus of that meeting that a supermarket was needed in the York Road area)*

- Clarification if the list of sites within the appendices were privately owned land or included Government and agency land. Particular reference was made to the Wharfedale Hospital site  
*(The Programme Manager responded and confirmed that the list referred to non-council owned land and included other agencies and government land where known. He confirmed that this list was evolving and could be added to on a regular basis as other sites became known)*
- Clarification of how many sites would get built out of the 19,500 on the list  
*(The Programme Manager responded and informed the meeting that he was not in a position to speculate on the actual numbers)*
- Clarification of how the Central Governments scheme on unlocking stalled brownfield sites was progressing  
*(The Programme Manager responded and made specific reference to ATLAS, the government initiative for Leeds which was one of the first cities to be offered support by the Homes and Community Agency's expert brokers who would spearhead a fresh drive to get stalled housing deals up and running and builders back on moth-balled sites. It was noted that the Chief Planning Officer had met with the ATLAS team)*
- Clarification of what action the Council had taken on each site listed to proactively engage with owners and developers to help get as many of these stalled brownfield sites redeveloped for housing
- Clarification of the Kirkstall Forge Scheme
- The need for the Board to be supplied with details of the owners of non Brownfield sites where known
- The need for the Board to be supplied with details of the sites listed which were included in the SHLAA
- Clarification of the current position in relation to Shaftesbury Public House  
*(The Programme Manager agreed to investigate this issue and respond to the relevant Board Member)*
- The need for the Acting Chief Asset Management Officer to go through the list of sites with a view to identifying the status of discussions and the prospect of future development and for this list to be circulated to all Members of Council  
*(The Acting Chief Asset Management Officer responded and agreed to undertake this area of work)*

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That a further report be submitted to the next meeting in November to include the following information:-

- details of the owners of non Brownfield sites where known
- which sites listed were included in the SHLAA
- what action the Council had taken on each site listed to proactively engage with owners and developers to help get as many of these stalled brownfield sites redeveloped for housing
- what progress had been made to date in relation to ATLAS, the government initiative for Leeds which was one of the first cities to be offered support by the Homes and Community Agency's expert brokers who would spearhead a fresh drive to get stalled housing deals up and running and builders back on moth-balled sites

## 51 **Good practice guide to pre-application engagement**

The Director of City Development submitted a report on the development of a good practice guide to pre-application engagement.

Appended to the report was a draft copy of a document entitled 'Good practice guide to pre-application engagement' for the information/comment of the meeting.

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

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Mr David Newbury, Area Planning Manager, City Development
- Ms Helen Cerroti, Development Project Manager, City Development

In her presentation, Ms H Cerroti informed the meeting that the guide was work in progress and that the Council was currently waiting for details of thresholds from the Government in relation to large scales of development.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- The need for a step by step guide that was more prescriptive and vigorous to assist developers
- Clarification if any training would be given to planning officers on the new areas of working  
*(The Development Project Manager responded and confirmed that training would be provided and a range of providers would be considered)*
- The need to dispose of a telephone answering service within the Area Planning teams and to allow more one to one contact between officers and Elected Members)  
*(The Area Planning Manager responded and agreed to address this issue)*
- The concerns expressed that Parish and Town Council's had not been consulted on the good practice guide and of the omission that there

was no reference to localism within the Neighbourhood Development Plans

- The need to acknowledge the importance of consulting with Elected Members and to ensure that all officers were suitably briefed in this area  
*(The Development Project Manager responded and made reference to the new protocol for City Plans Panel which would ensure that Elected Members would be better briefed on planning related issues, especially relevant to their ward)*
- The view that there should be a mandatory requirement that communities were consulted on proposals relating to pre-planning applications. It was noted that the government had not progressed this proposal and it remained discretionary

The Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services informed the meeting that this guide was a 'living' document. He stressed that the authority could not force developers to consult but felt the development of a good practice guide for pre-application engagement was a positive approach.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the draft guide be received and noted.
- c) That a revised draft guide be submitted to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board which encompasses a more prescriptive approach to providing clear guidance to developers as to the Council's expectations of effective community involvement at the pre-application stage of the planning process.

#### **52 Recommendation Tracking on Housing Growth**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on recommendation tracking on Housing Growth.

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Recommendation tracking flowchart and classifications: Questions to be considered by Scrutiny Boards (Appendix 1 refers)
- Review of Housing Growth in Leeds (Appendix 2 refers)

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

- Mr S Speak, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, City Development
- Ms Maggie Gjessing, Housing Investment Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods
- Mr Andrew Haigh, Regional Policy Team, Environment and Neighbourhoods

The Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser informed the meeting that recommendations 4, 6 and 12 had been previously achieved and were not included within the report for consideration.

For the benefit of the meeting, the Chair went through each individual recommendation.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the proposed category status of Appendix 2 of the report be dealt with as follows:-
  - Recommendation 1 change from category 4 to category 2
  - Recommendation 2 change from category 4 to category 2
  - Recommendation 3 change from category 4 to category 2
  - Recommendation 5 remains at category 4 and for the Principal Scrutiny Adviser to write to the Director of City Development seeking information on the take up of government incentives to progress brownfield sites in the city for redevelopment
  - Recommendation 7 remains at category 4
  - Recommendation 8 change from category 4 to category 2
  - Recommendation 9a change from a 4 to a category 2
  - Recommendation 9b change from category 3 to category 1
  - Recommendation 10 change from category 3 to category 4
  - Recommendation 11 remains at category 4 and that the Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to write to the Chief Planning Officer to identify why little or no progress had been made in establishing this working group
- c) That approval be given to those recommendations which no longer require monitoring in accordance with the report now submitted.

(Councillor D Nagle left the meeting at 12.25pm at the conclusion of the above item)

**53 Community Infrastructure Levy - Establishment of a Working Group**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the establishment of a Community Infrastructure Levy Working Group.

Mr S Speak, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, City Development was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments.

The Chair referred to the Leeds Economic Viability Study being carried out by GVA Consultants and discussions held between himself, the Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services and appropriate officers concerning this study and proposals to establish this Working Group

In view of those discussions the Chair proposed that the Board agree the establishment of this Working Group but any meeting be postponed until such time that the consultants and officers had developed their position further and issues clarified.

Following a brief discussion, the Board agreed to the above proposal.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That approval be given to the establishment of a Community Infrastructure Levy Working Group but to postpone any meeting of the group until such time that officers and consultants had developed their position further and issues have been clarified which was likely to be early in the new year.

**54 Population Projections**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report which included an update on the latest Census releases from ONS, the 2011 Mid-Year Estimates of Population, the Interim 2011-based Sub national Population Projections (SNPPs) and Conclusions and next steps.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Population Update: October 2012' for the information/comment of the meeting.

Mr S Speak, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, City Development was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification as to why the Census figure in the 2011 Census update was significantly lower than previous estimates. It was stated that the problem with the ONS figures were that they are only trend based projections but the work the Council had undertaken using a variety of sources and material had helped the Council develop a base population figure
- Clarification as to whether the Council in any future appeals would use the GVA Consultants May 2011 figures or the current ONS projections (*The Deputy Chief Planning Officer responded that the ONS base date figures were widely out and suggested it would be better to stay with the GVA Consultants 2011 figures and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Whilst the ONS figures showed a lower population of 750,700 as opposed to 755,580 in the SHMA this was marginal being only a 0.6% variance. If the ONS figure was carried forward you would need 88900 units by 2020/21 or 8,890 units a year and by extrapolating these figures on a pro rate basis to the life of the Core Strategy you would be 40,000 units short*)
- Clarification if detail of the figures could be broken down on a ward by ward showing ethnicity figures (*The Principal Scrutiny Adviser responded and agreed to provide this information to the relevant Board Member*)

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Tuesday, 27th November, 2012

- b) That the Board notes the latest update on population projections issued by the Office for National Statistics in accordance with the report now submitted.

**55 Work Schedule**

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

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:

- Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) Work Schedule for 2012/2013 Municipal Year (Appendix 1 refers)
- Executive Board – Minutes of a Meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 2 refers)
- Forward Plan of Key Decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012-31<sup>st</sup> January 2013 (Appendix 3 refers)

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser, Scrutiny Support presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes and Forward Plan be noted.
- c) That the work schedule be approved as now outlined.

**56 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012 at 10.00am in the Civic Hall, Leeds  
(Pre-meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 12.40pm)

## SCRUTINY BOARD (HOUSING AND REGENERATION)

TUESDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors B Atha, D Collins, J Cummins,  
P Grahame, M Harland, M Iqbal, S Lay,  
V Morgan, C Towler and G Wilkinson

Mr G Hall – Co-opted Member

**57 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the November meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration).

**58 Late Item**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Brownfield Sites - Report of the Director of City Development (Agenda Item 12) (Minute 67 refers)

The report was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website.

**59 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

**60 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor D Nagle.

Notification had been received for Councillor M Harland to substitute for Councillor D Nagle.

**61 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved as a correct record.

**62 Good Practice Guide to Pre-Application Engagement**

Referring to Minute 51 of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a report on a good practice guide to pre-application engagement.

Appended to the report was a revised draft copy of a document entitled 'Good practice guide to pre-application engagement' for the information/comment of the meeting.

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

- Mr Phil Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer, City Development
- Ms Helen Cerroti, Development Project Manager, City Development

In his presentation, the Chief Planning Officer informed the meeting that the guide had now been revised in light of the Board's comments. Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- A view that the revised guide was still not prescriptive enough as discussed at the previous meeting  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and outlined his concerns at being too prescriptive in approach as there were wide variations in the scale of developments and therefore one size does not fit all)*
- The concern that planning officers may interpret the guide in different ways and as a consequence there was a need for officer training in order to achieve a consistent approach on this issue  
*(The Chief Planning Officer stated that arrangements were in hand for the necessary training to take place)*
- To note that the good practice guide was voluntary and not mandatory on developers for pre application engagement
- The proposal to include in the guide a simple flow chart on the steps developers should take to ensure proper engagement with officers, ward members and local communities at pre planning application stage and useful contact details  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and agreed to include a flow chart in the guide and consider the inclusion of local community group details as appropriate)*
- Clarification if officers had taken into consideration recommendation 9 b of the Housing Growth Inquiry and whether or not they would be rewriting the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and stated that the guide did go well beyond the SCI guidance)*

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the revised draft guide be discussed further at the Board meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

(Councillor M Iqbal joined the meeting at 10.30am during discussions of the above item)

**63 Warning Over Neighbourhood Regime**

A copy an article entitled ' Warning over Neighbourhood Regime' was submitted for the information/comment of the meeting following a recent Northern Growth Summit conference which was addressed by the Council's Chief Planning Officer.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Tuesday, 18th December, 2012

Mr Phil Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer, City Development was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification of the neighbourhood planning process and its implications arising from the Local Government Association (LGA) briefing: Growth and Infrastructure Bill 2012 – House of Commons Second reading on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2012
- Clarification if representations and comments had been made by the Chief Planning Officer to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and Local Government Association (LGA) on the Growth and Infrastructure Bill  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and confirmed that representations had been made to the Local Government Association and the Department for Communities and Local Government. He stated that he would be happy to circulate to the Board the response submitted to the LGA on this issue)*

In conclusion, the Chair stated that there was considerable political lobbying going as a consequence of the proposals in the Bill which would have serious implications for Leeds and referred to an all party working group which had been established on this issue.

**RESOLVED** -That the contents of the document be noted and received.

**64 Directors Response to Executive Board on the Recommendations of the former Regeneration Scrutiny Board following Completion of its Inquiry on Affordable Housing by Private Developers**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report following the Directorate's formal response to the Executive Board following completion of the Scrutiny Board's Inquiry on Affordable Homes by Private Developers.

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

- Scrutiny Inquiry into Affordable Housing by Private Developers – Joint Report of Directors of City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods – Executive Board – 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012
- Scrutiny Inquiry Report – Affordable Housing by Private Developers – Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) – May 2012

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

- Mr Phil Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer, City Development
- Mr Robin Coghlan, Team Leader Policy, City Development

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Tuesday, 18th December, 2012

- Ms Maggie Gjessing, City Development

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Board notes the joint report of the Directors of City Development and Neighbourhoods and Housing which was presented to the Executive Board in response to the former Regeneration Scrutiny Board's report and recommendations on affordable housing by private developers.

**65 Updated progress on returning private sector empty properties back into occupation**

Referring to Minute 49 of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on progress in relation to returning private sector empty properties back into occupation.

Appended to the report was a copy of the Empty Property Strategy Action Plan for the information/comment of the meeting.

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

- Mr John Statham, Head of Housing Partnerships, Environment and Neighbourhoods
- Mr Mark Ireland, Service Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods

Detailed discussions ensued on the contents of the report.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification as to how the number of private properties had been brought back in to use so successfully and requested that a short seminar on this issue be arranged for all Members of Council (*The Head of Housing Partnerships responded and agreed to convene a seminar in conjunction with the Members Development Team*)
- Clarification of the progress being made to date on the potential for a Empty Homes Doctor service
- Clarification of the figures in relation to long-term empty homes returning into use and the comparison of other core cities

In concluding discussions, the Board welcomed the findings contained within the report and commended officers on the work undertaken in this area.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That officers be commended for the work undertaken in achieving the return of 3243 private properties back in to occupation in 2011/12 and a further 1526 properties by the end of quarter 2 2012/13.

- b) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted setting out the progress made against recommendation 3 from the Safer, Stronger Communities Scrutiny inquiry report in to the Private Rented Sector (2012).

**66 Financial Position Statement 2012/13 - City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorates**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report providing Members with a financial position statement of the City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate's in relation to this Board's responsibilities after six months of the financial year 2012/13.

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

- 2012-13 Budget Position – Period 6
- Housing Revenue Account – Period 6
- Capital – ALMOs and BITMO/Other Strategic Landlord (HRA)/ E&N – Housing General Fund/City Development – Regeneration Services

Mr Richard Ellis, Head of Finance, Environment and Neighbourhoods was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

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

- The concerns expressed at the reduced staffing levels within the Regeneration Unit and whether this was effecting the effectiveness of the unit
- Clarification of the figures in relation to Essential car user allowances (*The Head of Finance responded and it was noted that this area was currently under review*)
- The need to look at reducing the Council's expenditure on the purchase of petrol and diesel. The Board noted that this specific issue was being addressed by the Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services)

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That this Board notes the projected financial position of the Directorates City Development and Environment and Neighbourhoods in relation to the areas listed in the appendices after six months of the financial year 2012/13 as set out in the report submitted.
- b) That a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board on the staffing levels within the Regeneration Unit of the City Development Directorate.

## 67 **Brownfield Sites**

Referring to Minute 51 of the meeting held 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report regarding brownfield sites.

A copy of a report entitled ' Brownfield Sites' prepared by the Director of City Development was circulated at the meeting as supplementary information.

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

- Mr Adam Brannen, Programme Manager, City Development
- Mr Martin Sellens, Head of Planning Services, City Development
- Mr Chris Gomersall, Head of Property Services, City Development

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification of the process undertaken in relation to Asset Management placing a Council/non Council brownfield site in the Strategic Housing Land Area Assessment (SHLAA)
- To welcome the detail contained within the report and appendices and to request that a copy of the non-Council owned brownfield sites be circulated to all Members of Council for information  
*(The Programme Manager responded and agreed that this be circulated by the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser)*
- The concerns expressed that on a number of non-Council owned brownfield sites listed, the authority did not know the name of the owners  
*(The Programme Manager responded and stated that work was continuing to identify the owners of these sites)*

In concluding discussions Councillor B Atha put forward the following motion for the Board to consider:

'That all officers owning development land or prospective development land in the City of Leeds or shares in companies involved in it's development of such land be required to register their interests in a register held by the Chief Executive's Office which was open to the public on demand. Any such breach of this duty would be deemed prima facie of a serious disciplinary offence'

### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and supplementary information be noted and welcomed.
- b) That this Board recommend that all officers owning development land or prospective development land in the City of Leeds or shares in companies involved in it's development of such land be required to register their interests in a register held by the Chief Executive's Office

which was open to the public on demand. Any such breach of this duty would be deemed prima facie of a serious disciplinary offence.

- c) That the Principal Scrutiny Adviser be requested to notify the Chief Executive of this recommendation as now outlined.

## **68 Work Schedule**

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

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:

- Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) Work Schedule for 2012/2013 Municipal Year (Appendix 1 refers)
- Executive Board – Minutes of a Meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 2 refers)
- Forward Plan of Key Decisions – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012 -13<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 3 refers)

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser, Scrutiny Support presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

### **RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes and Forward Plan be noted.
- c) That the work schedule be approved as now outlined.

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

Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2012 at 10.00am in the Civic Hall, Leeds  
(Pre-meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 11.55am)

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (HOUSING AND REGENERATION)

TUESDAY, 18TH DECEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors B Atha, D Collins, J Cummins,  
M Iqbal, V Morgan, D Nagle and  
G Wilkinson

Mr G Hall – Co-opted Member

**70 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the December meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration).

**71 Late Item**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Executive Board - Minutes of a Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2012 - Appendix 3 refers (Agenda Item 10) (Minute 79 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website.

**72 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

**73 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors P Grahame, S Lay and C Towler.

**74 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012 be approved as a correct record.

**75 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

a) Brownfield Sites (Minute 67 refers)

The Chair referred to the above issue and reported that he would be meeting shortly with Mr Alan Gay, Director of Resources and Acting Deputy Chief Executive on the Board's recommendation that all officers owning development land or prospective development land in the City of Leeds or shares in companies involved in its development of such land should be required to register their interests in a register held by the Chief Executive's Office which was open to the public on demand.

It was agreed to invite Mr Gay to the next meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013 to update the Board on progress in implementing this recommendation.

## **76 Regeneration Staffing Position**

Referring to Minute 66 of the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012, the Director of City Development submitted a report on the staffing position in relation to the Regeneration Unit of the City Development Directorate.

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

- Mr Martin Farrington, Director, City Development
- Mr Adam Brannen, Programme Manager, City Development

The Director of City Development highlighted the rationale behind the recent decision to move the Regeneration Division to the City Development Directorate. He stated that he was anxious to develop much closer working relationships and operational efficiencies with other services in his Directorate including asset management, planning, highways and economic development.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- The concerns expressed that the reduced staffing levels within the Regeneration Division could affect the progress in relation to the development of Brownfield sites in the city  
*(The Director of City Development responded and indicated that there had been no substantive changes to staffing levels in recent months and that bringing forward brownfield sites for redevelopment was a priority. He made reference to EASEL and the current economic climate and the consequential need to have a mix of housing developers in East Leeds that would share the risk. He reported that he would be taking a report to the Executive Board in January 2013 on a revised strategy for delivering Brownfield sites in the light of current market conditions, including EASEL)*
- Clarification of the current staffing levels within the Regeneration Unit  
*(The Programme Manager responded and informed the meeting that with flexible working arrangements there were currently 23.8 Fte posts within the Regeneration Division)*

### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That the Director of City Development submit a report on the revised strategy for delivering brownfield sites in the city including those in East and South East Leeds (EASEL) for consideration at either the January/February 2013 Board meeting.

## **77 Former Residential Properties Utilised for Non-Residential/Community Office Purposes**

Referring to Minute 38 of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the Chief Officer Statutory Housing submitted a report updating Member on progress in relation to a piece of work undertaken to assess the number of residential Council properties which are being used for non-residential, community or office purposes.

Appended to the report was a copy of a list of properties being used for non-residential, community or office purposes for the information/comment of the meeting.

Mr John Statham, Head of Housing Partnerships, Environment and Neighbourhoods was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- To note that since the initial report on this issue the number of residential properties being used for office/community/non-residential purposes had increased from 49 to 55 units. It was suggested that a further property should be added to the list known as Gipton Access Point, Coldcotes Drive and that one and two Lakeland Court and 7 Queensview be removed from the list as they were no longer potential residential properties having been made into communal areas or too small  
*(The Head of Housing Partnerships agreed to action these)*
- The view that officers should be contacting appropriate lease holders now with a view to identifying alternative suitable premises in order to bring as many premises back into residential use and not wait until the leases are due to expire  
*(The Head of Housing Partnerships responded and supported this approach wherever possible)*

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

(Councillor M Iqbal joined the meeting at 10.40am during discussions of the above item)

## **78 Quarter 2 Performance Report 2012/13**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance)/ Directors of Environment and Neighbourhoods and City Development submitted a report summarising the performance against the strategic priorities for the council and city related to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board.

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

- Appendix 1– Performance Reports for 2012/13 Quarter 2 City Priority Plan Priorities relevant to the Board
- Appendix 2 – Directorate Priorities and Indicators

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 29th January, 2013

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

- Mr Paul Maney, Head of Strategic Planning, Policy and Performance, City Development
- Ms Maggie Gjessing, Housing Investment Manager, City Development
- Mr George Munson, Energy and Climate Change Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods

The Head of Strategic Planning, Policy and Performance introduced the report and outlined key areas of good performance and highlighted the specific challenges brought out in the report.

The Housing Investment Manager updated the meeting and referred to paragraph 3.3 of the report and stated that within the allocated timeframe, a revised year end target of 400 not 500 new affordable homes would be met. She added further that the department did produce a forecast for the year which was as accurate as they could make it, but it was partially dependent on market led activity and partially on the housing association programmes which were agreed over the comprehensive spending review period (2011-15) for delivery.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:

- Clarification if the department had undertaken a unit cost analysis for installing Solar PV panels on 10,000 Council homes as opposed to the delivering the Wrap Up Leeds scheme  
*(The Energy and Climate Change Manager responded and confirmed that work had been undertaken in this area. It was considered on balance because of changes in Government subsidies that it was currently more cost effective to improve insulation in the home and other measures rather than install solar panel)*
- Clarification of the subsidy changes for Solar panels and their maintenance
- The concerns expressed about the slowness of affordable housing completions and that the information submitted to the Board in this regard was inaccurate  
*(The Head of Strategic Planning Policy and Performance responded and outlined the report clearance procedures which had resulted in the information contained within the report being out of date)*
- The concern that the Council does not insist that draft Heads of Terms for Section 106 agreements were submitted with an applicant's planning application  
*(The Head of Strategic Planning Policy and Performance responded and agreed to follow up this issue with the Chief Planning Officer)*

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

**79 Work Schedule**

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

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:

- Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) Work Schedule for 2012/2013 Municipal Year (Appendix 1 refers)
- Forward Plan of Key Decisions – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012 - 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012 (Appendix 2 refers)
- Executive Board – Minutes of a Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2012 (Appendix 3 refers)

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser, Scrutiny Support presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the Executive Board minutes and Forward Plan be noted.
- c) That the work schedule be approved as now outlined.

**80 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 10.00am in the Civic Hall, Leeds (Pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 11.20pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 1ST NOVEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, R Grahame,  
M Harland, C Macniven, J Procter,  
E Taylor, G Wilkinson, B Selby and  
J Harper

### **10 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **11 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests

In respect of application 12/03300/ADV – Churchfields, High Street Boston Spa - Councillor Wilkinson stated that he had commented on the application before he became a Member of North and East Plans Panel and having discussed this with the Panel's Legal Adviser was informed that he could participate in considering this application (minute 17 refers)

### **12 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A McKenna who was substituted for by Councillor J Harper

### **13 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved

### **14 Application 09/04018/FU -Engineering works to form flood storage area - Land off First Avenue Bardsey LS17 9BE**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel's Lead Officer provided a brief history of the site, for Members' information

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 29th November, 2012

The Panel was informed that outline planning permission was granted in 1997 for the erection of 6 houses. The Reserved Matters application was however refused on issues relating to design and that the scheme did not take flooding into account. The applicant lodged an appeal and planning permission was subsequently granted by the Inspector. A S106 agreement was entered into which stated that provision would be made to address the flooding before commencement of the development, with this being accepted by the Inspector

In 2006, a flood compensation scheme was submitted which the Environment Agency (EA) in January 2007, did not object to. In July 2007, a severe flooding event occurred which resulted in the EA revising their position, stating that the proposed scheme was not fit for purpose. Since that time until recently, the EA's concerns were maintained and discussions to resolve the situation had been ongoing

In 2008, the developer commenced laying out the foundations for a garage block on the site but was informed that work must stop as this was in breach of the S106 agreement. The developer complied with this request but the works which had been carried out on site meant that the planning permission remained live, with this being checked with Legal Services

Having been provided with contextual information in respect of the application, Officers then presented the report to Panel which sought approval for a flood compensation storage area relating to an approved residential development which was located in the functional floodplain (Zone 3b)

The proposals were to raise the properties by 50cm and displace the water towards the floodplain area – Keswick Beck. A cut and fill operation would be used, with the materials excavated being used to create a bund of up to 1.5m high, which, as well as being requested by the EA, would also provide a greater degree of comfort to the residents in the area. Outlet pipes would be placed in the bund and whilst local concerns had been raised about the sewer which crossed the site, Members were informed that the sewer would not be impacted on

To ensure the bund did not create more flooding, an agreement had been obtained with two adjacent landowners that their land could be flooded if a 1:100 year flood event occurred

In respect of the EA, it was now satisfied that the proposed scheme was acceptable, as was Yorkshire Water and the Council's Flood Risk Manager

Whilst there had been a significant level of objections received to the scheme proposed in 2009, since the revised scheme which was before Members had been advertised, it was reported that no representations had been received

Members commented on the following matters:

- the issues raised previously by local residents and set out in paragraph 6.2 of the submitted report and whether these had been resolved
- whether the proposed scheme would benefit the residents of Paddock View
- the need for the bund to be maintained and for this requirement to be set out legally
- that flooding was a major issue but that development was continuing to be allowed which had an impact on this

- that the proposals would not be of any benefit to those living further down stream who invariably were affected the most

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the issues raised in paragraph 6.2 of the report related to the previous scheme and had been addressed by the scheme before Members. The Competent Authority in this case was the EA which was satisfied with the proposals and there was a degree of betterment provided by the scheme, for residents. Bardsey Parish Council had not commented on the revised proposals and there had been no representations received from the public
- that the scheme would benefit the residents of Paddock View
- that it would be for the Council to ensure that those matters covered in the S106 agreement would be enforced and in perpetuity; that Officers would need to be satisfied that the flood compensatory storage scheme was in order before the development commenced and that the proposed wording of the S106 agreement could be revised to highlight the requirement for the bund to be retained and maintained

**RESOLVED** - To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matter:

- The housing development approved under ref 31/200/00/RM will not be continued until the proposed flood storage area and the bund, approved under application ref 09/04018/FU has been completed and authorised as such in writing by the Local Planning Authority
- The applicant or successors in title of the proposed site or any part of the land shall retain and maintain the flood storage area and bund provided under application ref 09/04018/FU for the life of the residential development
- The applicant or successor in title of the land or any part of the land under application ref 09/04018/FU to enforce the requirement of the written agreements from Mr C N and Mrs S Lupton and Mr E Gilchrist, both dated 26.04.2012 to provide the floodwater capacity for the approved developments refs 32/200/00/RM and 09/04018/FU

In the circumstances where the Section 106 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

**15 Application 12/03034/FU - Partial demolition of existing retail units and extension of existing supermarket; car parking; laying out and landscaping to Hallfield Lane car park - Morrisons Supermarket 7-8 Horsefair Centre 22-28 North Street Wetherby LS22**

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

It was the decision of the Chair to consider the corresponding Conservation Area application (minute 16 refers) simultaneously, although each application would be determined individually

Officers presented the report which sought permission for an extension to the existing Morrisons supermarket at the Horsefair Centre, North Street

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 29th November, 2012

Wetherby LS22 which would include the partial demolition of existing retail units together with landscaping and improved car parking to the Council owned Hallfield Lane car park

A revised plan was shown to Panel which included a coach drop off point and pedestrian link which the applicant had now included in response to comments from Ward Members and Wetherby Town Council. Also to address local concerns, the residents' car parking spaces within the Hallfield Lane car park would be retained

A garden area would be provided at the corner of the site and whilst the scheme did not include public toilets, it did not preclude these being provided at a later date if funding could be provided

In relation to improvements to the Hallfield Lane car park, this would include a new hard surface; lighting and landscaping. Although there would not be an increase in the number of spaces being provided, the 144 spaces would be marked out in the car park with the ratio between short and long stay spaces to be resolved by Highways Officers, in consultation with Ward Members

The receipt of a further letter of representation was reported, although it was stated that this did not raise any material planning issues

Members commented on the following matters:

- the lack of toilets in the scheme. Members were informed that toilets would be provided in the supermarket but these would not be public ones; although the provision of these was an aspiration and the layout of the proposals could accommodate them
- the likelihood of the scheme being implemented in view of proposals from Asda for a store on land at Standbeck Lane. On this, Officers stated they were unable to comment on the motivation behind the application but stressed that it complied with policy

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

**16 Application 12/03035/CA - Conservation Area application for partial demolition of existing retail units and covered mall - Morrisons Supermarket - 7-8 Horsefair Centre 22-28 North Street Wetherby LS22**

With reference to the previous discussions (minute 15 refers), Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer relating to a Conservation Area application for demolition of existing units and covered mall, to facilitate an extension to Morrisons supermarket at the Horsefair Centre, Wetherby LS22

**RESOLVED** - To grant consent subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

**17 Application 12/03300/ADV - Retrospective consent for six flag signs and two non-illuminated signs at Churchfields, High Street Boston Spa LS23**

Plans, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 29th November, 2012

Officers presented the report which sought retrospective approval for temporary planning approval for a period of three years for marketing signs advertising a forthcoming residential development which was located in a Conservation Area

Members were informed that an earlier application to introduce a similar arrangement of signs across the frontage of the site was refused due to the proposals being harmful to the visual impact of the St Mary's Church and to the character of the Conservation Area. The revised scheme was considered to be acceptable; the signs were felt to be discreet and only noticeable when in close proximity to them and that the long distance views from Boston Spa were protected

The Panel discussed the application with there being mixed views on the intrusive nature of the signs

Concerns were raised that the applicant, a major house builder, should have been aware that planning permission was required for these signs, prior to them being erected. That fact that the hedge immediately adjacent to the signs was deciduous was raised as this would lead to greater visibility of the signs for several months of the year

In respect of the timescale of the application, although this had been presented as a temporary consent for three years there was concern that due to the housing market, the timescale for completion of the residential development could be much longer. On this point, the Chair advised that if the site had not been completed within the three year period, a further application would be required to renew the temporary consent for the signs

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the condition set out in the submitted report

## **18 Application 12/01141/FU - Detached house at Plot 1, Land adjacent to 8 Lowther Avenue Garforth LS25**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a single detached dwelling on land adjacent to 8 Lowther Avenue Garforth LS25 and provided a brief history of the site, with Panel being informed that an outline application was granted in 2007 followed by approval of the Reserved Matters application in 2008. At that time the site was considered to be a brownfield site, but in view of changes introduced to national planning policy in June 2010, the site was now considered to be greenfield. Members were informed that had there not been an extant permission for the site, a less intensive scheme would be sought for the site. What was being proposed in the application before Panel was essentially the same building which had approval apart from the removal of a chimney and the addition of a single storey rear extension with additional side windows

Concerns had been raised about the relationship between the proposed house and the neighbouring properties but that an accurate street plan had now been provided. In recommending approval of the scheme to Panel, Officers had noted the fall-back position which existed in this case and

that most of the alterations could be allowed under permitted development rights

The Panel heard representations from the applicant and an objector who attended the meeting

Clarification was sought on the issue of height of the proposed dwelling, with Panel being informed this would be 5.6m to eaves height and 8.9m to ridge height, with the height of 9 Lowther Drive being given as 2.5m to eaves height and 6.4m to ridge height

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

**19 Application 12/04100/FU - First floor side extension with window to side - 60 Jackson Avenue Gledhow LS8**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented a report to Panel seeking approval for a first floor side extension with window to the side at 60 Jackson Avenue Gledhow LS8. Members were informed that as the applicant was a senior officer of Highway Services, it was considered appropriate for Panel to determine the application

If minded to approve the application, an additional condition was recommended regarding clarification to be provided of the window detail

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and an additional condition requiring revised plans to be submitted which clarified the window detail

**20 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

## NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 29TH NOVEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, R Grahame,  
M Harland, C Macniven, A McKenna,  
J Procter, E Taylor, B Selby and  
B Anderson

### 21 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### 22 Late Items

There were no late items

### 23 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, however Councillor Macniven declared an other interest in application 12/01597/FU – 11 Old Park Road Gledhow LS8 through being a Ward Member for Roundhay and living in close proximity to the site (minute 26 refers)

### 24 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wilkinson, who was substituted for by Councillor Anderson

### 25 Minutes

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 be approved

### 26 Application 12/01597/FU - Alterations to existing unauthorised residential annexe at 11 Old Park Road Gledhow LS8

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 20th December, 2012

Officers presented the report which sought approval for alterations which had been made to an existing unauthorised residential annexe at 11 Old Park Road Gledhow, which was situated in the Roundhay Conservation Area

The Panel noted the planning history and that several applications in respect of the annexe had been refused since planning permission was first granted in 2007, with enforcement proceedings being implemented culminating in appeals and a public inquiry, with the Inspector requiring the building to be demolished within 8 months of the date of his decision, this being by 19<sup>th</sup> April 2011. The Panel also noted that a further application had been submitted in December 2010 which was subsequently refused by Plans Panel East at its meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2011 (minute 85 refers)

Members were informed that when comparing the 2007 approved scheme with the current application, the first floor level would be identical to that which was approved in 2007, although at ground floor level this would be 2.6m longer and slightly higher by approximately 10cm. The footprint of the proposed building would be 25% larger than that approved in 2007 but would be constructed narrower than that originally approved. The accommodation in the roofspace of the existing building would be removed; the gable roof of the annexe would be removed and lowered to a pitch roof and re-clad in clay tiles. In respect of the windows, the UPVC windows would be removed and replaced by timber frames

Alongside these alterations, Members were informed that the applicant had agreed to enter into a unilateral undertaking which would restrict occupancy of the annexe building solely to family members of the occupants of the main dwelling on the site. If minded to approve the application, Officers proposed that a timescale for the completion of the necessary works should be incorporated into the unilateral undertaking, which would also include timetables for the submission of details to discharge conditions

When considering the application, Officers advised Members that the main issues related to:

- the principle of development – and that an annexe to the main house had been accepted by the Inspector
- the impact on the Roundhay Conservation Area – that the Inspector identified a sense of spaciousness to the properties surrounding the Park and that as built, the annexe was too big and constrained this openness. The proposal before Panel had been reduced and to the front, now complied with the 2007 approval. It was the view of Officers that the proposed alterations helped address some of the concerns which existed and that on balance, it could be difficult to refuse on the grounds of the minor impacts on the Conservation Area which remained

Receipt of further representations were reported, these being from Gledhow Valley Conservation Group; a local resident; Leeds Civic Trust and local Ward Members Councillor Urry and Councillor G Hussain

If minded to grant the application, Officers recommended a further condition to set out that the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved and specified finished floor levels and ridge height. A amendment to condition no. 2 was also recommended to specify the development to be built in accordance with the most recently submitted plans

The Panel heard representations from an objector and the applicant's agent who attended the meeting

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- that the situation concerning this development, as described to Panel, brought the planning process into disrepute
- the length of time which had been spent on this development; Plans Panel East's concerns about the application which had been considered in October 2011; the fact that an Inspector had required the annexe to be demolished and why this had not been followed up by Officers
- the materials used and whether if approved, the building would remain the existing colour of whether it would be rendered to match the host property
- the applicant's agent's comments that a draft unilateral undertaking could be submitted to the Council within a few days and the possible timescales for Officers to deal with this

The Head of Planning Services stated that Officers had sought to pursue the enforcement matter but that where, as in this case, an applicant wished to submit a further application, on the grounds of reasonableness, this had to be considered. In relation to the application now being considered, there had been a substantial push by the applicant to retain more of the first floor and that the lengthy negotiations which had taken place were reflected in the time taken to bring a scheme before Panel which could be recommended for approval

In terms of the Inspector's decision, some of the scheme was found to be acceptable and that proportionality also had to be considered when seeking an outcome

Concerning the unilateral undertaking, a completed document had not yet been obtained from the applicant as this was a relatively recent proposal and arose only when an acceptable scheme had been drawn up

The Panel's legal adviser stated that it would be possible to deal with the documents for the unilateral undertaking fairly quickly but this would require a willingness on both parties and for there not to be any problems arising out of the documentation

In respect of materials, Members were informed that the existing stone material would be retained and that this was considered to be acceptable by the Council's Conservation Officer

Members considered how to proceed with concerns continuing to be raised at the way the development had proceeded in this case; the time taken to deal with the issues it had raised and that what was being proposed was a material change from the original proposals

Discussions also took place on the recommendation proposed with Members requiring the application to be determined by Panel rather than delegated to the Chief Planning Officer, in the event that a satisfactory unilateral undertaking was not submitted by the applicant

**RESOLVED** - To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, subject to an amendment to condition no.2 to state that the development to be built in accordance with the approved plans to refer to the most recently submitted

plans; an additional condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved and specified finished floor levels and ridge height and the receipt of a completed and signed unilateral undertaking from the applicants restricting occupation of the annexe building to family members of the occupants of the main dwelling and tying the applicants into completion of the works to comply with the plans now submitted within a period of 8 months from the date of the decision

In the circumstances where the unilateral undertaking has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, that a further report be submitted to Panel for determination of the application

**27 Application 12/03841/FU - Detached bungalow to side garden plot at 7 Brookside Alwoodley LS17**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which related to an application for a detached bungalow to a garden plot at 7 Brookside, Alwoodley LS17

The planning history of the site was outlined for Members who were informed that previous proposals for a residential dwelling on the site had been refused, with the most recent refusal being in October 2010

Members were informed that the development site was constrained due to an easement which ran across it which had to be kept clear, however the application before Panel sought to address previous concerns raised in relation to the proximity of the hedge and the width of the driveway which would now be 3.3m in width as requested by the highways officer

In terms of recent policy changes, it was stated that the changes to national planning policy, initially set out in PPS3, was relevant in this case as it removed gardens from the definition of previously developed land and in this case it was felt gave greater weight to the reason for refusal which was proposed in report before Members

The receipt of further representations was reported, with additional representations being received from Harewood Parish Council stating that its objection was to be withdrawn; the applicant who requested determination of the application to be deferred to enable Councillor Buckley, a local Ward Member, further consideration in view of a recent site visit he had undertaken with the applicant and from Councillor Buckley who had stated that some of his previous concerns about the proposal had been overcome but that some remained

As the recommendation within the report was to refuse the application, in line with the Council's Protocol for Public Speaking at Plans Panels, Members heard representations firstly from the applicant and then from an objector who attended the meeting

The Panel considered how to proceed and the Panel's Lead Officer suggested if minded to refuse the application, that the proposed reason be amended to include reference to a cramped and over-intensive form of development causing harm to the character of the area

**RESOLVED** - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposals, by reason of the size, scale and design of the proposed dwelling, including hardstanding and the loss of mature landscaping within the site, would fail to reflect the character and pattern of surrounding development and would result in the loss of a mature garden area which is considered to be a positive feature within the context of this established residential area and would lead to a cramped and over-intensive form of development causing harm to the character of the area. The proposed development is therefore considered to be of significant detriment to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies GP5, N12, N13 and BD5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Review 2006 and the guidance in Supplementary Planning Guidance 13 and the National Planning Policy Framework

**28 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> December 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

**29 Chair's closing remarks**

In closing the meeting, the Chair paid tribute to Mr David Marsh, the Local Government reporter with the Yorkshire Evening Post, who was to retire from the paper at the end of the week and commented on the fairness of his reporting of Council business and that he would be sadly missed

This page is intentionally left blank

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 20TH DECEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, M Harland,  
C Macniven, A McKenna, J Procter,  
E Taylor, G Wilkinson and B Selby

### **30 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **31 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **32 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests

For the record, Councillor Selby stated that although he lived in the next street to Primley Park Crescent – Application 12/04103/FU – 29 Primley Park Crescent – he did not know the applicant or any of the objectors other than Councillor Harrand (minute 35 refers)

### **33 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Grahame who was substituted for by Councillor J Harper

### **34 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2012 be approved

### **35 Application 12/04103/FU - New first and second floor dormers to existing bungalow to form house; porch to front and new ground floor window to each side; two storey extension and conservatories to rear front boundary wall and gates - 29 Primley Park Crescent Alwoodley LS17**

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 24th January, 2013

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel's Lead Officer presented the report which sought permission for extensions to form a new house at 29 Primley Park Crescent Alwoodley LS17

The design characteristics of the surrounding area were outlined with Members being informed that it was not unusual for there to be a mix of bungalows and two storey properties adjacent to each other

An in/out driveway was proposed which was considered to be acceptable. As the plot was a generous one, two conservatories would be sited at the rear of the property, whilst still leaving an appropriate area of garden land

Officers were of the view there were good levels of separation between the property and its neighbour; that the spatial setting of the proposals was acceptable and that a generous garden would be retained and recommended approval of the application, with an additional condition in respect of the boundary enclosure to the eastern side of the property

Panel was informed that a revised plan had been submitted and had been sent to Councillor Harrand. In response to a question from Panel, it was stated that Councillor Harrand had not made further representations in respect of this revised plan

Members discussed the application and sought clarification about the size of the second storey dormer windows, with the Panel's Lead Officer stating these were slightly smaller than those on the adjacent property

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and an additional condition requiring the submission of details of the boundary enclosure to the eastern side of the site

**36 Application 12/04456/FU - Two storey side, front and rear extension including dormer window with Juliet balcony to the side, raised terrace with balustrading above to front and new bay window to other side - Dene Cottage Linton Lane Linton Wetherby LS22**

Plans, photographs and drawings showing the current application and previous consented schemes were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel's Lead Officer presented the report which sought retrospective permission for extensions to Dene Cottage, Linton Lane, Wetherby, which was situated in a Conservation Area

Members were informed that a peculiarity of the site was that the rear of Dene Cottage was the front of the adjacent house, The Willows, and that this was an important consideration in understanding the application

Members noted that unauthorised works had been carried out on the property and initially the applicant had not ceased work but had now done so

A particular issue was the impact the extensions, which were at an advanced stage, had on the amenity of the residents of The Willows

Whilst the extension to the front of the house which had been constructed was similar in scale and form to what had been granted planning

permission in 2004 and 2009, there were elevational differences. It was set out that it could be contended that the extension to the rear did not comply with the Householder Design Guide in respect of how the impact of an extension, on the amenity of neighbours was assessed. Members were informed that in respect of this, although the proposals contravened the letter of the Code, Officers were of the view that due to a number of other factors, this was a balanced decision and were recommending approval of the application. It was noted that the Conservation Officer's view differed from that of Planning Officers

The receipt of 15 further letters of support were reported

The Panel heard representations from an objector who attended the meeting

Panel then discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the rear boundary treatment which would help screen the extension from The Willows and that although a condition had been placed on the retention of this in the 2009 application, this had not been included in the current scheme
- that the 2009 scheme was more suitable as it was subservient to the host property, unlike what had been constructed on site
- that whilst Planning Officers might express a view to an applicant on a planning application this could only be an initial view as the planning process provided the opportunity for public consultation on the proposals, including representations both in support and against an application
- concerns about the rear extensions and its impact on The Willows

The Panel's Lead Officer stated that whilst the Head of Planning Services had been asked by the applicant to give an initial view on the proposals and had done so, without prejudice to the determination of any planning application that might be submitted, the applicant had been somewhat premature and had commenced the works

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That determination of the application be deferred to enable further negotiations regarding the projection of the extension with a view to making this more subservient to the host dwelling and to reduce the impact on the neighbouring dwelling and that a further report be presented to Panel in due course, for determination of the application

### **37 Applications 11/00975/UTW1 and 12/00501/FU - 10 Elmete Avenue Scholes LS15 - appeal summary in respect of enforcement case and planning application**

Further to minute 212 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2012, where Panel resolved to refuse an application for the variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 09/03138/FU, for minor material amendment relating to three 4 bedroom detached houses with integral garage to rear garden, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on appeal decisions in respect of this refusal and of an enforcement appeal

The Panel's Lead Officer presented the report and stated that the applicant had been successful in appealing the decision to refuse planning permission but had lost the enforcement appeal. The Inspector required plot 3, which had not been built in accordance with the approved plan, to be demolished within three months and that to address this, the applicant would now implement the planning permission granted on appeal, within three months. Members were informed that issues still remained regarding boundary treatments and drainage and that these were being dealt with

Concerns were raised that no reference had been made to why the planning appeal had been granted, i.e. through an administrative error within Planning Services which resulted in the timescale for submission of evidence being missed, as set out in the submitted report and that no apology had been offered to Panel or to the local residents who were affected by this situation

The Panel's Lead Officer stated that a meeting had been arranged with local residents and objectors for January and that steps had been taken to ensure this situation could not be repeated

Members noted the steps which had been taken and suggested that a report be submitted to the Joint Officer/Working Group, if considered appropriate, which set out the measures which had been put in place to prevent this situation from occurring in the future

**RESOLVED** - To note the appeal decisions and the comments now made

**38 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

**39 Chair's closing remarks**

The Chair wished everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy 2013

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, M Coulson,  
R Finnigan, C Gruen, C Towler, P Truswell,  
P Wadsworth, J Walker and R Wood

### **17 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests**

Councillors P Truswell and J Harper declared interests on Agenda Item 11, Application 10/04404/FU – Junction of Moorhouse and Old Lane, Beeston and Agenda Item 12, Application 11/04306/OT – Site of Asda Store, Old Lane Beeston due to their membership of the Co-operative Society.

### **18 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **19 Matters arising from the Minutes**

Application 12/03260/FU – Former Prestige Car Sales Centre, 2 Town Street, Stanningley

It was reported that discussion was ongoing with the applicant and a report would be brought to a future meeting of the South and West Plans Panel.

### **20 Application 12/03599/FU - Low Green Farm, 40 Leeds Road, Rawdon**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a refrigerated chiller extension with car parking and landscaping at Low Green Farm, 40 Leeds Road, Rawdon.

It was reported that representations had been made by Ward Members and had requested that the item be deferred for a site visit.

**RESOLVED** – That the item be deferred to allow for a site visit.

### **21 Application 12/03473/FU - 35 Claremont Drive, Leeds, LS6 4ED**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer brought back the application for the change of use of a former children's home to a 7 bed house in multiple occupation (HMO) at 35 Claremont Drive, Leeds. The application had been previously considered at the Plans Panel (West) in September 2012 and

South And West Plans Panel in October 2012 when Members had requested a further report setting out reasons for refusal based upon their concerns.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Previous permission granted at the property was for the purpose of the National Children's Home only and should they cease to own the property then the use would revert back to Class C3 Dwelling House.
- Since the October meeting, the applicant had engaged the services of a Planning QC and the Panel were made aware of his comments.
- When the application was previously considered, it was not known that the property was currently occupied. Should the Panel resolve to refuse the permission, subsequent enforcement action would be necessary.

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

- Concern that the Panel was not been given a clear enough direction on reasons for refusal. Members sought further legal advice on reasons for refusal and were asked to consider whether the property could be brought back into use as a family home and whether grounds for refusal would be strong enough to support any potential enforcement action.
- Reference to previous representations made by local residents and that this could be considered as grounds towards enforcement action.
- The property was very large at 7 bedrooms to be brought back into family accommodation – it was reported that it was previously converted into flats that would suit family accommodation. Further to this it was commented that even if it was converted back to two flats there was likely to be around the same number of occupants as if it was a HMO.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report.

## **22 Application 12/02491/OT - Victoria Road, Headingley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an outline application for a residential development and retail store at Victoria Road, Headingley.

The application was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

## **23 Application 12/02712/FU - Land at Woodhouse Street, Woodhouse, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer brought back an application for a part three storey part four storey block of 18 cluster flats (112 rooms), retail store at ground floor, associated parking and landscaping at land at Woodhouse

Street, Woodhouse, Leeds which was considered at the meeting of South and West Plans Panel held in October 2012.

Members were reminded of their reasons for the previous refusal of this application and these were outlined in the report. It was reported that there had been further discussions with the applicant who was exploring a revised scheme and intended to engage Ward Members and the Panel to present a revised scheme for a pre-application presentation in the near future.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report.

#### **24 Application 10/04404/FU - Junction of Moorhouse and Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the erection of a retail store with car parking and landscaping at the junction of Moorhouse Avenue and Old Lane, Beeston.

Prior to the consideration of this item, Members were reminded of the subsequent application on the agenda which was also for a retail store at an adjacent location. An emphasis was made on the need to consider each application individually and it was reported that both applications had been recommended for refusal on retail policy grounds.

Members had attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application had been submitted to Plans Panel (East) in September 2012 with a recommendation for approval. Prior to that meeting, the application was withdrawn following objections for the applicant of the adjacent site.
- Further letters of support and objection that had been received.
- The applicant had stated that there were no alternative preferable sites in the locality.
- The proposed development would be a single storey building that was commensurate with the height of nearby residential properties.
- Existing access to the site would be used with pedestrian access off Old Lane.
- TPO trees would be retained.
- All other matters, including design were considered to be acceptable.
- It was acknowledged that there were concerns regarding Dewsbury Road Town Centre and the applicant had been asked to consider alternative locations.

The applicant's representative addressed the hearing. The following issues were highlighted:

- The application had been well supported locally as a result of public consultation.
- There would be highway improvements.
- The proposal would increase local employment opportunities and increase shopping choice in South Leeds.
- The proposals would see the redevelopment of a derelict site.
- In response to a Members question, it was reported that approximately 75% of staff employed would come from the immediate local area.
- There had been a full retail impact assessment and it was not felt that the proposals would have a significant impact on any other areas.

Further to the applicants representations, it was reported that there was a difference of opinion between officers and the applicant with regards to the sequential test issue and the Council's retail consultant was asked to address the meeting. He raised the following issues:

- Dewsbury Road Town Centre had not delivered full shopping facilities as expected and appropriate sites for development should be considered.
- This proposal would reduce the commercial prospect of other operations on Dewsbury Road.
- Reference to policy and strategy and the use of town centres.

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

- Dewsbury Road Town Centre was identified in the UDP over 6 years ago and had still not been developed – it was felt that this policy may influence too heavily and could other ways of developing Dewsbury Road Town Centre be found.
- The proposal would improve the area and create jobs.
- If members were minded to vote against the recommendation it was reported that further work would need to be carried out for the cumulative impact on Beeston and Dewsbury Road Town Centre.
- There were other examples of similar stores adjacent to each other elsewhere, should there be approval given to both applications then there would need to be a consideration of the Impact on traffic and other retail operations.

**RESOLVED** – That the officer recommendation for refusal be not accepted and the application be deferred for further negotiation.

## **25 Application 11/04306/OT - Site of Asda Store, Old Lane, Beeston**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a retail foodstore (Class

A1), with car parking, landscaping and access at the site of the existing Asda store, Old Lane, Beeston.

Members had attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Further information from the applicant and letters of support had been received.
- An alternative site on the Dewsbury Road Town Centre had not been identified.
- There was an extant permission to expand the current premises.
- Existing access to the site would be used and improved.
- TPO trees would be retained.
- There were no concerns in relation to siting, layout, highways or design.

The applicants representative addressed the meeting. The following issues were highlighted:

- The proposals represented a significant investment in Leeds and would provide up to 140 jobs in a deprived area.
- The current store did not meet the needs of customers.
- A 1,000 signature petition had been received in favour of the proposals.
- Work carried out by Asda in the local community.
- A representative of a local primary school also spoke in support of the application and referred to the community life programme carried out with Asda and how they would benefit further from the proposed scheme.

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

- Asda employed over 5,000 staff across Leeds and approximately 80% were from within a 2 mile radius of where they were based.
- The unused buildings to the rear of the current store would be demolished.
- Comments regarding Dewsbury Road Town Centre as discussed on the previous application were reiterated and Members were asked to consider the impact should this and the previous application be approved.

**RESOLVED** – That the officer recommendation for refusal be not accepted and the application be deferred for further negotiation.

## **26 Application 12/04061/FU - Cockburn High School, Gipsy Lane, Beeston**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for an all weather grass football pitch including changing facilities, eight lighting columns and fencing at Cockburn High School, Gipsy Lane, Beeston.

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Sport England had withdrawn their objections and were happy to support the scheme.
- The Council's conservation team were now satisfied that the lighting would be acceptable in relation to bats that nested in the area.
- A further letter of objection had been received from a local archery club.
- The site was within the grounds of the current Cockburn High School playing fields.
- The pitch would be surrounded by 3 metre high fencing and there would be 8 15 metre high lighting columns.
- The location of the pitch had been moved to take it further away from residential properties.
- The all weather pitch would improve PE provision at the school as the current pitches often became waterlogged and unusable.
- The views of local residents were not considered detrimental to the application and it was recommended for approval.

A local resident addressed the meeting with concerns. These included the following:

- Concern of noise and light pollution.
- Potential for vandalism and anti-social behaviour.
- Increased traffic and noise from traffic.
- Potential for lighting being left on late at night.

A representative of the school addressed the meeting. He highlighted the following issues:

- The facility would enhance sporting facilities at the school and support the curriculum.
- It would provide opportunity for sports other than football including hockey, handball and a permanent tennis area.
- Approximately 80% of usage would be by the school.
- The scheme had been revised following meetings with local residents.
- There had been no objections from the police or highways.

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

- The site would be fully secured and there would not be open access. Staff would be on duty at all times and the lighting would only be used until 9.00 p.m.
- The facility would be 80 metres from the nearest residential properties.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as outlined in the report and subject to the following conditions:

- The turf pitch and changing rooms to be constructed in accordance with Sport England’s Technical Guidance.
- Submission of community use scheme for approval prior to first use.
- Bat roost survey to be carried out May to September 2013.
- Bat commuting/foraging survey to be carried out May to September 2013.
- Submission and approval of facilities management plan and implementation prior to first use of pitches. To include management of car parks, turning off of lights, security and management of general access to the facilities.

**27 Application 12/03373/FU - Church of the Nativity, Westerton Road and Waterwood Close, West Ardsley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the demolition of a church building, laying out of access and erection of 14 dwellings at the Church of the Nativity, Westerton Road and Waterwood Close, West Ardsley.

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- It was proposed to erect 14 two storey dwellings on the site.
- Distances between the proposed and existing dwellings met guidelines.
- Impact on highways – the proposals conformed to highways guidance. There would be improvements to footpaths.
- Impact on local schools – this had been discussed with Ward Members and the scheme was below the threshold for Section 106 contributions to education.

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

- Concern regarding the impact on schools and poor public transport issues.
- There had been contact from the local MP on behalf of local residents asking that the cumulative impact be considered.
- Concern that the proposals and impact of other nearby developments wouldn’t comply with sustainability guidelines within the National Planning Policy Framework.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

**28 Application 12/03494/FU - Hunger Hill, Morley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the change of use of a vacant warehouse to a private hire taxi booking office with car parking and installation of radio mast at Hunger Hill, Morley.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application had previously been granted on a temporary basis.
- In the two years of temporary operation there had only been one complaint and that was not substantiated.
- There were no residential properties on Hunger Hill.
- There had been previous concerns regarding access. There had been no accidents at the site and highways felt the proposals to be acceptable.
- There would be improvements to the road surface and parking area which would reduce vehicular noise.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

**29 Date and Time of next meeting**

Thursday, 6 December 2012 at 1.30 p.m.

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, M Coulson,  
R Finnigan, C Gruen, P Truswell,  
P Wadsworth and R Wood

### **30 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests**

Councillor P Wadsworth declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, Rawdon Service Station, Apperley Lane, Rawdon as he had previously been involved in negotiations with the developer and also in Agenda Item 11, Leeds Bradford International Airport – Monitoring Report as he was a member of the Airport Consultative Committee.

Councillor R Wood declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 12, Former Prestige Car Sales Centre, Town Street, Stanningley Leeds as he knew the owner of the property.

### **31 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors C Towler and J Walker. Councillor D Congreve was in attendance as substitute for Councillor C Towler.

### **32 Minutes - 8 November 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **33 Application 11/03820/FU - Stonebridge Mills, Stonebridge Lane, Wortley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the laying out of an access road and to erect a retail foodstore with service yard, covered and open car parking and landscaping at Stonebridge Mills, Stonebridge Lane, Wortley.

Members were shown site plans and photographs.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Previous planning history of the site.
- Proposed extension to ring road and introduction traffic light junctions.
- Landscaping plans – this scheme provided more scope for landscaping than the previous scheme proposed.

- Proposed use and restoration of listed buildings.
- The proposals were for a store that would have 4,709 square metres of floor space selling approximately 67% consumer goods and 33% comparison goods. It was felt that this could have an adverse impact on Armley Town Centre.
- Members were made aware of letters of objection made regarding the application.
- It was recommended to refuse the applications. Details for this were outlined in the report.

The applicant's representative addressed the meeting. The following issues were highlighted:

- The proposed scheme would bring listed buildings back into use and provide affordable housing.
- The scheme would create up to 400 jobs.
- There was no indication that a supermarket was to take the opportunity to operate from Armley Town Centre.
- Local people currently had to travel to stores with a significant non-food offer and it was felt that these proposals would not have an adverse impact elsewhere.

The Chairman of a local campaign group addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- Increased traffic on the ring road and impact on pedestrians.
- Impact on small businesses in the area.
- The size and mass of the store.
- Environmental impacts – noise pollution and increased carbon footprint.
- Detrimental effect on the Armley Town Centre plan.
- Potential flooding problems.

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

- There was not any known interest in the use of the listed buildings for heritage purposes.
- The Council's retail consultant reported that should a store of this size be approved at Stonebridge Mills, it was unlikely that someone else would invest in the opportunity at Armley Town Centre.
- There was discussion with two national operators regarding the possibility of a store in Armley. Nobody had yet signed up.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation.

### **34 Application 12/04246/FU - Sukothai, 4 St Annes Road, Headingley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension with relocation of flue and condenser units and addition of access ramp at the front at Sukothai Restaurant, 4 St Anne's Road, Headingley.

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- A previous application had been refused due to the lack of car parking in the area.
- Planning permission had now been given for a pay and display car park opposite the premises.
- A joint arrangement was held between the Applicant and the Car Park Operators.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

In response to Members comments and questions potential conditions for the storage of bins and limiting the number of covers were discussed.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report and two additional conditions to ensure provision and retention of the bin storage area and to ensure that there shall be a maximum of 100 covers within the restaurant.

**35 Application 12/03537/FU - Pool Court Arena, Pool Bank, New Road, Pool in Wharfedale**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for an office extension to stables and new outdoor riding area at Pool Court Arena, Pool Bank New Road, Pool in Wharfedale.

Members were shown plans and photographs of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Vehicular access to the site was highlighted.
- It had not been used as an equestrian centre for the previous 12 years.
- There were no grounds for refusal for re-use as an equestrian centre.
- The site had recently been used for sheep grazing.
- Objections to the application had included concerns regarding noise disturbance and highways safety issues and the application had been referred to the Panel at the request of a local ward member.
- It was recommended to approve the application.

A local Ward Councillor addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- Concern regarding highways safety at the junction on Pool Bank Road.

- Concern regarding noise and light pollution.
- It was felt that the Panel should have visited the site prior to determining the application.

It was reported that the applicant had offered to include some buffer tree planting as a noise barrier and the only lighting would be low level security lights. There was also an offer to build in passing places for vehicles on the access road. The applicant's representative addressed the meeting and highlighted the following issues:

- There would be no external floodlighting.
- The horse area would only be used during the daytime.
- Landscaping by condition would provide screening from local residents.
- Larger vehicles tended to use the alternative access from Pool Bank Road.

In response to Members comments and questions options for the right hand turn into the access road from Pool Bank Road. Potential enforcement measures, speed limits and signage were also discussed.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to further discussions to restrict the size and or weight of vehicles allowed to enter and off Pool Bank Road and to look at the possibility of a right turn ban from Pool Bank Road into access or white lining to improve the turning circle. Ward Members to be consulted on final proposals. Proposal to be brought back to Panel only if agreement cannot be reached with Ward Members.

**36 Application 12/04516/FU - Rawdon Service Station, Apperley Lane, Rawdon**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of the existing service station and redevelopment to provide a new petrol filling station comprising of canopy/forecourt, sales building with ATM, underground storage tanks and car parking.

Members were shown plans and photographs of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The proposed retail facility was not considered to be of harm to neighbouring shopping areas. There was a substantial shortfall of shopping space in the area.
- Reference to objections to the application on the grounds of impact on local businesses, traffic concerns and loss of landscaping.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

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

- Pedestrian access and the possibility of including a zebra crossing.
- Potential for motorists to use the site as a through road.
- Traffic calming measures.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to discussions to try to secure a pedestrian crossing on the Apperley Lane Arm of the adjacent roundabout and to improve traffic calming within the site to dissuade rat running to avoid the roundabout. Ward Members to agree final proposals or the application be returned to Panel for determination.

### **37 Leeds Bradford International Airport - Monitoring Report**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer provided the Panel with monitoring information on night time aircraft movements, noise levels and air quality at Leeds Bradford International Airport.

It was reported that there had been 8 breaches of the night time noise quotas during the period of monitoring and reasons for these breaches were outlined in the report. 2 complaints had been received from members of the public during the monitoring period. Members were also informed of the potential replacement of the aircraft fleet by Pakistan International Airlines (PIA) which would introduce quieter planes.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted in relation to night time movements and noise and air quality.
- (2) That a formal commitment is requested from LBIA and PIA on the introduction of the B777 aircraft for PIA flights and such commitment included details on timescales for implementation of this quieter and more reliable aircraft.
- (3) That a formal procedure is considered that allows notification and justification between Officers and LBIA in relation to PIA flights that arrive late at the airport.
- (4) Despite recent breaches, Members reaffirmed their continued support for the approach of officers in seeking to resolve any future issue of PIA braches by continued dialogue rather than formal action at this stage.
- (5) That Members be updated on these issues and report again on the night time movements, noise and air quality monitoring in six months time.

### **38 Application 12/03260/FU - Former Prestige Car Sales Centre, 2 Town Street, Stanningley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use and alterations of a former car sales showroom to a retail unit (A1 use) and electrical wholesaler with trade counter (B8 use) at the former Prestige Car Sales Centre, 2 Town Street, Stanningley, Leeds, LS28 6LQ.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 10th January, 2013

Members were shown site plans and photographs of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Since the application was deferred at the October meeting, additional conditions relating to highway safety had been recommended.
- There had been a number of further objections and a 100 signature petition on the grounds of highway safety, impact on existing shops and noise.
- The plans included 5 parking spaces for customers and 6 spaces for staff.
- There was space within the site for large vehicle manoeuvres.
- It was recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

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

- Accidents – it was reported that there had been one recorded traffic accident near the site in the past 6 years. The accident was not connected with the site.
- Concern regarding delivery vehicles and pedestrian safety.
- Alternative solutions for delivery vehicles.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the loss of one car parking space to access and introduction of some form of segregation of service area from the adjacent footpath. It was also requested that Senior Highways officers be involved in the design.

Councillor R Wood abstained from the voting on this item.

### **39 Application 12/03599/FU - Low Green Farm, 40 Leeds Road, Rawdon**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a refrigerated chiller extension with car park area and landscaping at Low Green Farm, 40 Leeds Road, Rawdon.

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site and had attended a site visit prior to the meeting.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application was outside the conservation area.
- Policy would not normally allow development in a green belt area but Members were asked to weigh the benefits of the proposal against this.

- Current arrangements of the applicant meant that stock had to be transferred to a site at South Kirkby.
- The proposals would sustain a viable business and reduce vehicle movements.
- It was proposed to include an acoustic barrier fence.
- Representations had been made regarding the loss of amenity.
- The application was recommended for approval.

A local Ward Member addressed the meeting. He raised concerns regarding a history of non-compliance with planning issues at the site and a lack of enforcement action.

The applicants representative addressed the meeting. He reported that discussions had been held with local residents and an acoustic barrier fence would be installed along the western boundary of the site within six months.

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

- There were currently 12 to 15 visits per week to the site at South Kirkby.
- The proposals would help retain jobs at the site.
- Improved landscaping at the site.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

#### **40 Application 11/02389/FU and Application 11/02390/LI - Cornmill Road, Horsforth**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer gave the Panel a position statement on applications for a part two storey and part three storey office block and listed building application to demolish the former cornmill building at Cornmill View, Horsforth.

Members were shown plans and photographs of the site and visited the site prior to the meeting.

Further issues highlighted from the report included the following:

- Members views on demolition of the listed building were sought.
- Members were giving a brief history of planning applications at the site which previously included refurbishment of the listed building.
- The site had been used for storage and there was pollution and flooding issues at the site.
- The applicant had said it was no longer economically viable to sustain the listed building.
- It was not viable to maintain the listed building as a historic site.

- Ownership of the listed building no longer sat with the company that the original application.

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

- Proposed developments would be above the flooding levels.
- The views of civic trusts and societies should be gathered in respect of the listed building.
- Should the listed building be demolished, the use of existing materials should be used in the design of any new building and.
- The poor condition of the listed building – there was a feeling that the only practical solution was for demolition.
- There would need to be a significant amount of parking for office accommodation.

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

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

Thursday, 10 January 2103 at 1.00 p.m.

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,  
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,  
T Leadley, J McKenna, E Nash,  
N Walshaw, J Hardy and M Coulson

### 26 Opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel that agreement had been reached with John Lewis about the lease for their anchor store in the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter and that a presentation on the progressing scheme would be made on behalf of the applicants at the December meeting of City Plans Panel

### 27 Late Items

Although there were no formal late items, the Panel was in receipt of the following additional supplementary information which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Application 12/03975/FU – 6 storey data centre Black Bull Street, LS10 - coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 31 refers)

Application 12/04018/FU – office building – land off Sovereign Street, LS1 – coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 32 refers)

Application 12/04017/1a – greenspace – land off Sovereign Street, LS1 coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 33 refers)

Application 11/03705/FU – Energy from Waste Facility, site of former Skelton Grange Power Station Stourton LS10 – coloured charts and maps (minute 36 refers)

### 28 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

No disclosable pecuniary or other interests were declared at this time, although a disclosable pecuniary interest was declared later in the meeting (minute 38 refers)

### 29 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Murray who was substituted for by Councillor Coulson. Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor D Blackburn

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

## 30 Minutes

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved

## 31 Application 12/03975/FU - 6 storey data centre - land formerly Yorkshire Chemicals site - Black Bull Street Hunslet LS10

Further to minute 20 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on the proposals, Panel considered the formal application. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Plans, graphics and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a 6 storey data centre on part of the former Yorkshire Chemicals site. Members also had regard to a supplementary report which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Leeds Core Strategy and provided details on the non-standard conditions being recommended for the application

With reference to the detailed discussions which had taken place at the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, Officers addressed the issues raised by Members at that meeting and provided the following information:

- that in respect of sustainability, a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating was being sought for the building; that there would be green roofs to the generator houses and that the building would achieve the Council's standard on 20% CO2 reduction and 10% renewable energy generation, with this being controlled by condition
- a wind assessment had been undertaken and independently assessed on behalf of the Council, with no significant concerns being raised from this survey
- that the concerns raised by Carlsberg to the proposals had been considered and it was felt that the height of the building was comparable to those in close proximity to it and in terms of the impact on daylight, a study had been submitted which showed that the building would create less shadow at different times of the day than the previously approved scheme. The issue of noise had been considered by the Council's Environmental Protection Team which were satisfied with the proposals, subject to conditions and air quality was considered to be acceptable. Concerning pedestrian connections in this area, the development would be providing pedestrian access through the site but not enhanced road crossings due to the low level of occupancy. However it was anticipated that further phases of development in the area would contribute more to connectivity, including new pedestrian road crossings

Members were informed that the Environment Agency (EA) had no

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

objections to the principle of the scheme, subject to conditions in respect of remediation strategies and flood risk

A late comment from Leeds Civic Trust was reported which whilst supporting the scheme expressed disappointment at the lack of highway works to Black Bull Street

The current position on the issue of the contribution towards public realm was provided, with Members being informed that the proposal had been amended and that the applicant now wished to provide the improvements within their own site, rather than providing some temporary landscaping beyond the red line boundary. As this would fall short of the 20% greenspace requirement, an off-site commuted sum of £56,000 would be provided to be used for the city centre park

Members commented on the following matters:

- the northern footway, who would maintain this and when it would be fully provided. Members were informed that the footways and landscaping would be maintained by the site operator and owner and the maintenance of these would form part of the S106 agreement. That the full extent of the northern footway would be provided once further developments came on board but that this scheme would provide a 6-8 metre pathway
- the importance of reducing Black Bull Street from three lanes of traffic to two to provide traffic calming measures on a stretch of road where speed was an issue and for this to be done as soon as possible

The Chief Planning Officer stated that Highways Section were looking strategically at the entire city centre; that there was an aspiration to narrow Black Bull Street and this could be supported but that the application being considered could not provide for this

Members also discussed the colour for the proposed cladding with the view being expressed that grey cladding should be used on the scheme

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the provision and maintenance of publicly accessible landscaped areas as identified on plan 1209 -(P)- 002E, a greenspace contribution by way of a commuted sum of £56,000, public transport contribution in accordance with SPD5 Public Transport Improvements and developer contributions of £11290, cooperation with local jobs and skills training initiatives and a Section 106 management fee of £750 and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted reports

### **32 Application 12/04018/FU - Four storey office development with basement car parking and landscaping - land off Sovereign Street LS1**

Further to minute 21 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a major office development in the city centre, Members considered the formal application. Members were also in receipt of a supplementary report which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Core

Strategy, an amendment to condition no.12 and clarification of the number of trees being removed at the site

Plans, graphics and a sample panel showing the opacity level of the glazing in a key location of the building were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and following the detailed discussions held at the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, provided further information on the issues which had been raised by Members

In terms of the roof top plant, revisions had been made and these had been modelled from a range of key locations. The amount of green roof space had been reduced and an area of screened plant would be provided

Regarding the glazing manifestation, Members' comments had been considered but the applicant had indicated they wished to retain the film to this area. Whilst a sample panel showing opacity at a level of 20% had been provided to Panel, Members were informed that the actual material would be glass so would be more reflective than the sample being shown and that a BREAM 'Excellent' rating was being sought for the building

York stone paving would be provided and one tree was proposed although no further planting was to be provided

In respect of the S106 Agreement, the total contribution would be £232,633 which would comprise public transport contribution; travel plan monitoring fee; greenspace contribution as well as a requirement to work with Jobs and Skills

Officers recommended the scheme for approval and stated this was likely to contribute towards the first phase of the regeneration of this site

Members commented on the following matters:

- the glazing manifestation; that as stated previously, technologically there were ways to provide the commercial confidentiality which the applicant sought without adversely affecting the appearance of the building
- the need for sensitive uses to be located at this part of the building and whether these could be located elsewhere
- the cost of an electronic system which could be switched on only when needed

Officers responded to the points raised and stated that the applicant had been pressed on this point in view of Members' comments on this issue. The proposed material would not fully obscure the area; it would allow movement to be seen but faces and information would remain obscured, with the alternative option being clear glass and blinds, however this would result in the blinds always being closed which would detract from the overall visual appearance of the building. Further information was provided on the particular uses for these rooms to enable the Panel to better understand the rationale for siting these uses at this point of the building

Members continued to discuss the glazing treatment and were informed that there was no information available on the cost of a more sophisticated electronic system of automatic glazing and that it would not be possible to condition the use of blinds

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified in the submitted reports and an amendment to condition 12 in

respect of the agreed off-site highways works to Pitt Row and the basement car park

**33 Application 12/04017/LA -Change of Use from car park to public realm and amenity space, to include paving, water feature, drainage, exterior lighting and associated soft landscaping works - land off Sovereign Street LS1**

Further to minute 22 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for an area of greenspace in the city centre, Members considered the formal report. A supplementary report was also provided for Members' consideration which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Leeds Core Strategy and provided clarification of the number of trees being removed and provided in the planning application

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and following the detailed discussions held at the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, provided further information on the issues which had been raised by Members

The Panel was informed that plot C had not been properly drawn on the plan before Members at the October meeting and that this was now correctly plotted, so moving it eastward, with the size of the greenspace area now comparable to Park Square. Furthermore, Executive Board had recently considered the potential disposal of plot B, which had set the parameters for that plot

In response to Members' comments about the balance of hard and soft landscaping within the scheme, this had now been amended with now 67% of the area being greenspace provision. Further amendments included more seating areas in a greater variety of styles and materials; an increased number of trees; a larger grassed area to Sovereign Square; re-alignment of the rill and the footpaths reduced in width

The level changes between the grassed areas were now very discrete; the whole area was now accessible to people with disabilities and the steps within the scheme would meet the requirements of the Access Officer

The importance of addressing Members' concerns about the possible build up of litter within the scheme was highlighted

A late representation from Leeds Civic Trust was reported which strongly supported the scheme but requested additional play areas, improved seating and improvements to Pitt Row

Members welcomed the revisions to the scheme and commented on the following matters:

- lighting within the scheme; the need to ensure it did not cause light pollution and the possibility of including coloured lighting at ground level to add further interest
- the need to ensure that the grass cutting machinery could reach the raised grassed areas
- that the enlarged greenspace area was welcomed
- the depth of the water; the need for this to be safe and for the water features to be regularly maintained

- the support for the proposals by Leeds Civic Trust in view of their earlier comments on the scheme
- the potential attraction of the area to skateboarders and whether this had been considered and addressed
- concerns about extensive use of the proposed tree species Sugar Gum which grew to 30m high
- the need for winter flowering cherry to be included in the planting scheme to provide some winter colour

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the depth of the water would be variable, with this being from 120mm to 40mm. Concerns were raised by some Members that this was too deep
- that the water feature would be maintained with an agreement being drawn up for a maintenance plan for a 15 year period
- that the issue of skateboarders using the space had been considered and that a range of measures would be included to prevent this from occurring

Members acknowledged the importance of this area of greenspace to the city and the role of the Plans Panel in securing a better scheme than had been originally proposed

**RESOLVED -**

a) To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the expiry of Notice No.1 on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any other which may be considered appropriate)

b) That Councillor Nash be consulted on the lighting within the scheme and the proposed tree species

**34 Application 12/04154/FU - Change of Use of offices to form student accommodation involving alterations and addition of roof top extension - Pennine House Russell Street LS1**

Plans, photographs, drawings, graphics and sample panels were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Head of Planning Services stated that a further representation had been received and that the Panel might wish to hear the speakers for and against the application, discuss the proposals and then defer determination of the application to enable proper consideration by Officers of the information which had been submitted, with the Panel agreeing to this course of action

Officers presented the report which sought a change of use of a vacant office building located in the Prime Office Quarter, to student accommodation. Members were informed that the UDPR (2006) supported the principle of office use in the area but accepted other uses which added variety and vitality so long as they did not prejudice the functioning of the principal use

The 1960s building had been reclad in the 1990s and the proposal was to strip the building back to its original structure and to provide a simpler, more unified approach, with the main material being artificial stone. A new pavilion would be located at the top of the building with the overall height of

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

the building matching nearby Aquis House and the adjacent multi-storey car park

The Panel then heard representations from the applicant and an objector who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the levels of rent being charged for this type of accommodation in Bristol and that the intended market for the scheme was wealthy students
- the management for this type of accommodation
- the need to consider the medium/long-term sustainability of the building and the need for further information on the amount of residential accommodation in the area and the amount of vacant office space in the vicinity
- if approved, the possibility of converting at some future point, student accommodation into residential accommodation for details to be provided about the differences there would be between these two uses in terms of the S106 Agreement
- that whilst the proposal would result in the conversion of an unattractive building, that there were grave misgivings about introducing students into the heart of the business area, with concerns that if approved, a precedent could be set
- the importance of not losing low cost office space in the city centre
- the rapid advancements in technology and IT requirements which meant that relatively modern offices needed to be refurbished to meet modern demands
- that alternative uses, e.g. a hotel might be more acceptable in this area rather than student accommodation
- that the site was in a highly sustainable area for students
- the need to provide details of the proposals affecting Henry's Bar and the roof, together with information on the treatment to the lean-to

The Chief Planning Officer stated that there was a need to look at the supply of student accommodation in the city in view of declining student numbers and that the investment in the regeneration of Bond Court would also need to be considered when introducing a new use to this area

**RESOLVED** – To note the report and the comments made and in light of the late representation which had been received, to defer determination of the application to a future meeting to enable a further report to be submitted which also addressed the issues raised by Panel and the Chief Planning Officer

**35 Application 12/04240/EXT - Extension of time for planning application 08/06944/FU for two storey extension to main airport terminal building to provide improved internal facilities and associated landscaping works to the terminal building forecourt - Leeds and Bradford Airport Whitehouse Lane Yeadon LS19**

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

The Head of Planning Services presented the report which sought an extension of time for additions and improvements to the main terminal building at Leeds Bradford Airport and explained that for such applications, the chief issue was whether there had been any material changes, including changes to policy since the original grant of permission, with the Panel being informed that there had been no real changes

Members were informed that an extension of time for a further three years, could only be applied for once. The original application had been considered by Plans West who were supportive of the proposals and the emerging Core Strategy supported the airport's growth

The application had been advertised and had attracted representations from local Councillors but no objections to the proposals had been received

One element of betterment arising from this application was the intention to bring forward at an earlier date the Transport Steering Group, which was a technical group which considered traffic data which was then reported to Members

Members discussed the application and in response to a question regarding the free drop-off and pick up-point which was to commence from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2012, the Head of Planning Services stated there was no reason why this should not commence on that date

If minded to approve the application, Members were asked that condition no. 14 which related to the Forecourt Management Plan, should be dealt with in the S106 Agreement

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the completion of a deed of variation to the original Section 106 agreement agreed as part of planning approval 08/06944/FU to tie the approved obligations to the extension of time approval and updated regarding relevant dates and with the following amended obligation:

- To bring forward the setting up of a transport steering group (to include Leeds, Bradford and York City Council's Metro and LBIA) so that it is not linked to commencement of development but with the granting of this permission i.e. within 6 months of the date of the decision. The group will hold six monthly meetings and will review the airport's vehicular impact on the local road network, progress towards modal shift targets and the most effective use of existing and future funds for public transport

and the additional obligation relating to the Forecourt Management Plan – to be in accordance with approved details as agreed by Panel but with new access to free 1 hour pick-up and drop-off area from Whitehouse Lane completed by the end of May 2013

and subject to the conditions in the submitted report, with the deletion of condition no 14 relating to the Forecourt Management Plan

**36 Application 11/03705/FU - Energy Recovery Facility (incineration of waste and energy generation), associated infrastructure and improvements to access and bridge on site of former Skelton Grange Power Station, Skelton Grange Road Stourton LS10 - Position Statement**

Plans, photographs including historical images and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented a position statement on proposals for an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) on the site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station at Stourton. The former Plans Panel East had previously received pre-application presentations and position statements on the proposals and minutes from these meetings were included in the report before Panel, to provide further background information. In view of two applications for ERFs in the city being received, a visit by Panel, relevant Ward Members and Officers to two such facilities in Sheffield and Mansfield would take place on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2012

With reference to the detailed report before Panel, Members were informed that the proposals were for an ERF which could accept up to 300,000 tonnes per annum of non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste and that if planning permission was granted, there was the potential to ensure that landfill ceased at the Skelton Grange landfill site which was operated by Biffa, the applicants for the ERF

The facility would result in 40 jobs at the site with approximately 300 jobs during the construction phase

Currently the site was derelict concrete and rubble which was now evolving into scrub land. Some poplar trees on the site would need to be removed but the area around the building would be landscaped and improved

In terms of the size of the building, this was largely dictated by the scale of the plant within it although design principles had been set at an early stage, with some modifications being made to the design in view of comments made by Plans Panel East. The proposed scheme provided additional detailing at the end of the building's elevations, with the office element now being raised higher and having a more refined facing to it. Good quality landscaping was proposed which would set the benchmark for future developments. As part of the scheme the Trans-Pennine trail would be re-engineered, giving improved pedestrian and cycle access

One matter which was considered by Plans Panel East at the meeting in August 2012 was vehicular access and the single carriageway solution which was proposed. Plans Panel East was of the view that there was a need for two way access and for sufficient access to be provided to open up the site to a wider area of the city to maximise its potential

Members were informed that this had been considered but that the applicant had agreed to carry out full strengthening works to the bridge which would allow the full width of the bridge to be provided as other developments came along

The Panel then received a presentation from Tim Shaw, a representative of the Environment Agency (EA), who outlined the EA permitting process and provided the following information:

- that applications for ERFs were assessed to ensure they were designed to the highest standards
- that the EA had a role as a consultee in the planning application process as well as a permitting role once an application for an environmental permit was received
- that a permit could be issued before planning permission was granted but that currently no permit had been applied for on this site
- that an environmental permit contained strict conditions to ensure the environment and people's health were protected and only when the applicant had demonstrated that the ERF would operate in line with UK and European laws and using best available technology, would a permit be issued
- that for older plants, the EA could require these to be retro-fitted to meet best available technology
- that once the permit application was received and checked that all the necessary information had been submitted, it would be advertised and a period of public consultation would commence which would also include other agencies, e.g. Natural England and PCTs. The EA had an obligation to take into account all comments which were received and once the application had been assessed, a draft decision was produced with further consultation on this being held and then a final decision was taken
- once a permit was issued the EA then assumed a regulatory role which required audits and inspections; continuous monitoring of emissions and periodic sampling. Emission reports would be reviewed and published
- management and operating procedures would also be monitored but the EA's role did not cover issues relating to traffic movements; visual impact of the development; operating hours or light pollution
- the enforcement action could be taken if this was necessary with a range of sanctions being available to the EA including suspension/prohibition notices being issued and prosecution for non-compliance

Members discussed the report and the presentation by the EA and commented on the following matters:

- concerns that the applicant had not yet applied for an environmental permit and that they should be encouraged to do so. The Chair advised that this was a matter for the applicant
- the transportation of waste from the applicant's materials recovery facility (MRF) on Gelderd Road and that it would be more efficient to sort the waste on the same site as it was being incinerated
- the fact there was another application for an ERF in close proximity and whether in the EA's evaluation, these were considered separately or collectively

- whether there was sufficient waste in the city to fully utilise both of the proposed facilities
- the topography of the area where the ERFs were proposed with concerns that due to the shallow valley these were sited in, the dispersion of emissions could be slow
- whether any similar scheme to that proposed had been refused an environmental permit
- the possibility of utilising the waterways to transport waste
- the possibility of both facilities being located on this site
- for residential properties which were sited close to an ERF, whether a higher standard for emissions or vibrations was required
- whether permits were time limited or had to be renewed

The following responses were provided:

- regarding the movement of materials from the MRF on Gelderd Road, whilst planning permission for the Gelderd Road site had been granted, it had not yet been implemented. In theory it would be more efficient to sort and incinerate waste on the same site, that proposal had not been put forward and it would only be residual waste which was transported from the MRF, which equated to around 9-10 vehicles per day
- that when determining the environmental permit for this site, the fact there was another facility proposed in close proximity would be taken into account and the EA would only grant the permit if it was satisfied it was safe to do so. When considering a permit for this site, the assumption would be made that the operators of the other site – which had applied for an environmental permit – would be operating at full capacity, so these emissions would be added to the background emissions and then those produced by this site would be added for the EA's consideration. If it was felt that the air quality standard was at risk through the level of emissions, it would be possible to refuse the permit or require additional technology to be provided to mitigate against this
- that in terms of waste arisings, the RSS set out the amount of waste the region produced and then further detailed information had been obtained in the research for the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (NRWDPD) which indicated that between 350,000 and 500,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per annum had to be catered for, which included recycling materials but not municipal waste which was in addition to that figure
- that some applications for ERFs had been withdrawn, rather than refused an environmental permit
- that the NRWDPD was supportive of transporting goods by water but that this was a difficult site to achieve this at as transport stations would be required along the route
- that the standards applied to emissions and vibrations were the same regardless of location but that all complaints would be

investigated and where there were problems, the EA could require the operator to put in further measures

- that environmental permits were not time limited and would remain in force until either the EA revoked them or the operator sought to surrender the permit, although the permits were reviewed regularly

The views of Members were sought on the bridge and whether this should be two way either now or in the future

The Panel's Highways representative stated that an assessment had been carried out and that the proposed one-way signalled controlled operation of the bridge would be sufficient for the proposed development but that there were concerns for the future development of the site and that a two way bridge would be needed when all the land was developed. Members noted that the footpath and cycleway would be cantilevered at the side and separated from vehicular traffic which would provide a safer environment

Panel discussed the proposals and that if a two way route could not be provided by this development, that details were needed about the trigger point to achieve this, for further consideration

**RESOLVED** - To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made

During consideration of this matter, Councillor Coulson left the meeting and Councillor Gruen also withdrew from the meeting for a short while

**37 Application 12/03459/FU -Multi-level development up to 17 storeys with 625 residential apartments, commercial units (class A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2), car parking, associated access, engineering works, landscape and public amenity space - land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road LS12 - Position statement**

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which provided the current position on proposals for a major mixed-use development close to the city centre. Panel noted that a pre-application presentation of the proposals had been made to Plans Panel City Centre on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2012 (minute 78 refers)

Members were informed that a mix of apartments across 7 units, were proposed which would include some 3 bedroom apartments and duplex units

The main public open space would be in the centre of the site, although this was less than 10% of the site area and Officers were considering whether a lower level of POS could be accepted in return for the provision of a footbridge over the canal

The main material proposed for the six lower buildings would be red brick which would provide a reference to the former industrial uses of this area. The tall building set apart from the rest of the blocks would be in a black brick with some relief being provided through the inclusion of gold-coloured detailing on the balconies of this block

To prevent graffiti on the elevation to the railway, green climbing plants were proposed which would also add interest and soften this area

Details of the vehicular access arrangements were provided and Members were informed that a cycle lane would be introduced into the scheme

A wind assessment had been submitted and this was currently being considered. A viability statement had also been received which was being examined

Members commented on the following matters:

- the need to see a sample of the gold-coloured cladding and to ensure that its appearance did not deteriorate over time. Members were informed that sample materials would be provided and the materials would be conditioned
- that the POS had to cater for families living on the site and from the image shown to Panel it appeared there was a road running through it
- whether houses should be considered for the site as opposed to flats
- the change of colour for the tall building and the reasons for this
- the need for the colour of the red brick to resemble that used on the developments at Granary Wharf, rather than that on the Courts
- the need for a more balanced housing structure in the city centre and the need for more family accommodation, e.g. houses/town houses in a traditional street pattern
- concerns about the density of the proposals
- the design of the buildings with a mix of views on this
- that the provision of the bridge would be beneficial if it could be achieved and would provide a link to Granary Wharf and the southern entrance of the railway station
- the importance of the views of the city to visitors arriving by train and the need for an image showing this development when entering Leeds station by rail
- the likelihood that conventional housing on this site would not be viable

The Head of Planning Services stated that in terms of viability the site was a marginal one. Regarding the design of the scheme, the comments from the pre-application presentation had indicated the buildings at that time were too 'blocky' and the amendments made were in response to those comments. In relation to the tall building, it was felt that elements of the nearby No.1 Whitehall were picked up in that block and that it was possible that the images provided did not fully indicate this

On the quantum of development, it was important to ensure this was correct

In response to the specific points raised in the report for Members' comments, the following responses were provided:

- that there were mixed views on the design approach adopted for the development and that a 'wow factor' was needed
- that there was support to the approach to private and public outdoor amenity space but that if families were to be accommodated, more child-friendly play spaces were required

and there should be increased green areas and reduced hard landscaping

- that there was support for the proposed car parking in the scheme

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

At the end of consideration of this matter, Councillors R Procter, G Latty, M Hamilton and T Leadley left the meeting

**38 Application 12/03788/FU - Hybrid application for full permission for 11 storey office building and outline application for office/hotel building up to 8 storeys with ancillary ground floor, A1, A3, A4 uses at Wellington Street/Whitehall Road LS1 - Position statement**

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

The Deputy Area Planning Manager presented a report setting out the current position on proposals for an office and hotel development at Wellington Street/Whitehall Road, LS1 on the site of the former Lumiere development. Members noted that a pre-application presentation on the scheme had been considered by Plans Panel City Centre at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012

Regarding the location of the site, this was close to the City Centre Conservation Area and there were a number of listed buildings in the vicinity, with a mixed architectural style of Victorian and modern buildings around the site

At this point, Councillor Nash having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest through being a Committee Member of the Leeds and Wakefield Area Co-operative Group which had a store in close proximity to the site, left the meeting

The following information was provided:

- that the proposals were for two buildings around a central space, with one application being for full planning permission whereas the other building was for outline permission only
- both the base of the outline building and the top of it would align with City Central
- a central open space of 35m x 25m would be provided and this would include an area of soft landscaping together with seating and public art
- the servicing arrangements would be provided by a new route for vehicular access off Whitehall Road to the basement car park
- the need to protect the amenity of residents from the possible intensive servicing use and that a wall to screen this from view would be provided
- for the building on the Whitehall Road frontage, the proposed materials would be masonry in a grid pattern, with a loggia feature at the top level

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 13th December, 2012

- a brown roof was proposed to the eastern wing which would constitute crushed aggregate, brick and concrete which would encourage biodiversity
- to address concerns about lighting and safety raised at the pre-application presentation about the pedestrian cut-through, this would be 8m wide with a fully glazed reception area sited along one elevation to improve natural surveillance
- that some columns in the centre would be needed for support but these would be slim and not obtrusive
- signing was proposed at the entrance to provide a feature and further illuminate this part of the building
- that construction would be phased including a phased provision of the basement car park
- a temporary fence line was being proposed to screen the part-built basement and temporary surface treatment would be provided to the Public Open Space until the outline proposal was implemented
- a lay-by area was being proposed for the proposed hotel use and there would be the opportunity for a new, upgraded bus stop to be provided on Wellington Street. The existing bus stops on Whitehall Road would be relocated and improved
- the existing pedestrian crossing on Wellington Street would need to be relocated
- a wind study for the site had been submitted and was being considered

Members commented on the proposals particularly the need to provide a lay-by to improve the flow of public transport along Wellington Street, and the pedestrian route in and how well-illuminated this would be

In response to the specific points raised in the report for Members' consideration, the following comments were made:

- that Members considered that the combination of the materials proposed and the elevational treatment to be acceptable
- that the concerns regarding the attractiveness of the pedestrian access on to Whitehall Road had been addressed
- that with the safeguards which were in place, in general, residential amenity had been protected both during the construction and operational phases of development but that there was a need to make the screen wall to the service area more interesting and attractive and that the flow of public transport along Wellington Street needed to be improved

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**39 Preapp 12/01085 - Proposed office building and creche at White Rose Office Park Millshaw Park Lane Beeston LS11 - Pre-application presentation**

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out proposals for another new office development in Leeds which was a further example of investor confidence in the city

Members were informed about the planning history of the site and that there were two permissions for additional office space which had commenced but had not been completed. The applicant had stated that if the proposed scheme was granted planning permission, the two extant permissions would be relinquished

Car parking was proposed at ground level with office accommodation above it. A crèche was proposed on an existing car park, with there being a net loss of approximately 190 spaces

Aspects of the design were still being discussed although the coloured cladding which had formed part of the earlier designs had now been deleted

The extant permissions were material planning considerations as was whether an out of centre use was acceptable in this location

It was reported that Councillor Congreve had raised the issue about the loss of car parking spaces and that this needed to be addressed to ensure there was no worsening of the car parking situation at the White Rose Centre (WRC)

If Members were broadly satisfied with the proposals, a request was made to defer and delegate determination of the planning application when it was submitted, to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to no major issues being raised

The Panel then received a presentation on behalf of the applicants who provided the following information:

- that the site was the home to a range of companies and was a large employer
- that the site could be regarded as being mid-town rather than an out of town location
- that a company had approached them for a new office building with crèche facility and that the consented scheme did not meet the demands of this tenant. If the scheme was approved, the building was hoped to be occupied by 2014 and with 700 employees
- that an area of land did exist where decked car parking could be provided if the loss of spaces was an issue
- that the applicants would work with the owners of the WRC to develop the link to the shopping centre
- that the consented schemes could be built without the need for planning contributions and that this should be taken into account when considering contributions on the proposed scheme

Members discussed the scheme and were content with the proposals as presented, to the extent that determination of the application could be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

The Chief Planning Officer welcomed this approach but advised that any approval would be subject to no new material considerations being raised and for the scheme to be policy compliant and for appropriate planning contributions to be made

**RESOLVED** – To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made and that consideration of the formal application be deferred and

delegated to the Chief Planning Officer but that in the event that issues arose which could not be resolved, that the application be submitted to Panel for determination

**40 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

This page is intentionally left blank

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn,  
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,  
T Leadley, J McKenna, E Nash,  
N Walshaw, J Hardy, T Murray and  
J Procter

### **41 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and paid tribute to David Marsh, the Municipal Correspondent at the Yorkshire Evening Post who was leaving the paper after 25 years. Councillor Taggart thanked him for his service to the people of Leeds and the Council and stated that he would be greatly missed

The Chair stated that in view of the workload of City Plans Panel, it would be likely that some additional meetings would be needed together with a workshop in the early part of the year on the NGT scheme and that dates would be circulated as soon as possible

### **42 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **43 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests. However, in respect of applications 10/04597/OT – Wakefield Road Gildersome and 12/02470/OT – land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane North, Councillor Leadley declared other interests through being the Chair of Morley Town Council Planning Committee which had commented on the proposals. As these applications were not being determined at this meeting, Councillor Leadley stated that he intended to take part in the discussions (minutes 48 and 49 refer)

Councillor Nash stated that in respect of application 12/04200/FU Kirkstall District Centre, she would not be declaring a disclosable pecuniary interest through being in receipt of a small income from the Co-op as although there was a Co-op store in the area, it was 1.5 miles from the subject site (minute 47 refers)

#### **44 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Procter who was substituted for by Councillor J Procter

#### **45 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 be approved

#### **46 Applications 12/04663/FU and 12/04664/CA -Position statement for the proposed demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 6 storey library with ancillary landscaping at the University of Leeds - land bounded by Woodhouse Lane and Hillary Place LS2**

Further to minute 11 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> September where Panel received a pre-application presentation for a proposed library at Leeds University, Members considered a position statement on the scheme

Plans, photographs, graphics, story boards and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and stated that the proposed student library would enable Leeds University to compete effectively to attract student numbers

Members were informed that the site was a sensitive one and was surrounded by heritage assets, some being Grade II Listed Buildings

One particular building which lay within the site was the former bank building which was now being used as a security office. Whilst the façade of the building was of interest, it was not Listed and that consideration had been given to its retention on site, however, due to the level changes of the building it was not felt this could be retained. For information, Members were informed that English Heritage supported the demolition of the former bank building as the replacement scheme was of higher quality

In terms of landscaping, there would be some loss of trees but replacement planting and new public realm would be provided

In addition to the library use, an ancillary café use would be included, with the ground floor being fully accessible to the public, schools, colleges and other universities. The upper levels would be for use by Leeds University only and would comprise study and book stacking areas, with feature windows providing views across the city and to the adjacent church

Roof top plant would be discrete and not impact on the overall visual effect of the building

The building would provide two entrances; the main entrance being off Woodhouse Lane, with a secondary entrance off Hillary Place

In response to Members' previous comments, the elevation to Hillary Place had been revised to reduce its dominance to the street. The building had been stepped back and an open podium level had been provided. Whilst the building required a wide footprint, it was not possible to increase its height,

so architectural features had been used, e.g. slot windows, to increase the appearance of height. The building frontage now aligned with the smaller building on the adjacent site and benefitted from a simplified and refined palette of materials, comprising mainly Portland Stone and glass. The inclusion of a glass box 'lantern' at the top of the building provided vertical emphasis and created a presence on the skyline

Officers reported an objection received from Leeds Civic Trust but felt that this related to the previous version of the scheme and not the one being presented to Panel

Members commented on the following matters:

- the revisions which had been made to the scheme, which were an improvement but whether the building fitted in with the surrounding gothic buildings
- that the loss of a bank building was acceptable
- an acceptance that the development could not be built in the gothic style
- the lack of any relationship to the building above it, i.e. at the eaves line
- the Hillary Place elevation and that concerns remained about its massing
- the possibility of creating some interest on the glazing to link the building with the churches and the university, with wording relating to learning being suggested, which would echo the statement on the former BBC building on the opposite side of Woodhouse Lane
- that Members' comments had been taken on board but that further detailing was needed to indicate the building's use as a library, rather than just another University building
- the community use of the ground floor which was welcomed
- concerns about the blandness of two elevations when looking from the site to the former BBC building, as shown on the images
- the entrance on Hillary Place with concerns that this appeared dark, unwelcoming and required lighting. Concerns were also raised about the decorative grill element; that this did not add much to the design and required further thought
- the need for both entrances to make a statement and whether the steps on the Hillary Place entrance would be used in view of a lift also being included
- the number of car parking spaces being lost in the scheme and where cars would be displaced to

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the ground floor of the building would be open to everyone and this included the study areas as well as the café
- that the two elevations shown on the graphic facing the former BBC building were existing campus buildings and that their detail had not been included on the graphic but would be when the image was presented at the point when the application was ready to be determined
- that some VIP car parking existed on the site and that this would be relocated. The Panel's highways representative stated that there would

be no new car parking provided in the scheme and that about 70 car parking spaces would be lost, however discussions were still ongoing with the University about the number of spaces which would need to be relocated, together with cycle parking, although the University was keen to encourage public transport use and the site was in a highly sustainable location in terms of bus routes. Members were also informed that for the NGT, there would be the need for a rearrangement of the road network on Woodhouse Lane and Hillary Place, which would be opened up to University traffic, with further information on this being provided in the proposed NGT workshop for Panel Members, early next year

In response to the specific questions raised in the report,

Members provided the following responses:

- that the proposed use was appropriate for this location
- that the design refinements were considered to be acceptable but that further detailing was required in view of Members' comments about the Hillary Place entrance; possible decorative glazing to link the building to the University and the nearby churches, and detailing/signage to properly indicate the use of the building
- that the demolition of the existing buildings was acceptable and that the decorative façade of the former bank building could be salvaged and relocated if required
- Members noted that further details would be provided about the relocation of car parking but were supportive in principle of the proposal to reduce the level of car parking on the site
- that the loss of the existing trees and the proposed tree replacement plans and other landscaping was acceptable but there was a need to ensure the proposed fruit trees did not overhang the footpath, in order to avoid accidents

Members discussed the possibility of deferring and delegating determination of the formal application to the Chief Planning Officer, however the majority of Members favoured the scheme to be considered by Panel

**RESOLVED** – To note the report and the comments now made and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report in due course, to enable Panel to determine the application

**47 Application 12/04200/FU - Position statement for demolition of existing buildings and erection of A1 foodstore, five retail units (A1,A2,A3,A4 or A5), new club building for Leeds Postal Sports Association Club, community centre, improved public realm and associated car parking, servicing, landscaping and access improvements - Kirkstall District Centre Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall Hill, Beecroft Street and Commerical Road Kirkstall LS5**

Councillor M Hamilton joined the meeting at this point

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which set out the current position for a major retail led development in Kirkstall. Members were informed that the proposals had been presented to Plans Panel West in early September, which had generally supported the scheme

The previous scheme was shown to Panel for comparative purposes

The level changes across the site were highlighted as was the previous proposals to site the retail units on Kirkstall Hill

Members were informed that the current scheme brought the development to street level on the Commercial Road side. The first level would comprise the retail units and a tower feature which would incorporate the lift and stairs which would give access to all levels. The next level would include the Post Office Sports Club and the servicing arrangements for the development from a new road off Commercial Road; the next level would include the new supermarket, which could be accessed at ground level on Kirkstall Lane. The final level would see the location of the car park

The proposed materials would be red brick, stone cladding and some bronze detailing

As a lower building was now being proposed, it would have less visual impact than previous proposals for the site

Officers reported the receipt of an objection from a local resident which was outlined for Members' information. Receipt of 7 e-mails in support of the proposals were also reported

Members were informed that the proposals provided the opportunity to develop the site in a different way and to bring forward a scheme on a site which was challenging due to the level changes. The scheme would now provide two active frontages; better servicing and the retail elements at a lower level. Local jobs would also be created

At this point, the Chair referred to the comments in the report made by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, which was part of West Yorkshire Joint Services which he also chaired, but stated that he was not declaring in interest

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following matters:

- the effect of moving the bus stop which was located nearby on Kirkstall Lane. The Panel's highways representative stated that the bus stop would be moved to accommodate the junction changes, but would be retained
- the need for more work to be done on the Beecroft Street elevation; that planting and design should be considered but that any signage on this corner would need to be carefully controlled. Members were informed that discussions about the design of this elevation were continuing and that in respect of signage, this would require advertisement consent in its own right
- that the design of the building should reach the highest environmental and sustainable standards
- the amount of future development in this area and that this site should not be considered in isolation, particularly in terms of the traffic assessment which should be a cumulative assessment.

The Head of Planning Services stated that agreed development had been incorporated into the transport assessment

- whether the active frontages were in the most appropriate location
- that this was an important junction coming into the city centre and there should be a statement building on the site
- concerns about the scale of the development and that a smaller scheme would be preferred, but recognising that the site was located in the heart of Kirkstall
- that the site was located in the heart of Kirkstall and the development was too big for a densely populated, residential area and was in the wrong location
- that a 24 hour use would need to be carefully considered in view of its impact on residents on Beecroft Street
- that compared to previous schemes for the site, this was better, especially as it used the slope of the site rather than working against it and that it had to be accepted that this was a large site and that a large building could reasonably be expected
- highways concerns as the size of the store was likely to attract shoppers from further away, leading to more traffic, together with concerns at the proposed junctions
- the need for more information about the tower, especially how it would work; whether it would be used by shoppers and the need for this element to be of good design as it would be a focal point, with possibly an increase in height being considered to make it a feature. The view was also expressed that a tower on the site was not appropriate
- the need for improved landscaping
- the impact on the views of Kirkstall Abbey, with the feeling that this was not now likely to be a significant consideration
- ensuring that the proposals related to the rest of the S2 centre, rather than the Kirkstall District Centre and the need to ensure it fitted in with the BHS site and Morrisons Supermarket, with a network of pedestrian crossings being needed to achieve this
- that the visual appearance of the supermarket from the Kirkstall Lane side was weak and that more was needed to make the roofline more positive and create a statement building
- that if built, the scheme could result in the surrounding area, particularly the shops, looking tired
- that the applicant was seeking a large store and that Panel could not redesign it but if, when the scheme came for determination, Members were minded to refuse it, the options needed to be considered
- concerns about the consistency of advice from Officers in view of no retail impact assessment being referred to for this scheme, when on other retail schemes, this was considered to be necessary
- that the applicant was Tesco, with concerns about the viability of other Tescos in the wider area, if this scheme was approved

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- on the principle of development on the site, the majority of Panel recognised the need for development
- in respect of the impact of the store on the character and appearance of the centre of Kirkstall, there were concerns about connectivity and the impact of the scheme on the wider area. The Head of Planning Services stated that there would be some impact but that the aim was to bring forward a scheme which worked and was capable of being implemented
- concerning the impact of the proposed development on the listed building on Beecroft Street, this had previously been commented on, however, Panel did have some concerns about the impact of 24 hour opening on nearby residents and that this needed to be considered further
- to note Members' comments about the design, scale and place making of the proposals
- in relation to the impact of the development on residential amenity, to note the concerns about 24 hour opening
- on the issue of the impact of the development on the local economy and the importance of the redevelopment of this site for the future of Kirkstall, it was accepted that the site needed developing but there were concerns about the impact this could have on retail in surrounding areas. The Deputy Area Planning Manager explained that as the proposals were in a designated town centre, there was no requirement in this case for the applicant to provide a retail impact assessment
- in terms of the proposals for pedestrian access to the development, further work on this element as well as public realm and sustainability were required. Regarding integration of the scheme with the rest of the Kirkstall District Centre, the Chief Planning Officer suggested that Members may wish to consider whether S106 contributions for this should be sought

**RESOLVED** – To note the report and the comments now made

**48 Application 10/04597/OT - Outline application to lay out access road and erect light industry, general industry and warehouse development (Use Classes B1c, B2 and B8) a 115 bed hotel and pub/restaurant with car parking - Wakefield Road, Gildersome - Position Statement**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Members considered the first of two reports of the Chief Planning Officer in respect of development proposals on sites in close proximity to each other, in Gildersome.

Officers presented the report which set out the current position on an outline application for an employment led scheme comprising industrial and warehouse uses together with a hotel and pub/restaurant on an undeveloped, sloping site of approximately 3.23 hectares to the south east of Junction 27,

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 17th January, 2013

between Wakefield Road and the M621. The site was surrounded by a number of existing industrial and offices uses, together with residential properties on Wakefield Road in close proximity

Members were informed about the main issues relating to the proposals which included:

- principle of development; that the site was mainly allocated for employment uses and that industrial use was acceptable in principle. In terms of the hotel/pub uses, these were usually seen as town centre uses. Paragraphs 10.3-10.8 of the submitted report set out the applicant's reasons for wanting to pursue these uses in an out of town centre location
- highways issues; that a new, signalised access junction was proposed to serve the site, with Highways Officers being satisfied on the provision of this. A 3 metre cycle route was also to be provided together with a bus layby. At the time the report was written, the application was subject to a Holding Direction by the Highways Agency relating to, amongst other matters, the scope and costs of works necessary at Junction 27, with Members being informed that the Holding Direction had been extended on 13th December 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2013
- landscaping proposals; the existing mature vegetation would be retained where possible, although a number of trees would be removed, some because they were diseased and some to facilitate development. Replacement planting would be provided, with the Council's Landscape Officer being generally happy with the proposals
- impact on residential amenity of the proposed 4 storey hotel use. Issues of overdominance or overlooking from the hotel use had been considered but due to the sloping nature of the site, and the distance to the nearest residential properties, it was felt that residential amenity would be adequately protected
- S106 agreement; that this was being negotiated and the need for Members' views on whether the hotel was needed to deliver the employment uses on the site

Members were informed that further comments had been received from residents and these would be detailed in a further report when the application was due for determination

Panel then discussed the impact of the proposed signalised junction on a resident who lived opposite the site and parked a caravan in his driveway, and referred to discussions held with the resident when Members visited the site that morning. Whilst it was possible for his vehicle and caravan to turn in his curtilage, it could be that his driveway would require widening to enable safe access on to the revised highway, with this to be paid for by the applicant

Members then commented on the following matters:

- the location of bus stop 10353, as set out in the submitted report; the absence of public bus services from that part of the A650 for five years, with two buses a day to serve Bruntcliffe High School, in term time only and that spending money to upgrade the bus stop to real time display could not be supported

- the possibility of retaining the wrought iron fencing which was on the site
- the lack of a compelling case to support the pub/restaurant use
- the planning history of the site, which originally was the remnants of a farm; the number of applications which had come forward for the site and the recognition that the site required development but that this should be low density, light industrial development
- highways issues, with concerns that Gildersome roundabout was now working well but could once again become problematic if a more intensive development was approved
- the proposed hotel use and that there were several sites in the Morley area which could accommodate this use and that in respect of the pub/restaurant, this could also be located in either Gildersome or Morley
- that the site was isolated and would result in more traffic on the roads
- doubt about whether this was an enthusiastic or realistic proposal for the site
- that the site was not suitable for a hotel and that the suitability of the site for the pub/restaurant uses was questionable, particularly in view of the number of such establishments in Gildersome and Drighlington which had closed down through lack of trade
- the possibility that the hotel use was aimed at a wider area in view of its location, at the apex of neighbouring districts

Officers provided the following responses:

- that bus stop 10353 was not located where Metro had indicated it was and that updated comments on the application were being sought from Metro
- that there was an intention to retain materials which would also include the wrought iron fencing and some stonework

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the hotel was an important component of the scheme as the case was being made that a hotel and pub/restaurant should be out of centre, yet Morley was in need of investment and that details would need to be provided as to why this use could not be sited in Morley

In respect of the visual appearance of the development, the Chief Planning Officer stated that the appearance of this and the site being considered next on the agenda was important, especially from the motorway, as it would be the first view of Leeds from this side of the city and that this, together with the height of the proposals and the amount of landscaping had to be considered

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- about whether, in the circumstances, a hotel and pub/restaurant uses were considered to be appropriate to the site, if tied to the

delivery of employment use on the site, there were mixed views on this, with the smallest majority in favour of the hotel use, but that guarantees were needed in respect of the whole site and the extent of the benefit had to be clearly set out. The possibility of a smaller hotel on the site was suggested but it was accepted that the issue of hotel use in the centre of Morley must be properly considered

- regarding the access arrangements and whether these were sufficient to deal with the anticipated level of traffic, there were mixed views on this with concerns being raised at the extent of the congestion in the evening peak
- concerning the landscaping proposals and whether these were sufficient to allow the development to proceed, further information was needed to enable full consideration of the landscaping and the positioning of buildings
- about whether the development could be considered to be harmful to residential amenity, Panel felt the development was located sufficiently far away not to be unduly detrimental to residential amenity
- in terms of the scope of the Section 106 Agreement, there was a wish for the bus route to be reinstated, with the Chief Planning Officer suggesting that in view of the importance of public access to the larger of the two sites being considered by Panel (minute 49 refers) there was the possibility this could be discussed with Metro to tie the two sites together
- finally, whilst there was the desire for the site to be developed, it was important that the applicant had a clear plan for it and town centre uses could only be considered as enabling if they ensured the delivery of the rest of the site via a legal agreement

**RESOLVED-** To note the report and the comments now made

**49 Application 12/02470/OT - Outline application for proposed employment development for Use Classes B1(b) and B1(C) (research and development/light industrial uses) and B8 (storage and distribution uses) with new accesses, associated infrastructure and landscaping - Land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane North, Gildersome - Position Statement**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which provided the current position in respect of proposals for an employment development on a 28.3 hectare undeveloped, former opencast mine site in Gildersome

Members were informed that there were a large number of issues to be resolved on this site and these included particularly complex highways issues. As set out in the previous report, the application was subject to a Holding Direction by the Highways Agency which had been extended to January 31<sup>st</sup> 2013

The topography of the site was challenging as there were substantial changes in levels on the site. In addition, a small residential development abutted into the site and a public right of way cut centrally across the site to a public footpath which runs down the western site boundary

Two vehicular access points into the site were proposed; one at Gelderd Road and the other from Asquith Avenue, both of which caused Officers concerns – at Gelderd Road the signals at this location were over capacity and could not be improved and in terms of Asquith Avenue, the presence of HGVs on this road should not be encouraged; discussions were ongoing but as the development would be so large, it would need a number of access points and would give rise to local impacts. There was also the point as to whether a highway linkage should be made across the beck, given the topography and ecological corridor

Drainage was another issue on the site with local concerns being raised about flood risk. Although £300,000 was proposed towards flood mitigation, Gildersome Parish Council's concerns about flooding remained

The quantum of development and the impact of this on long distance views was also a concern, particularly in view of one of the units potentially being as large as the White Rose Shopping Centre

Panel discussed the report and commented on the following matters:

- that an access on Asquith Avenue did not work and that an access from Nepshaw Lane South should be considered as two main routes were likely to be needed
- that there were no bus services on the Gelderd Road frontage of the site and that the existing bus services in this area were being depleted
- that the sum put forward for water mitigation measures was not index-linked and that third-party land ownership would be required to deliver them
- that issues relating to highways, off site works and public transport had not been addressed and that much more work was needed on the proposals
- the possibility of the water mitigation measures being tied into the nearby woodland to provide environmental benefits
- that vehicular access to the site from Nepshaw Lane South should be considered and that Asquith Avenue was not suitable for vehicular access serving the development as it was too narrow, although two main routes into the site should be provided
- concerns about the size of the proposed units and whilst accepting that the site was earmarked for development, that there was a need to protect the amenity of the residents living in the properties located within the site

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the site was allocated for employment and that jobs were needed but that there were particular issues with the site which needed to be considered and that a design brief for the site should be provided. The quantum and form of the floorspace would need to be controlled and that a robust travel plan would be required

The need for a range of employment sites to be available within Leeds was stressed as was the need to react positively to planning issues on

challenging sites such as this one, particularly in view of the length of time taken to progress this site

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- to note Members' comments concerning the principle of development
- that the applicant's proposals to improve accessibility were not appropriate to the site and that Asquith Avenue was not suitable for vehicular access and that Nepshaw Lane South should be considered as a more suitable access point
- that Members did not consider the extent of the access arrangements were sufficient to deal with the anticipated level of traffic and that a design brief was needed
- to note Members' comments regarding the scope of the Highways assessment
- to note Members' comments on the scope of the highway conditions and the Section 106 agreement
- that the extent of the landscaping proposals were not sufficient to allow the development to proceed and this needed to be addressed
- that regarding nature conservation, there was the possibility of linking the water features to the woodland to provide ecological benefits
- that further information was required on the drainage improvements
- that the applicant be encouraged to work with the Council on a suitable development brief for the site

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**50 Preapp/10/00300 - Update presentation for alterations and amendments to the approved Eastgate and Harewood Quarter Development scheme - Land bounded by New York Road (Inner Ring Road A64) to the North, Bridge Street and Millgarth Street to the East, George Street and Dyer Street to the South and Vicar Lane and Harewood Street to the West LS2**

Further to minute 6 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2012, where Panel resolved to grant outline planning permission for amendments to the mix of uses for the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter development, Members considered a pre-application presentation for alterations and amendments to the approved scheme

Plans, photographs, graphics and precedent images were displayed at the meeting

Officers introduced the report and Members then received a presentation on the proposals on behalf of the developer

Members were informed that agreement had been reached with John Lewis for their anchor store and that work had been continuing with the Council to vary the proposals in order to bring the scheme forward in a

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 17th January, 2013

phased way. Along with Millgarth Police Station which had been acquired by the Council, the Victoria Quarter had recently been acquired by the developer. Consideration was now being given to creating links from the Victoria Quarter to the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter development to form one scheme and this would necessitate some changes

Consideration was being given to whether a 21<sup>st</sup> century covered space could be created, with the intention being to take as inspiration and reference, the quality of the Leeds' historic arcades

In terms of car parking, John Lewis was keen to have a car park on the site and having considered the scheme in detail in order to deliver the car park in the first phase of development, the proposal was to demolish the Millgarth Police Station and move the NGT route onto the Ladybeck culvert, thereby leaving an adequate footprint on one side for the car park and a decent footprint for the retail development

The Leeds John Lewis would be designed with specific reference to the city, for example its cloth industry to ensure that it was of its time and place; was memorable and recognisable and that it stood for the city and the company. The design of the building also had to work for the store to ensure there was sufficient daylight and there was flexibility to changing retail trends

The time line for the scheme was given, with Members being informed that public consultation would commence in February 2013, with the application for Phase 1 being submitted in April and determined possibly in August 2013, with a start on site in 2014 and completion in autumn 2016

Members commented on the following matters:

#### General design issues

- that the detail of the John Lewis store had changed since the original planning permission had been granted; whether because of this there would now be the need for a bridge over Eastgate and how this change would affect the power generation plant off Bridge Street which had been approved
- the arcaded part of the scheme to the north of Eastgate and whether this remained part of the proposals
- that the original scheme was to create a new quarter whilst retaining much of what was there to enable a flow through from the Trinity scheme, however this did not now seem to be the case
- the need for details on achieving a safe transition to the development from the Victoria Quarter
- the design of the John Lewis building and whether it would look at odds with the Blomfield architecture which dominated this part of the city
- the need for the treatment of the John Lewis store to be consistent all the way round and not, as in the case of the Leicester store to have bland and functional rear elevations

#### Car park and highways

- that the demolition of Millgarth Police Station was welcomed but that there was a need to consider a similar treatment for the car park as would be on the John Lewis façade; that this was a very important issue and that despite its use, the car park should not look like one. As the site was a key gateway into the city it was

important that the scheme was met by something which befitted the city and that in view of the likely cost of the John Lewis building, a poor quality car park would not be accepted

- the need to ensure there was no queuing traffic from the car park and that the exit was situated opposite the coach station on Dyer Street with concerns about whether there was sufficient capacity on that street
- that expectations for this development were high and that for many people, car parks were dark and unattractive but that for this scheme something much better had to be produced and that it would set the standard of how multi-storey car parks should look and that strategically, this was very important
- the possibility of integrating the car park into the store at basement level and the success of the Selfridges basement car park on Oxford Street, London
- that the availability of the Millgarth site could provide an opportunity to redesign the building, rather than simply bolting on the car park

The following responses were provided by the developer's representatives:

#### General design issues

- that the intention of building a bridge over Eastgate would need to be reviewed in the light of the development of the scheme
- that the Energy Centre on Bridge Street formed part of the second phase of development; that the developers were looking to future-proof phase 1 and to connect this to the energy centre when it came on line, as there would not be a sufficient number of shops in phase 1, however discussions were ongoing with the Council about connecting the markets to the Energy Centre
- that the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter did not compete with the Trinity development as it was for a different market
- that the transition to the development from the Victoria Quarter would be through the use of a raised platform on Vicar Lane (between the County Arcade entrance and the application site), which would enable this to be step free whilst still retaining vehicular access. Whilst a pedestrian-first approach was being encouraged, it was not possible to take the buses off Vicar Lane as there was nowhere else to divert them to. Whilst the final design of this had not been reached as discussions were still ongoing with highways, there would be an extended area of public realm
- in terms of the Reginald Blomfield architecture, this was stronger on the northern side of the site, with the southern side being more diverse. Whilst the Blomfield language was white Portland Stone and then brick, the use of Portland Stone on the John Lewis building was favoured, with this giving an element of the Blomfield language, whilst not trying to mimic it

- regarding the rear of the John Lewis store, this would be the site of the customer collect area and the design of this would be brought back to Panel

#### Car park and highways

- that the aim was for the car park to be of the same design quality as the John Lewis store however, the budget for the cladding of the car park was less than that for the store and that it was not as easy to work with a small budget and for it to look the same and that a different model was being considered with interest being introduced through other elements
- in terms of the operation of the car park, John Lewis required tickets and machines, with these being located far into the car park to allow for queuing traffic to be within the car park. The car park would provide 600 car parking spaces and the volume of traffic would be controlled going in by ramps, and exiting by traffic lights, so it was felt there would not be queuing traffic on the highway
- in respect of the car park exit, work had been undertaken with highways over a long period of time with Members being informed that the developer was confident that a solution had been found which works both on entering and exiting the car park
- regarding the quality of the car park, as Hammersons were the largest retail owner in the UK, they knew how to build, manage and run car parks; the aim was for this car park to be the one of choice and there was a commitment to delivering the best car park in Leeds
- in respect of the massing and wrapping of the car park, every option had been considered, including a basement or roof top car park. The problem of integrating the car park into the John Lewis store was that it would create a building which would be overbearing
- that Members' comments about the car park were noted and the developer was mindful that the car park had to be a building of high quality

The Chief Planning Officer referred to the issues which had been raised about the scheme and the phasing and stated that if the whole of the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter was fully built out from the start, this could result in Trinity experiencing some empty shop units, whereas by phasing the development, prime and unique shops would be delivered in the first phase. This could only be seen as an economic advantage and adding to the prestige of the city and that Leeds was in a privileged position in respect of this scheme and that it was important for everyone to support the scheme

In summing up the debate, the Chair provided the following comments:

- that Panel understood the changes proposed to the scheme
- that the external design of the car park was a vital component of the whole scheme

- that concerns remained about how the car park would operate and that it must not lead to queuing traffic
- that Members were pleased with the relationship of the scheme to both the Victoria Quarter and the markets and that the proposed new arcades were welcomed

**51 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

## Joint Plans Panel

Wednesday, 5th December, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson,  
J Bentley, D Blackburn, C Campbell,  
D Congreve, M Coulson, R Finnigan,  
R Grahame, C Gruen, P Gruen,  
S Hamilton, J Hardy, R Harington,  
J Harper, G Latty, T Leadley, J Lewis,  
C Macniven, A McKenna, J McKenna,  
T Murray, B Selby, E Taylor, P Truswell,  
J Walker and N Walshaw

### 11 Election of the Chair

The nomination of Councillor Taggart as Chair of the meeting was seconded and supported by the Panel

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor Taggart be elected Chair of the meeting

### 12 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda however Members were in receipt of a copy of the “Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters” despatched as a supplementary document to Agenda item 11 after the agenda (minute 19 refers)

### 13 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

### 14 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harland, G Latty, J Procter, Nash, Towler and Wood

### 15 Minutes of the last meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 28th June 2012 be agreed as a correct record

### 16 Performance Management Report for Planning Services for Quarters 1 and 2, April to September 2012

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out the performance management report for Planning Services during Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 (April to September) 2012 and presented a brief outline of the implications of the measures contained in the Growth and Infrastructure Bill introduced as part of the governments’ planning reform agenda.

The Head of Planning Services summarised the key performance, service improvement issues and challenges contained in the report, including the following significant matters:

Performance targets – noted the good progress made against the target for the determination of minor and “other” applications. Progress was also being made in respect of reducing out of time applications and improving performance in dealing with major applications. It was noted that Leeds’ performance compared favourably with other Core Cities. Members requested more detail on the instances of delays caused by the failure to complete S106 Agreements.

Planning Guarantee – Consultation on the Planning Guarantee commenced on 27 November 2012 with two main themes for consideration being a proposed power for applicants to submit an application directly to the Secretary of State if the Local Planning Authority (LPA) was deemed to perform poorly; and the provision for an LPA to refund application fees if an application remained undetermined after 26 weeks.

The Head of Planning Services referred to paragraph 16 of the Consultation document, highlighting the opportunity for an LPA and applicant to agree a timescale for the determination of an application after it had been submitted, thus removing the application from the performance criteria. The Panel noted the suggested indicators of poor performance (20% of all major decisions overturned at appeal within a 2 year period and 30% fewer major applications determined within the statutory period over a two year timescale) and that Leeds currently is determining 57% of major applications within the statutory period in 2012/13.

The Panel further discussed the measures set out in the Consultation and expressed concern over the following issues:

- the weight to be apportioned to Neighbourhood Planning Documents, given the measures included within the Bill
- the proposals for application fees to be refunded and the impact this would have on the ability of LPAs to deliver a service
- the proposals to amend Permitted Development Rights in terms of size, scale and nature of extensions and the likely impact the proposals would have on neighbourhoods
- proposals to review the earlier consultation response to proposals to allow conversion of office units to residential
- those applications to be included within the Performance Indicators, particularly applications with a Holding Direction from a Government Department or Statutory Consultee.

Overall Members and officers expressed significant concerns that measures in the Bill would not support local plans or local decision making and some proposals could even discourage the good working relationships already established between LPA’s and developers. It was felt that an LPA could be forced to make a decision within 26 weeks in order to avoid refunding the application fee and this could lead to an increase in the number of refusals or an increased risk of poor quality schemes because insufficient time had been given to resolve all outstanding issues.

(Councillor Fox joined the meeting at this point and Councillor Campbell withdrew from the meeting for a short time at this point)

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and the comments made by Members, be noted
- b) To request a further performance report be submitted in six months time

**17 Planning Update - Core Strategy, Community Infrastructure Levy and Site Allocation**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report updating Members on three significant areas of work for Planning Services, namely the Core Strategy, Community Infrastructure Levy and Site Allocation. The Deputy Chief Planning Officer summarised the present position on each as follows:  
Core Strategy – Consultation on a number of pre-submission revisions would commence on 17 December 2012

Site Allocations Development Plan Document - Preliminary work had commenced with local ward Councillor consultations being arranged throughout January/February 2013. Development Plan Panel would consider the findings prior to making recommendations to Executive Board

(Councillor Leadley joined the meeting at this point)

Community Infrastructure Levy – Briefings had been arranged for December 2012 to discuss the implications of the CIL and its relationship with Section 106 agreements. Again, Development Plan Panel would consider the detail prior to making recommendations to Executive Board.

Members further commented on:

- the disparity between the views of Executive Board and Scrutiny Board on the amount of CIL which could be ring-fenced for spending in the local area
- the resistance to CIL from some neighbourhoods which expressed concern that their area would not benefit from the new scheme
- the likely impact of CIL on the number of viability assessments and subsequently the number of applications seeking LCC support for infrastructure to support developments.

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the update and the progress made so far in these significant areas of work

**18 Determining Planning Applications where the Council has a Financial Interest**

The Panel considered the report of the City Solicitor relating to the ability of the Council as Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications where the outcome has a financial implication for the Council.

The Section Head (Legal Services-Development) highlighted the guidance contained in the report, particularly the need to demonstrate a fair process had been followed during the determination process and the need to ensure that reports clearly distinguish material and non-material planning considerations.

Members discussed circumstances where prior agreements may have been reached between LCC and prospective developers and noted the response that the content of those agreements may not be a material planning matter but could be reasonably regarded as background information. Such instances

reiterated the need for officer reports to clarify material and non-material planning matters. Members also recalled instances when they felt pressure had been brought to bear on a Panel because of LCC prior involvement in development proposals – such as new schools or transport improvements – and felt it necessary to reiterate that Plans Panel determinations were made solely on the planning matters before them

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the report and the discussions

**19 Review of the Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report informing Members of the changes to the Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters following the implementation of measures contained in the Localism Act 2011. Standards and Conduct Committee had approved the new Code in July 2012 and now sought a further review of the document. A copy of the Code of Practice was contained in Appendix 1 of the report

The report also set out proposals to replace the Code with a new guidance document of planning good practice which would be owned by Joint Plans Panel with appropriate review and amendment arrangements, rather than feature in the Council's own Conduct Framework.

Members broadly supported the proposed approach. Further discussion followed on issues arising from the Member training sessions, currently led by an external provider for the compulsory update and with a series of West Yorkshire events, the latest of which involved health issues and minimum space standards for housing. Whilst there was some concern expressed about the content there was an acknowledgement of the value of region wide training sessions where councillors could share experience and set their own locality in wider context.

The Panel agreed that a review of the training offer be undertaken and discussed by the Joint Member Officer Working Group in the first instance

**RESOLVED** –

- a) To note the revised Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters
- b) To request that officers draft further amendments to the Code for consideration by the Planning Joint Member Officer Working Group in the first instance
- c) That a review of the training offer be undertaken and discussed by the Joint Member Officer Working Group in the first instance

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 29th October, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor Dunn in the Chair

Councillors N Buckley and G Hussain

### 83 Election of the Chair

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor Dunn be elected Chair for the duration of the meeting.

### 84 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

Councillor Hussain declared a significant interest in this item on the basis that the applicant was known to him.

### 85 "Apple International Foodstore" - Application for the grant of a premises licence in respect of Apple International Foods, 292 Cross Flatts Grove, Cross Flatts LS11 7BS

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 Apple International Foods, 292 Cross Flatts Grove, Cross Flatts, LS11 7BS.

A representation had been submitted by West Yorkshire Police, however the measures proposed had been agreed by the applicant and the representation subsequently withdrawn.

The Sub Committee had also received representations from 3 objectors and a local Ward Councillor.

The following representatives attended the hearing:

- Mr Uddin, Designated Premises Supervisor
- Mr Digwa, Applicant's representative
- Mr and Mrs Burton, Objectors
- Councillor Gabriel, Ward Member (Beeston and Holbeck).

Mr Digwa addressed the Sub-Committee and made the following points:

- The applicant had been trading at the premises for 2 years. There had been no issues of anti-social behaviour at the premises during that time.
- The premises consisted of a self-closing door. Signs had been displayed requesting customers to leave the premises quietly.
- Measures had been agreed with West Yorkshire Police, which included installation of CCTV.
- Confirmation that a proof of age check 21 policy was in place.
- A litterbin was being provided outside the premises.

Mr Burton addressed the Sub-Committee and raised the following concerns:

Final Minutes

- Concern about the saturation of takeaways on Dewsbury Road.
- Issues in relation to noise disturbance and littering.
- Potential for anti-social behaviour, particularly youths congregating outside the premises.

Councillor Gabriel addressed the Sub-Committee and raised the following concerns:

- Concern about the lack of parking outside the premises.
- The South (Inner) Area Committee funded projects that discouraged young people from drinking alcohol. Approval of this application undermined the positive work that had been undertaken.
- The store was situated in a residential area.

The Sub Committee then carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions and made the following decision:

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application, subject to conditions.

(The hearing concluded at 11.00am.)

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 5th November, 2012

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

Councillors T Hanley and B Selby

**86 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor B Gettings be appointed Chair for the hearing.

**87 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

No declarations were made.

**88 Application to vary a premises licence held by McDonalds Restaurants Ltd, 38 Butt Lane, Farnley, Leeds, LS12 5AZ**

The report of the Head of Licensing and Registration introduced an application to vary a premises licence held by McDonald's Restaurants Ltd, 38 Butt Lane, Farnley, Leeds, LS12 5AZ.

Responsible authorities and Ward Members had been notified of the application and it had attracted representations from other persons and a responsible authority. Prior to the hearing, agreement had been made with the responsible authority that had made a representation.

It was reported that the application requested to vary the hours for the provision of late night refreshment from 23:00 to 05:00 every day.

The applicant's representative addressed the meeting and highlighted the following issues:

- With reference to concerns from a local resident regarding noise, it was reported that there were voluntary conditions to the license regarding this and agreement had been made with environmental protection. Staff would monitor noise levels and signage would be in place to remind customers not to cause a noise disturbance. Members were shown an aerial photograph of the premises and surrounding area which showed the distance from nearby residential properties.
- The car park to the north of the site which was closer to residential properties would not be open between the hours of 23:30 and 05:00 and there would be no deliveries or waste collection between 22:00 and 08:00.
- Concerns regarding anti-social behaviour. There had been no incidents of anti-social behaviour since the last licence was approved and the establishment had a good relationship with local police and police community safety officers. Measures in place to prevent anti-social behaviour included CCTV and training of staff in security and safety matters.
- Concerns regarding vermin and litter – there was no evidence to support these concerns and the restaurant had a code of practice and carried out patrols in respect of litter.

A local Ward Member addressed the hearing on behalf of a local resident who had submitted a representation. He raised the following issues:

- Concerns regarding a beggar who had been outside the premises, these concerns had been discussed with the local PCSO.
- There was often litter strewn across the park area and it also blew over the area by the reservoir.
- Noise disturbance and its potential effect on wildlife at the reservoir. Members were informed that they would not be able to consider this issue as it did not form part of the initial objection.
- Concern that there had been incidents of cannabis smoking in the car park although it was acknowledged that the car park would be closed during the additional hours applied for.
- Concern of increased anti-social behaviour as patrons of a nearby public house would use the premises.
- In response to Members questions, he confirmed that he had witnessed the problems with litter, particularly on windy days and with regards to anti social behaviour that had been reports of people using offensive language.

In summary to the concerns raised, the applicant's representative reported that there were hourly patrols to check for litter and that outside bins were not full. With regards to the potential for anti-social behaviour it was reported that the nearby public house had closed down.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted as applied for.

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 12th November, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Townsley in the Chair

Councillors P Latty and B Selby

### 89 Election of the Chair

**RESOLVED** - That Councillor C Townsley be elected Chair for the duration of the meeting.

### 90 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:

- a) Appendix A, C and D to Agenda item 6, (Minute 96 refers) under the provisions of Paragraph 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 documents as they pertain to an individual and that person would reasonably not expect their personal information or discussions to be in the public domain and there is reference to action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime
- b) Appendix C and Supplementary update to Agenda item 7, (Minute 97 refers) under the provisions of Paragraph 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 documents as they pertain to an individual and that person would reasonably not expect their personal information or discussions to be in the public domain and there is reference to action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime

### 91 Late Items

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Revised covering report of the Head of Licensing and Registration – Application for the grant of a Personal Licence for Mr Sam Donnelly (Agenda Item 6) (Minute 96 refers)

- Copy of an e mail of further representation from West Yorkshire Police received on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2012 – Application to vary a Premises Licence held by Whinmoor (Agenda Item 7) (Minute 97 refers)

**92 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

**93 Application for the grant of a Personal Licence for Mr Sam Donnelly**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance the Authority's own Statement of Licensing Policy considered an application for the grant of a personal licence for Mr Sam Donnelly.

A revised covering report of the Head of Licensing and Registration on an application for the grant of a Personal Licence for Mr Sam Donnelly was circulated at the meeting as Supplementary information.

Representations had been received from West Yorkshire Police.

Present at the hearing were:

PC L Dobson – West Yorkshire Police

The Entertainment Licensing Officer informed the meeting that Ms Rebecca Collings, the applicant's supporter had conveyed her apologies due a pregnancy related issue.

As a result the applicant had requested an adjournment of the hearing.

Members of the Licensing Sub Committee and the representative from West Yorkshire Police raised no objection to this request.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be adjourned until 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

**94 Application to vary a premises licence held by Whinmoor, Stanks Lane South, Leeds LS14 5HZ to specify an individual as designated premises supervisor**

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 a premises licence held by Whinmoor, Stanks Lane South, Leeds LS14 5HZ to specify an individual as designated premises supervisor.

A copy of an e mail of further representation from West Yorkshire Police received on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2012 in relation to an application to vary a Premises Licence held by Whinmoor was circulated at the meeting as Supplementary information.

Representations had been received from West Yorkshire Police.

Present at the hearing were:

Mr Hing How – the applicant

Mr Kenneth Greenhough – Proposed Designated Premises Supervisor

PC L Dobson – West Yorkshire Police

PC S Dawson – West Yorkshire Police

Catherine Sanderson – West Yorkshire Police (Observer)

The applicant addressed the Sub Committee and, in summary, made the following points:

- The continuing discussions held between his solicitor, planning authority and himself regarding change of leasehold of the premises as a community facility
- The history behind the premises which had been derelict for the past two years and subject to vandalism
- The intention to run the premises as a public house with a tap room and carvery facility in the evening
- The history behind his employment as a baker, by trade, and on his decision to invite Mr Greenhough to run the premises in view of his previous experience in the licensing industry

The proposed Designated Premises Supervisor then addressed the Sub Committee, and in, summary, made the following points:

- The willingness to run the premises as a family/ friendly public house
- The research undertaken in relation to the Pubwatch scheme and the intention to recruit private members in an attempt to reduce any crime an disorder at the premises

Questions were then invited and the following points raised:

- Clarification as to why Mr Greenhough had failed to reply to two registered letters sent by the police on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012 in relation his previous position as Designated Premises Supervisor at Wyke Rose in Bradford
- Clarification of Mr Greenhough's current home address and previous employment as a Designated Premises Supervisor
- Clarification of the National Pubwatch scheme with specific reference to the protocol for barred (expired) customers

The Sub Committee heard from PC L Dobson of West Yorkshire Police and in, summary, made the following points:

- The previous discussions held on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2012 between Mr How and the police on his proposals for the premises
- The concerns expressed that Mr How did not have a background in the licensed trade

- The outcome of discussions held with Bradford Licensing Officer in relation to Mr Greenhough's previous position as Designated Premises Supervisor regarding Anti Social Behaviour and disorder at Wyke Rose, Wyke, Bradford
- The e mail evidence submitted in relation to a 'glassing' incident at the premises held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and of the fact that the police were currently investigating two assaults
- The view expressed that based on the evidence produced, Mr Greenhough was not suitable to be a Designated Premises Supervisor at the premises
- That, if granted, the exceptional circumstances of the case would undermine the crime prevention objective

The Sub-Committee then heard from PC S Dawson of West Yorkshire Police who provided the meeting with a brief summary of the issues and concerns in relation to Mr Greenhough's previous position as Designated Premises Supervisor regarding Anti Social Behaviour and disorder at Wyke Rose, Wyke, Bradford. Specific reference was also made to drug abuse found at the premises on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2012, together with the background issues regarding Mr Greenhough failure to reply to two registered letters sent by the police on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012.

Questions were then invited and the following points raised:

- Further clarification sought behind the reasons as to why Mr Greenhough had failed to reply to two registered letters sent by the police on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012
- Clarification of the outcome of the drugs raid made at Wyke Rose on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2012
- Clarification of the working relationship between Mr Greenhough and the Manager of Wyke Rose
- Clarification of the date when Mr How offered Mr Greenhough the position as Designated Premises Supervisor at Whinmoor and the reasons why Mr Greenhough left his position as Designated Premises Supervisor at Wyke Rose
- Clarification of the distance in mileage from Mr Greenhough's rented property in Bradford to Whinmoor

The applicant and the proposed Designated Premises Supervisor summed up.

The Sub-Committee then carefully considered all the written and verbal submissions and made the following decision:

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted, subject to the following condition:

- The Designated Premises Supervisor must be on the premises and residing there Friday, Saturday and Sunday night and all bank holidays, except for annual leave when West Yorkshire Police must be given 10 days prior notice

and in the case of an emergency, West Yorkshire Police must be informed immediately

(The meeting concluded at 11.45am)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 19th November, 2012

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

Councillors G Wilkinson and C Townsley

**95 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Gettings was elected Chair of the meeting

**96 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

**97 "Northbar" - Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Northbar, 468 Roundhay Road, Leeds LS8 2HU**

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 Northbar, 468 Roundhay Road, Leeds LS8 2HU.

Several letters of representation had been received from the public – one in objection and five in support of the application. None of the members of the public who had submitted a representation attended the hearing and the Sub Committee resolved to proceed in their absence and consider their written submission. No representations had been submitted by the responsible authorities; however an amendment had been made to the requested hours of operation of the licence following discussions with LCC Environmental Protection Team. These were clarified at the start of the hearing as being Monday to Wednesday 11:30 am until 23:00 hours; Thursday to Saturday 11:30 until 23:30 hours and Sundays 11:30 until 22:30 hours for the provision of licensable activities. The premises to close 30 minutes later

Mr J Gyngell, the applicant, attended the hearing. Mr J Carter also attended to observe the proceedings.

Mr Gyngell outlined the proposed style of operation and capacity of the premises and the experience of the management team in managing similar premises in similar localities. He addressed the comments made in the letter of objection regarding anti social behaviour, litter, noise and the impact of licensed premises and provided assurances regarding the management of such issues. The Sub Committee also heard evidence relating to the demographic of the patrons.

Members noted the intention to make use of the external area to the front of the premises as an additional seating area and discussed the necessary permit applications with the applicant

The Sub Committee carefully considered the contents of the application, the written representations and the verbal submissions made at the hearing.

Members were very satisfied with the presentation made by the applicants and the explanations offered in respect of the issues raised. The Sub Committee considered that this applicant had significant previous experience of managing such premises and

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application as amended.

## **Licensing Sub-Committee**

**Monday, 26th November, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor R Downes in the Chair

Councillors K Bruce and C Townsley

### **98 Election of the Chair**

Councillor Downes was elected Chair of the meeting

### **99 Late Items**

Although there were no formal late items, the Sub-Committee were in receipt of the following additional information which had been made available in advance of the meeting:

Further written information from the applicant; LCC Environmental Protection Team (EPT) and a local resident (minute 101 refers)

### **100 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

No disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests were declared

### **101 "Village Hotel" - Application for the grant of a Premises Licence for Land within the grounds of and adjacent to the Village Hotel, Capitol Boulevard (Marquee), Leeds LS27 0TS**

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 De Vere Village Trading, Village Hotel South Leeds, Capitol Boulevard, Tingley LS27

Representations had been received from LCC EPT, although Members were informed that these had been withdrawn following agreement by the applicant to a condition of inaudibility. Representations had also been received from local residents. As no residents were in attendance, the Sub-Committee agreed to deal with the issues raised by residents on the basis of their written representations

Present at the hearing were:

Mr Williams – applicant's solicitor

Mr Hartley – Designated Premises Supervisor

Ms Julian – Sales Manager

Also present were Mr Kenny an officer within the Environmental Protection Team and his colleague, Ms Turner, who was observing the proceedings. The Chair advised that as EPT had withdrawn their objection to the application, they were not a party and had no right to address the hearing, however the Sub-Committee could seek clarification or technical advice from Mr Kenny, if that was required

The Licensing Officer presented the application and stated that this had been amended to show a finish time of 00:30 hours for licensable activities and a closing

time of 01:00 hours. Further discussions had also taken place in view of the planning consent which had been recently granted and the Sub-Committee was informed that the application would be amended further to a time limited licence valid for six weeks from the date of the hearing to 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2013, with the proposed marquee being removed by 6<sup>th</sup> January 2013

The Sub-Committee then heard from Mr Williams, the applicant's solicitor, who confirmed that the application to erect a marquee in the grounds of the hotel would be amended to a six week period. The purpose of this was to provide additional function space as there was insufficient space for the events the hotel wished to hold over the Christmas and New Year period

Members were informed that the marquee would hold a maximum of 435 people and that the events to be held there would include DJs, live music and tribute acts.

Mr Williams acknowledged that there were nearby residential properties on Topcliffe Lane and Aspen Court and that representations had been received from local residents. To address these issues, the hotel had engaged acoustic consultants early in the process and the report before Members included the acoustic report which had indicated that due to the location of the hotel, the overwhelming noise in the area was from the motorway. The siting of the marquee and the position of Aspen Court in relation to the hotel was likely to prevent these residents from experiencing noise disturbance. The report stated that if the sound from the marquee was limited to 95 decibels, then the noise at the nearest noise sensitive premises in Topcliffe Lane would be lower than the ambient noise from the motorway. Members were informed that it was not the intention that 95 decibels would be exceeded and that a noise limiter had been purchased by the hotel which would clearly indicate to performers the sound level which could not be exceeded

Agreement had been reached by the applicant and LCC EPT on a condition of inaudibility which was tighter than that required under the planning consent which had set out the 95 decibel limit. Taken together, the applicant was confident that they had addressed any problem or potential noise breakout

Concerning possible noise nuisance related to the dispersal of patrons, Mr Williams stated that it was unlikely that people attending these events would drive home and that special room rates in the hotel were being offered to encourage people to stay overnight. In addition, arrangements had been made with a local taxi firm as an alternative option for those people not wishing to stay at the hotel

In response to a question from the Sub-Committee, Mr Hartley, the DPS, stated that temporary arrangements had been put in place for overspill parking to deter patrons from parking on nearby residential streets and that these parking areas would be clearly signed and marshalled, if necessary

Regarding concerns raised by local residents in their written representations, Members were informed that there had been an event held in the car park to celebrate the hotel's first year of opening, in September 2010. This had been a family fun day and local bands had performed on a stage. The Licensing Officer confirmed this and that no other complaints had been received

Mr Williams stated that as the application had now been amended to a six-week period over the festive season this would not be seen as carte blanche to affect local residents. In the event that the hotel wished to pursue a similar venture next year, a fresh application would be required and if residents' fears were realised,

there would be the opportunity for them to make representations which could be taken into account by the Licensing Sub-Committee

The Sub-Committee carefully considered both the written and verbal representations from the applicant and had regard to the written objections from local residents

Members were extremely concerned about the potential impact of the proposals on local residents but having regard to the time limited nature of the application now before them; the acoustic report; the agreement reached with LCC EPT and the requirement for there to be no noise audible from licensable activities at the premises, at the nearest noise sensitive premises at Topcliffe Lane Morley, the Sub-Committee decided to grant the application with additional conditions imposed to promote the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance; these being:

1. The marquee to be erected to be of the type specified in the acoustic report
2. The requirements set out in the acoustic report, page 34, paragraph 3, in respect of the location of the stage in the marquee and the sound insulation of this
3. If not a condition of the planning consent, a further condition requiring a noise limiter to be fitted and operative at all times when licensable activities were taking place

Although not part of the formal decision, the Sub-Committee required the Licensing Officer to write to local residents explaining the impact of the time limited nature of the licence and the process that would be followed in future years should further applications be made and that the letter should include contact numbers for residents to call in the events of any problems

Having heard the Sub-Committee's decision, Mr Williams sought clarification in respect of the requirement to re-site the stage and provide sound insulation as set out in paragraph 3 of the acoustic report (page 34 of the submitted papers), as this would be a requirement if a level of 95 decibels was exceeded and it was not the applicant's intention for this to occur

Members discussed this matter further in private session and concluded that the decision was a finely balanced one. The acoustic report had to be taken at face value by Members and that the measures to be implemented would produce the intended outcome. However, having taken into account all the information provided, it was the decision of the Sub-Committee to grant the application subject to conditions but not to require the matters dealt with in paragraph 3 of the acoustic report (page 34 of the submitted papers), although the marquee to be erected should be of the type set out in that report

**RESOLVED** - To grant the application, as amended and subject to additional conditions 1 and 3 as set out above

## **102 "Pizza Bella" - Application to vary a premises licence in respect of Pizza Bella, 32 Market place, Wetherby Leeds LS22 6NE**

The Sub-Committee, having regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Authority's own Licensing Policy, considered a an

application to vary a premises licence held in respect of Pizza Bella, 32 Market Place, Wetherby LS22

Representations had been received from LCC EPT and from Wetherby Town Council and Collingham with Linton Parish Council. It was noted that no representatives of either the Town or Parish Council were in attendance and the Sub-Committee decided to proceed taking into account their written representations. However part of the representations related to concerns about an extension of time for alcohol deliveries: as this was not part of the application, the Sub-Committee did not consider the representations raised about this aspect

Present at the hearing were:

Altin – the applicant – represented by Mr Akif and Mr Samil  
Mr Kenny – LCC EPT  
Ms Turner – LCC EPT (observing)

Mr Akif explained that this was a family run business and was situated in the basement of the premises. An extension to the opening hours was being sought for weekends as this was the busiest time and that patrons were requesting longer opening hours. As the local pubs closed around 00.45 hours, the trade was there which was the reason for requesting a closing time of 02.00am on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Members noted that an extension to 03.00am was being sought for Christmas Eve and the comments of the applicant that he would be willing to give up both the ability to serve alcohol by delivery and the Christmas Eve extension in order to secure the additional hours on a weekend

Members were informed that Altin had been in business for seven years and there were no problems with noise or bad behaviour in the area caused by the business

The Sub-Committee then heard from Mr Kenny of the Environmental Protection Team who stated that the premises were situated in a quiet market town, close to residential properties, although no objections to the application had been received from local residents

EPT's concerns related to the possibility that extending the hours of operation of the premises could lead to it becoming a focal point for patrons leaving the local pubs, which in turn could result in people congregating/ queuing at the premises with the potential for noise and disturbance which was difficult to manage. Extending the opening hours to 02.00am could also set a precedent and could lead to further applications coming forward

In responding to the points made by EPT, Mr Akil stated that CCTV was installed in the premises and that there was another takeaway premises in the area which opened until 01.00am

The Sub-Committee carefully considered both the written and verbal representations from the applicant and LCC EPT and the relevant aspects of the written representations from Wetherby Town Council and Collingham with Linton Parish Council

The Sub-Committee noted the concerns raised about potential public nuisance and determined to grant the license but only until 01:00am on Friday, Saturday and Sunday and on Christmas Eve until 02:00am. In reaching this

decision Members noted the absence of objections from the police or local residents to identify there were existing problems with the night-time economy in Wetherby. Although potential problems had been identified, by restricting the licensing hours to 01:00am, it was felt this would prevent any potential problems for occurring

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted, as set out above

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Licensing Sub-Committee**

**Tuesday, 4th December, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Townsley in the Chair  
Councillors A Khan and G Wilkinson

### **103 Election of the Chair**

Councillor Townsley was elected Chair of the meeting

### **104 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 of exempt information so designated as follows:

- a) Appendix D of the submitted report 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 documents as they contain information relating to action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime
- b) 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

### **105 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **106 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests

### **107 Review of the Premises Licence for "Phono", 174 Lower Briggate, Leeds, LS1 6DT**

The Licensing Sub-Committee considered an application made by West Yorkshire Police under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the review of a Premises Licence in respect of Phono, 174 Lower Briggate LS1. It was noted that the application was originally scheduled for hearing on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2012, but following agreements between West Yorkshire Police and the Premises Licence

Holder, the hearing was adjourned to allow the new management team further time to satisfy West Yorkshire Police that they were promoting the licensing objectives

Present at the hearing were:

Sgt Fullilove – West Yorkshire Police  
Mr Whur – Legal representative for the Premises Licence Holder  
Mr Nathan-Geary – Representative for the Premises Licence Holder  
Mr Kowiak – Member of Phono's Management Team  
Mr Baxter – Designated Premises Supervisor – Phono  
Mr Grinion – Protech Security  
Mr Dyson – Protech Security

The Licensing Officer presented the report; outlined the activities and operating hours permitted in the premises licence and the steps the Sub-Committee could take when determining the review

The Licensing Sub-Committee then heard from Sgt Fullilove who stated that the review had been brought at the request of a Senior Police Officer, following several incidents, up to and including incidents on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> July 2012. Since that time the Premises Licence Holder had addressed issues at the premises through bringing in new management and a new Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) and that whatever the outcome of the review, Members were informed that West Yorkshire Police would work with the Licence Holder and his management team for the benefit of both parties

Sgt Fullilove briefly outlined the concerns which had led to the review being brought and which were documented in the submitted report. Members were informed that West Yorkshire Police had now only one remaining concern and that this related to the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance. Incidents of people attempting to gain entry to the premises in the early hours of the morning were occurring, with many of these taking place after 04:00, having been reported by door staff at the premises

West Yorkshire Police had concerns about this as the previous management at the premises had a connection with a particular client base which had sought to gain entry to the premises, and it was felt that this same client base were continuing to seek admittance to Phono and other premises in the area, with concerns that they did not bring anything positive to the venues they sought to be admitted to. The Police were also concerned about why the premises remained an attraction to this group, despite the change of management at Phono

Another concern to West Yorkshire Police was the recruitment of a member of staff who had experienced serious problems when employed at another venue in the city and that there was a lack of clarity about the role of this person at the premises, in view of recent visits by the Police to Phono. Whilst this issue was ultimately a matter for the management team at the premises, concerns remained in view of previous difficulties which had occurred involving this person

Sgt Fullilove also referred to traces of drugs which had been found on a police visit in November. The traces had been found in what was believed to be the staff toilet, although it had been stated that this was the disabled toilet. A routine Police visit on Saturday 1<sup>st</sup> December found traces of drugs in the men's toilet but the

disabled toilet was not able to be inspected as the Police were informed that the key could not be located

To address the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance, West Yorkshire Police requested a reduction in the trading hours of the premises, with an extra condition being imposed that the last customer to be admitted no later than 03:00; to cease licensable activities at 04:00 and for the doors to be closed at 04:30 hours, with Members being informed that this was considered to be reasonable and proportionate

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, Sgt Fullilove confirmed that the problems which had occurred with the previous management about the CCTV were no longer an issue with the current management team and that there had not been any further incidents at the premises since the last one detailed in the submitted report, which had occurred on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2012

The Licensing Sub-Committee then heard from Mr Whur, on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder who sought clarification from Sgt Fullilove as to whether the sliding scale of incidents which could lead to an application for a review hearing remained in operation, and if so, whether Phono, since its new management had taken over, would have triggered a review. Sgt Fullilove confirmed that this 'traffic light' system was still being used and that since the current management team had been operating at the premises, a review would not have been triggered on the basis of the incidents which had been logged

Mr Whur referred to a meeting between West Yorkshire Police and the Premises Licence Holder which had taken place on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2012, where no further requirements in respect of the premises licence had been made by the police

Members were informed that Ravenpine Ltd as premises licence holder was a family-based company which had positively addressed the previous problems which had led to the review being brought. It was felt that the previous issues had been due to the use of an external promoter who was no longer affiliated to the premises. Time had been taken to find a new management team and the DPS, Mr Baxter, had been carefully selected, that he was experienced and was also a trainer of door staff

When the application for a review of the premises license was made, time was sought for the new management at Phono to build bridges and develop a relationship with the police, which had occurred

The premises operated with stringent levels of control through the use of regular and SIA registered door supervisors. Whilst there was the view that a particular group of people were trying to gain admittance to the premises, these incidents were being reported to the police. To further distance Phono from its previous problems, there would be a re-branding of the premises and its name would be changed in January 2013

Regarding the comments made by Sgt Fullilove, about a member of staff, these issues had been discussed with Mr Nathan-Geary and Mr Baxter who were supportive of their employee. In addressing the point raised by Sgt Fullilove, this person's role at the premises was clarified at the hearing

In relation to the points raised about the toilets at the premises, it was confirmed that the key to the disabled toilet was not available on Saturday 1<sup>st</sup> December 2012, and that Mr Baxter, who had not been on duty at the time, would take this issue up. The Licensing Sub-Committee was informed that management at the premises did not accept that staff were taking drugs; that a strict search policy

existed, which included staff and that random searches were also undertaken on staff, and that this policy was made clear at the induction process

The toilets had been reconfigured and that an attendant was present in the men's toilets, however, it was accepted that despite the rigorous searches which took place on customers entering the premises, there were ways in which substances could be brought in, undetected, and that it was likely that traces of drugs would be found in most premises

Concerning the management's relationship with the Police, Mr Whur stated that this had developed and that the level of contact which now existed would be maintained

Mr Whur referred to paragraphs 11.21, 11.22 and 11.24 of the Section 182 guidance, in respect of reviews and stated that the work done by the premises licence holder to address the previous problems was the most appropriate response and that this had occurred. To reduce the hours would be disproportionate in view of all the measures which had been taken by the new management team to deal with the previous issues

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, it was stated that the capacity of the premises was 450; that by 8am at weekends, there were usually only around 20-30 customers on the premises; that a person named in the papers was no longer employed at the premises and there would be an impact of reducing the operating hours as requested by West Yorkshire Police. The reasons for this were that venues in close proximity opened similar hours to Phono and that was what the public expected; also customers would be unlikely to pay a door fee to enter premises which closed early. Whilst accepting the problems which occurred when an external operator was used, the events which had been organised at the premises had proved popular and that since this operator's removal, there had been a loss of revenue, which would be compounded if the opening hours were reduced

In summing up, Sgt Fullilove stated there was some anecdotal evidence that some of the client base which were causing concerns, were being allowed to enter the premises, to alleviate problems which were occurring. There were also issues about the validity of the calls for the police to attend at the premises. Mr Whur highlighted the issue of proportionality and balance and highlighted the experience of the DPS and the good working relationship with the Police which would be maintained

The Licensing Sub-Committee carefully considered the written representations from West Yorkshire Police and heard from the Police and the Premises Licence Holder's legal representative

The Licensing Sub-Committee acknowledged the seriousness of the incidents which had taken place at the premises in the past and considered that the review had been correctly sought. Members noted that the Premises Licence Holder had taken control of the problems at the premises and had replaced the Designated Premises Supervisor and the management team

Both parties accepted that there was a problem with people trying to gain entry to the premises in the early hours of the morning and the Licensing Sub-Committee imposed an additional condition that there were to be no admission to the premises after 04:00 on any night of the week

Members were also pleased to see that there was a working relationship developing between West Yorkshire Police, the Premises Licence Holder and the management team at the premises

**RESOLVED** - To impose a further condition on the licence in respect of no further admission to the premises after 04:00 on any night of the week

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 10th December, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Hyde in the Chair

Councillors B Gettings and T Hanley

**108 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Hyde was elected Chair of the meeting

**109 Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda, however the Licensing Authority was in receipt of an additional submission in respect of the application at Minute 111 below

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

Members being in receipt of the late submission (minute 109 above refers) noted that Appendices A C D and E of the report were marked exempt under the provisions of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (1) and Paragraph 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings Regulations 2005). However in the circumstances it was not necessary to exclude the public from the meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That in the circumstances, the public be not excluded from the meeting

**111 Application for the Grant of a Personal Licence for Mr Sam Donnelly (10.4 (1))**

It was reported that Mr Donnelly had submitted documentation just prior to the hearing formally notifying the Licensing Authority of his withdrawal of the application for a Personal Licence.

Due to the short notice, it had not been possible to notify members of the Sub Committee prior to the commencement of the hearing. A copy of the email correspondence was tabled for Members reference

**RESOLVED** – To note the withdrawal of the application

This page is intentionally left blank

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Monday, 17th December, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor Asghar Khan in the Chair

Councillors B Gettings and N Buckley

**112 Election of the Chair**

Councillor A Khan was elected as Chair.

**113 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

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

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

**115 Late Items**

There were no formal late items added to the agenda. However Members received a letter from West Yorkshire Police confirming they had withdrawn their representation.

**116 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations made.

**117 Application to vary a premises licence held by Co-operative Group Food Limited at Bradford Road, Tingley, Leeds, WF3 2DJ**

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 variation of a premises licence for the Co-operative Group Food Limited at Bradford Road, Tingley, Leeds, WF3 2DJ.

A representation had been received from Councillor L Mulherin, however she was not in attendance.

The hearing was attended by the following:

Richard Arnott – Representing the Co-op

Kurt Robinson – Manager at the Co-op

Mr Arnott addressed the Sub Committee highlighting that under Section 18 of the Act the representation made by Councillor Mulherin was not a relevant one and fell outside the four licensing objectives and that the application should therefore be dismissed.

Following this Mr Arnott highlighted the record and history of the Co-op in retail and the policies and procedures that are rigorously applied by the organisation, specifically in relation to sales of alcohol to the public. This includes state of the art computerised tills requiring the operator to give careful consideration to a customer's age.

Mr Arnott also described the lay out of the store and the number of cameras in place to help monitor the sale of alcohol.

It was confirmed to the Sub Committee that out of the 14 staff there would be five personal licence holders which was a high ratio.

Mr Arnott went on to stress that the application was for one extra hour in the morning which reflected the changes in the economy and the changes to peoples working hours over recent years which mean shops need to be more flexible to customer needs.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the agreements previously reached with West Yorkshire Police being incorporated into the licence. The Sub Committee noted the concerns raised by Councillor L Mulherin the objection apparently based on health grounds. However the application was from a good and responsible retailer.

## Development Plan Panel

Wednesday, 19th December, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, M Coulson, C Fox,  
T Leadley and J Lewis

### **58 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **59 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: Harrington, Campbell, Gruen, Mitchell and Walshaw.

### **60 Minutes - 26th September 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2012 be accepted as a true and correct record.

### **61 Matters Arising**

#### Minute 48. Late Items – Affordable Housing Threshold

Members questioned the progress made with regards to the wording in Policy H5.

**RESOLVED** – That the Director of City Development be requested to provide an update at the next meeting

#### Minute 52. LDF Core Strategy – Publication Draft, Analysis of Consultation Responses: Housing Policies H1 (Phasing), H2 (development on non allocated sites), H3 (Density), H4 (mix) and H8 (Independent Living)

Members questioned the Policy H3 and what the logic behind and that it was essential that this policy was correctly drafted.

**RESOLVED** – That the Director of City Development be requested to review the wording of policy H3.

## **62 Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document - Inspector's Report**

The Director of City Development submitted a report presenting the Inspectors report which concluded the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (DPD) was sound and subsequently sought formal Adoption of the Plan by the City Council.

Members welcomed the document commenting that this was a comprehensive report that would stand up to scrutiny.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) To note the Inspectors report;
- (b) To recommend to full Council that the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document pursuant to Section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 be adopted.

## **63 Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy - Results from the Leeds Economic Viability Study**

The Director of City Development submitted a report which provided an overview of the findings and recommendations of the Economic Viability Study undertaken by consultants GVA as the key evidence base for the development of the CIL (Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy) for Leeds.

Members considered the report in detail. Initially discussion took place on the size of houses being built and the links in terms of Council Tax Banding.

Members gave consideration to the different map zones used for different purposes in planning policy. Officers confirmed that once the CIL was adopted that the zones used for affordable housing policy would be updated.

Discussion also took place on the zoning of areas and how this had been arrived at.

Members raised concern about developers' desire to make profits and what if any influence they had on the CIL.

At this point in the meeting Members views were invited on the following issues:

- 1) whether different rates should be set on the zoned basis as outlined in paragraph three of the report – Members agreed that this was the basis that the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule should be proceeded with, including splitting the broad outer southern zone into two;

- 2) what the appropriate balance in setting the Leeds CIL should be and whether this rate of £10 below the rates in the Viability Study was appropriate – Members requested further explanation on this issue at the next Panel;
- 3) whether to set a nominal rate for all or some types of development which the Viability Study proposed as a zero charge – Members agreed that there should be a nominal charge;
- 4) Members views were invited on the detailed residential zone boundaries, in order to proceed with setting the OS map base for the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Members accepted the principle of the five zones and their general extent but considered that there would be a need to look again at the exact boundaries at the next Panel;
- 5) Whether to have an Instalments Policy for phased payments of the CIL charge – Members agreed that this should be proceeded with subject to details of the instalments being brought back to the Panel.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the information relating to the Economic Viability Study for the Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy be noted
- (b) That a further report be received setting out the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and the related evidence base
- (c) That the Director of City Development be requested to action the views of Members raised at points 1 – 5 above.

(Councillor Coulson left the meeting during discussion of this meeting at 2:45pm)

**64 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Corporate Governance and Audit Committee

Friday, 9th November, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor T Murray in the Chair  
Councillors P Grahame, N Taggart,  
J Elliott, T Hanley, C Fox, G Hussain,  
T Murray, R Wood, E Taylor, J Illingworth  
and J Bentley

### **27 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **28 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **29 Late Items**

There were no late items submitted to the agenda.

### **30 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests'**

There were no declarations made.

### **31 Apologies For Absence**

There were no apologies.

### **32 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were approved as a correct record.

### **33 Matters Arising**

#### Minute No. 21 Decision Making Framework; Annual Assurance Report

In response to Member queries about the arrangements for Licensing Decisions taken by officers it was confirmed by the Chief Officer (Audit and Risk) that this issue had not been considered by the Committee. Members agreed that this would be a piece of work that they would like to look further into.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to request a paper that considers the arrangements in place for licensing decisions taken by officers.

Minute No. 24 Report to those Charged with Governance from KPMG

Members sought to understand the arrangements that are in place when assets are transferred by the authority that appropriate due diligence processes are in place to ensure that those ‘receiving’ an asset have appropriate governance, insurance and financial management arrangements in place.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to request a report outlining the due diligence processes in place in respect of asset transfers.

**34 Internal Audit Report April to September 2012**

The Head of Internal Audit presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report provided a summary of Internal Audit activity for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April to 20<sup>th</sup> September 2012 and highlighted the incidence of significant control failings or weaknesses.

The Head of HR (Resources) was also in attendance.

Members discussed the report in detail, particularly in respect of:

- arrangements to ensure that CRB checks are in place for Private Hire and Hackney carriage drivers. Members being of the view that such checks should be undertaken on an annual basis in order to provide reassurance to the public;
- The capital programme central controls – particularly the extent to which Chief Officer approval is given (and where relevant Call In processes having expired) prior to a contractual commitment being given;
- the Head of Internal Audit confirmed that 734 cards have been issued and undertook to provide the additional information concerning use to the committee by way of correspondence;
- Overtime payments made by the Council, where the Head of HR (Resources) confirmed the arrangements for the payment of overtime to staff over scale point 29 and outlined the issues that had been identified in respect of compliance with those arrangements by recent Internal Audit work. Members expressed concern with the shortcomings identified by the audit, commenting that;
  1. it was unacceptable that staff had received payments contrary to the council’s policies;
  2. the rules governing planned overtime were out of date as they do not reflect modern working practices
  3. that the guidelines for claiming overtime appeared to have been not well enough communicated to managers and other staff.

Members were informed about the outcome of a Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services) report on overtime and agency staff, considered at the meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2012. The inquiry resolved, among other things, to support the improvement measure to set clearer guidelines and protocols on the use of overtime and agency staffing. Members were assured that this would be followed up by the Scrutiny Board and that the findings of Internal Audit would be taken into consideration.

- The apparent under-use of Council owned buildings by the public for community benefit. Members requested that Internal Audit undertake a Value For Money review of buildings owned by the Council to explore the scope for greater access and use by the public and community groups.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved:

- (a) To note the work undertaken by Internal Audit during the period covered by the report;
- (b) To inform the Chief Officer Democratic and Central Services of the views of this Committee with regards to taxi drivers obtaining an annual CRB check;
- (c) To note that Scrutiny Board Resources and Council Services will follow up their previous recommendation that HR set clear guidelines and protocols on the use of overtime and agency staff;
- (d) To request that HR liaise with Internal Audit to help ensure the revised guidelines and protocols address the control issues highlighted in the Internal Audit Report;
- (e) To note that the Head of Internal Audit will supply further details to Members with regards to which services are using purchasing cards; and
- (f) that Internal Audit conduct a VFM review of buildings owned by the Council.

### **35 KPMG report - Annual Audit Letter 2011/12**

The Senior Financial Manager (Corporate) presented a report of the Director of Resources which provided a summary of the key external audit findings in respect of the 2011/12 financial year.

Heather Garrett from KPMG was in attendance to answer Member questions.

It was noted that the report provided assurance that the consolidation pack for the Whole of Government Accounts produced by the Council was consistent with the audited financial statements.

Members considered the report asking the KPMG representative what if anything the Council needed to be concerned about in relation to its financial management. It was confirmed to Members that KPMG undertake a risk

assessment before each audit to ensure that any areas considered a risk are reviewed to establish that the controls in place are effective and complied with. It was also noted that KPMG have identified two key value for money risk areas; plans for assuming responsibility for public health on 1/4/13 and savings plans to achieve a balanced budget.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to note the conclusions and recommendations arising from the 2011/12 audit process.

### **36 Treasury Management Governance Report**

The Principal Finance Manager (Treasury Management) presented a report of the Director of Resources. The report outlined the governance framework for the management of the Council's Treasury Management function. The report also reviewed compliance with the revised Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) code of practice on treasury management and guidance notes and a revised prudential code. These were issued in November 2009 and revised in 2011.

Members discussed the report asking specific questions about the treasury advisors used by the Council, how they are selected and how their performance is monitored. It was confirmed to Members that Sector (treasury advisors) were procured using a central procurement process which measured both value for money and the quality of service provided. Sector's performance is monitored on an ongoing basis through quarterly Treasury Strategy meetings.

Members also asked about the money that has been saved by Treasury Management and congratulated the service on its work which has resulted in significant savings for the Council.

Members were informed that implementation of the treasury strategy over recent years had resulted in savings for the Council of over £70 million which had been achieved through efficient debt management and investment.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to:

- (a) note the delegations in respect to treasury management as outlined in Appendix A to the report;
- (b) note the assurance provided by Treasury Management adopting and complying with the revised CIPFA Code of Practice and guidance notes and the Prudential Code; and
- (c) note that the Treasury Management Policy Statement has been updated.

### **37 Local Public Audit; an update**

The Chief Officer (Audit and Risk) presented a report of the Director of Resources which provided the Committee with a progress report on the Local

Public Audit Bill, including provision in the Bill for independent audit appointment panels.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to note the update provided on the progress of the Local Audit Bill.

### **38 Work Programme**

The Director of Resources submitted a report notifying Members of the work programme.

The Committee reviewed its forthcoming work programme. Members requested a further report on the arrangements in place to manage the City's traditional York paving stone assets.

**RESOLVED** – The Committee resolved to note the forthcoming reports to the committee and requested that Internal Audit review arrangements in place to manage the City's traditional York paving stone assets.

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 2012

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

Councillors J Walker, N Walshaw,  
C Towler, B Atha, J Illingworth, L Yeadon,  
J Bentley, S Bentley and J Chapman

### **39 Declarations of Disposal Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **40 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: M Hamilton and G Harper.

### **41 Temporary Closure of the West Park Centre**

The Director of City Development and Chief Officer Strategy, Commissioning and Performance submitted a report which provided an update on the West Park Centre following its temporary closure due to health and safety concerns.

The following officers were in attendance:

Christine Addison, Acting Chief Asset Management Officer  
Anne Chambers, Head of Corporate Property Management  
Neil Charlesworth, Community Asset Officer  
Sarah Sinclair, Chief Officer (Strategy, Commissioning and Performance)  
Children's Services  
Ken Morton, Young People & Skills, Children's Services

Addressing the report, Christine Addison, Acting Chief Asset Management Officer confirmed that the decision to temporarily close the West Park Centre was made following receipt of information which suggested that the existing electrical system was potentially dangerous and a health and safety concern.

The Acting Chief Asset Management Officer reported that in considering the information available to her, she took the view, that in light of the health and safety concerns raised (risk of electrocution), this was an emergency situation and arrangements be made for it's immediate temporary closure.

Councillor Atha sought clarification that the building was being closed on a "temporary basis"

The Acting Chief Asset Management Officer confirmed that the decision taken was the temporary closure of the centre.

In brief summary the following issues were highlighted:

- The issues identified within the last survey report, carried out in 2009, were not acted upon and had led to the current deterioration of the building.
- The need to carry out a full inspection to determine if, in addition to electrics, there were any other health and safety issues that required addressing.
- The importance of ensuring that the existing users are kept informed in relation to the temporary closure and receive regular updates on progress.
- The relocation of existing users and how this could have been achieved in a more eloquent manner.
- In finding alternative venues, existing user groups should not be financially burdened.
- The possibility of bringing part of the building back into use, as an interim measure, as soon as possible.
- Security of the building, particularly due to the openness of the site. It is essential that the centre is protected from further damage and potential vandalism.
- The need to undertake a lessons learnt exercise, review systems and processes i.e. could the Emergency Planning Unit have been involved to ensure the best and most timely support was provided to displaced users.

Councillor Yeadon requested that a list of the user groups and where they had been reallocated to, be supplied to Committee Members.

The Chief Officer (Strategy, Commissioning and Performance) Children's Services confirmed that the requested information would be supplied to Committee Members.

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion the Chair said, it was the view of the Area Committee that the West Park Centre was a valuable community asset and a well used facility. It was important that inspection works were undertaken without delay and any repair works be carried out in order to regain the operational use of the building.

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) To inform the Executive Board that it is the opinion of the North West (Inner) Area Committee that the West Park Centre is a valuable community asset and should continue to operate as an educational, cultural and community facility.
- (ii) That an update report be prepared for the next meeting of the Area Committee scheduled to take place on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012.



This page is intentionally left blank

## **NORTH WEST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors M Hamilton, J Walker,  
N Walshaw, G Harper, B Atha,  
J Illingworth, L Yeadon, J Bentley,  
S Bentley and J Chapman

### **Officers:**

Stuart Byrne - West North West Area Support  
Anne Chamber -Head of Corporate Property Management  
Neil Charlesworth - Community Asset Officer  
Jason Singh - Locality Manager (West North West)  
Juliet Duke - West North West Homes  
John Grieve – Governance Services

### **Members of the Public**

Sue Buckle – SHCA  
Amanda Jackson – University of Leeds  
Rose Black – Leeds University Union  
Ben Fisher – Leeds University Union  
Stuart Long – Leeds University Union  
Howard Eaglestone – Local Resident  
Bill McKinnon – Friends of Woodhouse Moor  
Isobel Sidebottom – NHPMA  
Tony Green – NHPNA  
Ken Torode – WPRA  
Doug Kemp – WPRA  
Janet Kemp – WPRA  
Victoria Jaquiss – West Park Centre Refugees  
Douglas Gilliam – West Park Centre Refugees  
John McKenzie – Cardigan Centre

#### **42 Late Items**

There were no late items.

#### **43 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 44 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Towler.

#### 45 Open Forum

- (i) Temporary Event Notices – Tony Green, Chair of the North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association spoke of the issuing of a Temporary Event Notice for an outdoor event at Hillyridge House, Grosvenor Road, Leeds 6. The event took place on 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> December 2012 operating from 10.00pm til 4.00am with around 500 people attending the amplified music event.

Many local residents were denied sleep as a consequence of the noise and nuisance. Following the event local people were critical of West Yorkshire Police and the Licensing Authority for granting the event in the first place.

Mr Green said the NHPNA intend to take the matter up with the newly elected Police and Crimes Commissioner but in the meantime better communication between the Police, Licensing Authority, Local Elected Members and local residents would be welcomed. It would also be useful if the Noise Nuisance Service could receive intervention training.

It was reported that Councillor Walker was in discussion with Councillor Gruen, the Executive Board Members responsible (Safer and Stronger Communities) and she was also seeking a multi – agency meeting to discuss the issue of Temporary Event Notices.

Councillor Walshaw suggested that when a TEN was granted, neighbouring properties should be notified similar to planning applications, thus allowing local people the opportunity to comment on the notice.

Councillor Hamilton proposed that the issuing of Temporary Event Notices be referred to Scrutiny with a view to further investigation of the Licensing Policy.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) To support Councillor Walker in drawing the concerns of the local community on Temporary Event Notices to the attention of the Executive Board Member responsible.
- (b) That the issuing of Temporary Event Notices be referred to Scrutiny with a view to further investigation of the Licensing Policy.
- (c) That the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development be made aware of the request for scrutiny

- (ii) Remobilisation of the New Generation Transport (NGT) Scheme – Bill McKinnon, Friends of Woodhouse Moor, spoke of a recent meeting with officers from City Development who had suggested that there now was an option whereby the proposed trolley-bus route would no longer run across Woodhouse Moor.

Mr McKinnon said this was a significant improvement and one which should be supported.

The Chair and Councillor Harper said they were aware that a public meeting was taking place with officers from City Development early in the New Year to provide the latest update on route proposals.

**RESOLVED** - The Area Committee was of the view that the proposed trolley bus route should not run across Woodhouse Moor.

#### **46 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 25<sup>th</sup> October and 14<sup>th</sup> November 2012, be accepted as a true and correct record.

#### **47 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Members considered a report by the West North West Area Support Team which identified a number of issues which required further action following the last meeting of the Area Committee.

**RESOLVED** – To note the progress and outcomes of the issues identified in the submitted report.

#### **48 Area Chairs Forum**

The minutes of the Area Chair's Forum held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were received and noted.

#### **49 West Park Centre - Update Report**

The Director of City Development and the Director of Children's Services submitted a report which provided an update on the temporary closure of the West Park Centre, following health and safety concerns.

The report outlined the actions taken to ensure that user of the facility were supported in identifying alternative temporary accommodation and set out the way forward in terms of the centre's future.

Anne Chambers, Head of Corporate Property Management and Neil Charlesworth, Community Asset Officer, presented the report and responded to Members queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report which included the following:

- Members disappointment at the lack of detail in the submitted report
- Concerns at the manner in which the building was closed
- Existing user groups had obtained “temporary” alternative accommodation, making it difficult to plan when unsure of future arrangements.
- Financial burden to existing users due to temporary accommodation issues
- The security and winter protection of the building
- Lack of clarity around projected cost to bring building back into use, understand electrical costs to be in region of £150,000 - £170,000, but £931,000 was the estimated costs for urgent works.
- Clarification around the transfer of the building to Asset Management
- Explore other opportunities for the Centre: Creation of a Development Trust/ voluntary sector asset transfer/ Management by external partners
- Grant funding available for community facilities but only open to Voluntary Community Faith Sector Groups
- Use of Section 106 Contributions from local developments
- Defer funding from other projects in the City (Dortmund Square refurbishment) to fund the necessary works to get the Centre up and running
- The wish of the Area Committee that the facility be retained and brought back into use as quickly as possible, to delay may affect the Centre’s future viability
- Concerns around the consultation process about the future of the centre
- To request that the crucial decisions required, be made by the Executive Board at its meeting in February 2013

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted
- (ii) To note the intention of the Acting Chief Asset Management Officer to prepare and submit a report on the future of the Centre, to the Executive Board in February 2013
- (iii) That the North West (Inner) Area Committee remain of the view that the West Park Centre is a valuable community asset and should continue to operate as an educational, cultural and community facility

- (iv) That the manner in which the West Park Centre was closed and the decision making process around the future of the centre be referred to Scrutiny for further investigation
- (v) That the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development be made aware of the request for scrutiny

**50 Environmental Services - Six Month Performance Update on the Service Level Agreement**

The Locality Manager (West North West) submitted a report which provided an update on performance against the Services Level Agreement between Inner North West Area Committee and the West North West Environmental Locality Team.

The report covered the six month period from June to November 2012 and provided details on a range of functions being delivered across the area during this period against the priorities and commitments set out in the SLA.

The following appendices accompanied the report:

- Appendix A – Service Level Agreement update – Inner North West Leeds
- Appendix B – Service Requests (11<sup>th</sup> June to 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

Jason Singh Locality Manager (West North West) presented the report and responded to Members queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices including:

- A complement from Councillor Walshaw suggesting that there was a marked improvement in terms of less litter on the streets
- Could gully cleaning be concentrated in the “known low lying areas”
- The removal of high level graffiti
- The cleaning of moss from pavements in the West Park area
- Increased enforcement of nuisance vehicles/ mobile advertising
- Increased enforcement of “fly parking” on cycle lanes and street corners
- The problem of household refuse bins on streets particularly in the student areas

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted.
- (ii) To note there had been a marked improvement in respect of less litter on the streets.

- (iii) That gully cleaning be concentrated in the “known low lying areas”, resources be put into high level graffiti removal and the cleaning of moss from pavements in the West Park area.
- (iv) In planning for 2013/14 could further consideration be given to enforcement action in particular: mobile advertising vehicles, parking on cycle lanes and other inappropriate locations “fly parking”. Working in partnership with the Universities to highlight the problem of household refuse bins on streets.

## **51 Wellbeing Fund 2012 - 13 Update Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access & Performance) submitted a report which provided an update on the budget position for the Wellbeing Fund for 2012/13, including the budget monitoring information for Quarter 2.

The report also sought approval for the allocation of the remaining balance within the Hyde Park & Woodhouse Capital Pot.

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

- Appendix 1 2012-13 Wellbeing Budget Statement
- Wellbeing Monitoring: Quarter 2 (2012 - 13)

Stuart Byrne, West North West Area Support Team, presented the report and responded to Members queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices which included:

- A need to further understand the work of the Youth Service
- To note that Hyde Park Unity Day project benefited the Hyde Park and Woodhouse ward not Weetwood ward as indicated in the submitted report

### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the current budget position for the Wellbeing Fund for 2012/13.
- (ii) To note the contents of the Quarter 2 Monitoring Returns.
- (iii) To approve the allocation of the £652.28 remaining balance of the Hyde Park & Woodhouse Capital Pot to fund the capital element of providing festive lights in Little London.

- (iv) That a representative from the Youth Service be invited to a future meeting to provide further details of the service they provide.

## **52 Area Update Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access & Performance) submitted a report which provided an update on recent Sub Group business and the current position relating to other project activity including developing the Leeds Citizen's Panel.

The report also informed the Area Committee about the newly established High Rise Management Team.

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

- Appendix 1 – Extending permitted development rights for homeowners and businesses: Technical consultation – Response Form (Department of Communities and Local Government)
- Appendix 2 – Leeds Citizens Panel – Membership Summary

Stuart Byrne, West North West Area Support Team, presented the report and responded to Members queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices including:

- The issues discussed at the Planning Sub Group
- To clarify that the Transport Sub Group had met on a number of occasions but had not been official supported by officers

### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note and action as appropriate, the Key Messages arising from the Sub Groups as detailed in section 3 of the submitted report
- (ii) To note the update in respect of the Leeds Citizens Panel Membership
- (iii) To note and welcome the establishment of the High Rise management Team by West North West homes

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

**RESOLVED –** To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 21<sup>st</sup> February 2013 at 7.00pm in St Chad's Parish Centre, St Chad's Vicarage, Otley Road, Leeds, LS16 5JT

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 21st February, 2013



## **NORTH WEST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 5TH NOVEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
J L Carter, B Cleasby, R Downes, C Fox,  
C Townsley, P Wadsworth, D Collins and S  
Lay and G Latty

### **34 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **35 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **36 Late Items**

There were no late items added to the agenda.

### **37 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

Councillor Townsley declared a significant other interest in Agenda Item 9 'West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service – Proposals for Changes to Emergency Cover in West Yorkshire as a Member of the West Yorkshire Fire Authority. (Minute 43 refers.)

Councillor Cleasby declared a significant other interest in Agenda Item 10 'Well – Being Fund Budget Report' as a Committee Member of the Horsforth Live at Home Scheme. (Minute 44 refers.)

### **38 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Latty.

### **39 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.

On this occasion there were two members of the public in attendance who had heard about the meeting through an advert placed in the Otley and Wharfedale Observer.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

#### **40 Minutes - 24th September 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were approved as a correct record.

#### **41 Matters Arising**

##### Minute No. 23 Matters Arising

In relation to a question asked about a representative of Leeds Bradford Airport attending the Area Committee, Members were informed that due to the most appropriate person currently being off work sick the airport were unable to confirm at present which Area Committee meeting they would be able to attend.

#### **42 Annual Community Safety Report**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted the annual community safety report which provided Members with details of the community safety activity undertaken during the last 12 months. The report also provided details of crime data, making comparisons with previous years.

In attendance to answer member questions were:

Zahid Butt – Area Community Safety Officer; and  
Inspector Richard Coldwell – West Yorkshire Police.  
Lucy Mosalski – Leeds Anti-social Behaviour Team

Members discussed the crime statistics for the Adel and Wharfedale ward, and the increase in car crime due to two active criminals operating in the area. Arrests have been made and overall crime had dropped in the current year. Specific discussion took place on theft from vehicles and that preventative measures can significantly reduce the crime statistics in relation to this. Inspector Coldwell confirmed this was the message West Yorkshire Police were communicating to the public.

Discussion took place about the effectiveness of cameras in preventing crime and providing assurance to the public. Members were informed that CCTV evidence can be powerful and that cameras generally help the Police gather intelligence and can act as a deterrent.

The merits of using special constables was considered by Members and the Area Committee were informed that the number of special constables being recruited in the North West Leeds division had increased and a new process for specials deployment has led to more effective use of the specials.

Specific questions were asked of the Leeds Anti-social Behaviour Team in terms of anti social behaviour in Otley and Yeadon which the Leeds Anti-social Team agreed to provide to Members for Otley and Yeadon

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

**RESOLVED** – That the Area Committee:

- (a) note the contents of the report;
- (b) note the Area Committee's role in reducing burglary and other crime; and
- (c) request specific crime figures in terms of anti social behaviour in Otley and Yeadon.

**43 West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (WYFRS) - Proposals for Changes to Emergency Cover in West Yorkshire**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which brought to the attention of the Area Committee the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Services' consultation document which provided outline proposals for addressing the challenges of a reducing budget and the realignment of resources following a dramatic reduction in risk and demand over the past ten years.

Nick Smith, District Fire Commander and Nigel Atkins Station Commander (Rawdon & Cookridge) informed Members about proposed changes to fire services in North West Leeds. They highlighted the budget pressures the service was under, current and future response times and the reduction in risk over the last few years especially in the outer areas of Leeds. The plan for Rawdon and Otley was put forward and the merger between Cookridge and Moortown was also highlighted to Members.

Members discussed the report in detail. Members sought reassurance that the new station to replace the merged stations of Cookridge and Moortown would be large enough to cope with future demand especially considering the likelihood of new housing developments. The location of a new fire station was discussed.

Members also sought explanation for the closure of Rawdon fire station and the difficulties that would now be encountered as fire vehicles would have to travel along the congested A65. Members were informed that the area was low risk and that there was no longer finance available to keep Rawdon fire station open.

Members also discussed with fire service officers the need for continued focus on prevention especially when considering vulnerable people.

Members asked questions about the new response times and whether these had been calculated. Fire officers confirmed calculations had been made and these were read out to Members.

Members also asked fire officers questions about the future and whether there would be more cuts to services imposed. Members were informed that the current plan takes West Yorkshire Fire Service through to 2020.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

The time spent on various activities was broken down by fire service officers present, at the request of Members.

Members also discussed the relationship West Yorkshire Fire Service has with neighbouring fire services, how services overlapped and the opportunities to re-charge other authorities when the service attend incidents outside the county.

Members were also assured that West Yorkshire Fire Service were well placed to support problems caused by flooding.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the Area Committee note the report; and
- (b) that information on response times be circulated to Members.

#### **44 Well-Being Fund Budget Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report outlining the current position statement of the Area Committee's Wellbeing budget, detailing for determination those expressions of interest received for Wellbeing funding and presenting for information those small grant applications which had been received to date.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the current position of the Well Being Budget, as set out in Section 2 and Section 3 of the submitted report be noted;
- (b) that the following be agreed in respect of those expressions of interest received for Wellbeing funding, as detailed within Section 4 of the submitted report.

**Name of Project:** Horsforth Live at Home Gardening Scheme

**Ward affected:** Horsforth

**Name of delivery organisation:** Horsforth Live at Home Scheme

**Decision:** £1,225 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** OPAL in the Community

**Ward affected:** Adel and Wharfedale

**Name of delivery organisation:** Older People Action in the Locality (OPAL)

**Decision:** £2,450 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Adel Players Theatre Sound System

**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale

**Name of delivery organisation:** Adel Players

**Decision :** £4,957 revenue **APPROVED**

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

**Name of Project:** Lawnswood Community Percussion Band  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** 2527 (Lawnswood Squadron Air Cadets)  
**Decision:** £6,385 revenue **DEFERRED**

**Name of Project:** Upgrading of lay-bys in Church Lane , Adel  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharefdale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Perennial Gardener's Royal Benevolent Society  
**Decision:** £5,000 revenue **APPROVED**

(c) that the small grant and skip approvals detailed in paragraph 5.0 be noted.

#### **45 Area Update Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which brought together a range of information regarding Area Committee business.

Members questioned officers present about Neighbourhood Planning and what would be on the agenda of the meeting to be held on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

**RESOLVED** – That the Area Committee note the contents of the report.

#### **46 Area Chairs Forum Minutes**

The Area Committee considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive Customer Access and Performance. The report formally notified Members that the minutes of the Area Chair's Forum meetings will be brought to Area Committee meetings as a regular agenda item and presented for comment the minutes of the Area Chairs' Forum meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

**RESOLVED** – that the contents of the report be noted.

#### **47 Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting**

2pm, Monday, 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012, Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR.

The meeting ended at 3:45pm.

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting held on Monday, 10th December, 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 10TH DECEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Latty and P Wadsworth in the Chair  
Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
J L Carter, B Cleasby, R Downes, C Fox,  
C Townsley, D Collins and S Lay

### 48 **Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### 49 **Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### 50 **Late Items**

There were no late items added to the agenda.

### 51 **Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations made.

### 52 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor P Latty.

### 53 **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 term of reference of the Area Committee.

On this occasion there were no members of the public present.

### 54 **Minutes - 5TH NOVEMBER 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2012 were approved as a correct record.

### 55 **Environmental Services - Six Month Performance Update on the Service Level Agreement**

The Locality Manager (West North West) presented his report. The report provided an update on performance against the Service Level Agreement between North West Outer Area Committee and the West North West Environmental Locality Team. The report covered the six month period from June to November 2012.

Members discussed the report in detail. Initially the Locality Manager was questioned about the clearance of leaves and the schedule in place to

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 4th February, 2013

undertake this work. Members requested that they be given a copy of the schedule to help manage requests from constituents more effectively.

Members requested explanation from officers present about the mechanical sweeping of streets in Horsforth which is well below other wards in the North West Outer Area. Members were informed that problems had been encountered with equipment used in Horsforth and sickness levels.

Members went on to discuss the clearance of gulleys and problems with collapsed gulleys. Carlton Lane was specifically exemplified as a problem area. Members also questioned officers about frequency of gulleys being cleared and dug out. Members highlighted the need to work with Yorkshire Water and to ensure that they undertake all their responsibilities in relation to gulley clearance. A paper was requested for the next Environmental Sub Group meeting with regard to the ongoing work to keep gulleys clear.

Sickness levels of staff in this service were considered with Members expressing concern that levels were too high. The Locality Manager confirmed that he would provide Members with an accurate figure for absenteeism.

The impending changes to charging for bulky waste was brought up by Members and the banning of commercial vehicles from Council owned tips. It was considered that this might lead to costly enforcement action being taken if any rubbish was dumped.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that a schedule of leaf collecting rounds be provided to Members;
- (b) that an accurate figure for absenteeism be provided to Members;
- (c) that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Environmental Sub Group detailing the latest position on gulley cleansing; and
- (d) that the Committee note the report.

#### **56 WELL-BEING FUND BUDGET REPORT**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report outlining the current position statement of the Area Committee's Wellbeing budget, detailing for determination those expressions of interest received for Wellbeing funding and presenting for information those small grant applications which had been received to date.

Members were informed that the Lawnswood Squadron Air Cadet application for a grant which was previously deferred had since been withdrawn.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the current position of the well being budget as set out at sections 2 and 3 be noted;

- (b) that the following be agreed in respect of those expressions of interest received for Wellbeing funding, as detailed within Section 4 of the submitted report;

**Name of Project:** New Litter Bins  
**Ward Affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Environmental Services  
**Decision:** £1,845 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Moss and Graffiti Removal  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Environmental Services  
**Decison:** £2,732 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Dog Fouling Enforcement  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Environmental Services  
**Decision:** £1,364 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** CASAC  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** CASAC  
**Decision:** £15,000 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Holt Lane Play Area  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Parks & Countryside  
**Decision:** £5,500 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** Improvement work to the surface of Public Bridleway No 1 Leeds (Cookridge Cricket Club)  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Parks & Countryside  
**Decision:** £10,120 revenue **APPROVED**

**Name of Project:** SIDs  
**Ward affected:** Adel & Wharfedale  
**Name of delivery organisation:** Highways & Transportation  
**Decision:** £4,000 revenue **APPROVED**

- (c) That the small grant and skip approvals as detailed at section 4 of the report be noted.

## **57 AREA UPDATE REPORT**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which brought together a range of information regarding Area Committee business.

It was reported by the Chair that in future Sub Group notes will be written up more formally.

With regards to the Health and Well Being Sub Group it was noted that the Area Committee and its Members can have a beneficial impact on health services in North West Leeds.

With regards to the Transport Sub Group, Members were critical of the route chosen for the NGT scheme and commented that consideration should have been given to a stop at Headingley Stadium.

**RESOLVED** – That the Area Committee note the contents of the report.

## **58 NORTH WEST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE REPORT**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which provided an update on the work to date to deliver the actions within the North West Outer Area Committee Business Plan 2011-2015. The report also sought approval to undertake a review of the business plan to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose and reflects the current city wide priority plans.

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) that the progress made against the Business Plan actions be noted as detailed at Appendix 1 to the report;
- (b) that the Area Support Team undertake a review of the Business Plan for 2013/14; and
- (c) that a refreshed Business Plan be received at the Area Committee meeting in March 2013 for approval.

## **59 AREA CHAIRS FORUM MINUTES**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which formally notified Members that the minutes of Area Chairs Forum meetings will continue to be brought to Area Committee meetings as a regular agenda item, and to give a brief overview of the Area Chairs Forum meetings.

Members raised concerns at the removal of universal services for young people and the Youth Service review. It was requested that the Children and Young People's Sub Group give some focus to this issue.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the contents of the report and the minutes from the Area Chairs Forum meetings be noted; and
- (b) that the Children and Young People's Sub Group give consideration to the provision of Youth Services in North West Leeds.

**60 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

2pm, Monday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at Yeadon Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **NORTH EAST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 10TH DECEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Hussain in the Chair

Councillors J Dowson, S Hamilton,  
C Macniven, M Rafique, A Sobel, E Taylor  
and B Urry

### **49 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the December meeting of North East (Inner) Area Committee.

### **50 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

The following other significant interests were declared at the above meeting:-

- Councillor J Dowson in her capacity as a Member of Groundwork Leeds (Agenda Item 8) (Minute 55 refers)
- Councillor A Sobel in view of the fact that his wife works for St Vincent de Paul (Agenda Item 9) (Minute 59 refers)

### **51 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor R Charlwood.

### **52 Open Forum**

The Committee received a presentation from Friends of Gledhow Valley Woods on their role within the community and their future plans.

The following representatives were in attendance:

- Martin Calvert, Chair, Friends of Gledhow Valley Woods
- Adrian Coltman, Vice Chair, Friends of Gledhow Valley Woods

In their presentation they outlined their previous and future environmental works for Gledhow Valley Woods and circulated photographs on the works undertaken in areas such as forestry and landscaping, including the laying out of new footpaths and access arrangements.

They also outlined their close links with disability groups and primary schools in the area and the fund raising activities undertaken throughout the year.

During the presentation, Members were informed that the organisation was self-efficient, but in view of current funding pressures it was noted that it was their intention to approach the Area Committee with a funding request at some point in the future to assist them with their future plans and objectives.

The Chair invited comments from Members of the Area Committee.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Monday, 28th January, 2013

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

- Clarification of their specific proposals for Gledhow Valley Woods
- Clarification of their involvement in relation to the cleaning of the lake  
*(It was noted that the maintenance of the lake was not their responsibility)*
- Clarification of their involvement with other partnerships within the Council and how they publicised their work
- Clarification if the organisation were a registered charity and how they achieved funding
- Clarification if the organisation had any links with the Gledhow Conservation Heritage Group
- Clarification of the organisations involvement with young people, including scout groups and whether the organisation had helped other groups in the area in view of the crossover of priorities

In conclusion, Rory Barke, East North East Area Leader acknowledged the excellent work carried out within the area by the Friends of Gledhow Valley Woods and requested the organisation to liaise directly with Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer with a view to identifying suitable projects for funding.

The Area Committee thanked the Friends of Gledhow Valley Woods for their presentation and attendance.

(Councillor J Dowson and M Rafique joined the meeting at 4.10pm during discussions of the above item)

### **53 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **54 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

- a) Children's Services Update Report to Area Committees – Inner North East (Minute 44 b) refers  
Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer referred to the above issue and confirmed that a breakdown of the location of all children's homes had been e mailed to Members of the Area Committee for their information/retention.
- b) Wellbeing Fund Revenue Budget (Minute 44 c) refers  
Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer referred to the above issue and confirmed that contact had been made with the Polish Advice Bureau with a view to linking them into other education providers.
- c) Future Approaches to Priority Neighbourhoods (Minute 43 refers)  
Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer referred to the above issue and informed the meeting that a list of those organisations who

had received funding by the Chapel Allerton Community First panel had been emailed to Members of the Area Committee as requested.

Councillor S Hamilton enquired on the latest developments in relation to the recruitment process for appointing a new Neighbourhood Manager.

Rory Barke, East North East Area Leader responded and up dated the meeting on the latest recruitment process which was subject to Council procedures. He informed the meeting that the recruitment was in progress, but it may take some time to fill the position.

In view of current staffing issues within his department, Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer would co-ordinate, in the first instance, any issues arising until the post was filled.

- d) East North East Health and Wellbeing Update (Minute 44 refers)  
Councillor B Urry referred to the above issue and informed the meeting that a briefing between the Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager and himself was still outstanding.

Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer informed the meeting that following discussions between the Health and Wellbeing Improvement Manager and herself, specific details on the outstanding issues raised at the last meeting would be circulated to Members of the Area Committee in due course.

## **55 Wellbeing Fund Revenue Budget 2012/13**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report providing Members with an update on the current position of the revenue Wellbeing funding for the Area Committee and highlighting the applications made for consideration by the Area Committee.

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents:-

- Inner North East Area Committee Well-Being Budget 2012-13 (Appendix 1 refers)
- Summer Projects feedback 2012 (Appendix 2 refers)

Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

Specific reference was also made to the following issues referred to in Appendix 2 of the report:-

- To welcome the information on the summer projects and to acknowledge that the projects were good value for money
- The need for some projects to attract more young people in the future

- The need to discuss target schemes from the Clusters at the Area Committee or Wellbeing Working Group
- The offer to view the Roundhay Film project DVD at Ward Member meetings
- To encourage the Roundhay Park event to be held again following its cancellation
- To chase up feedback in relation to Champ Boxing  
(*The East North East Area Officer agreed to co-ordinate this issue*)

In addition to discussing the above issues, Rory Barke, East North East Area Leader informed the meeting that the 2012/13 budget was making good progress. As a result the financial management system had been updated and the Area Committee should be on target by the year end.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That approval be given to fund £1,419.16 for the relocation of a planter on Back Chapeltown Road.
- c) That approval be given to fund £1,500 for the Litter Education project.
- d) That approval be given to fund £1,000 towards the first stage for Adult Exercise equipment in the Norma Hutchinson Park and that the decision to fund a further £1,000 towards the second stage of the project be deferred.
- e) That approval be given to fund £35,000 for the post of Neighbourhood Manager and that this Committee welcomes the fact that the monies unspent this year would be ring fenced to the Area Committee.
- f) That approval be given to set aside an additional £4,000 for small grants.
- g) That this Committee notes the way forward for wellbeing spend in 2013/14 as outlined in the report.

**56 Environmental Services - Six Month Performance Update on the Service Level Agreement**

Referring to Minute 10 of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2012, the Locality Manager (East North East Area) submitted a report which provided a half year update on the performance against the Service Level Agreement (SLA) between Inner North East Area Committee and the East North East Environmental Locality Team.

The report also provided the Area Committee with information of the range of functions being delivered across the area during this period against the priorities and commitments set out in the SLA, and how they were helping to make a difference on the ground/at the front line.

It was noted that the Area Committee had an opportunity to influence the service and budget planning process for 2013/14 and that views on service developments and continued top priorities for Inner NE were sought, particularly in light of the expected further financial pressures.

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Analysis of service requests responded to by ENE Locality Team during the reporting period May to October 2012 (Appendix A refers)
- ENE Locality Team – Financial Position 2012/13 (half year update) (Appendix B refers)
- Leeds Citizens Panel – Environmental Services satisfaction results (Appendix C refers)

John Woolmer, East North East Locality Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Mick Johnson and Andrew Gibson, East North East Locality Team, Environmental Services were also in attendance to provide background details.

Prior to discussing the report, the Area Committee were requested to consider the following specific issues:-

- i) what aspects of the service they feel were working well and delivering against the commitments made in the SLA;
- ii) what aspects of the service do they feel were not working as well as they should against the commitments made in the SLA and would like to see improvements made;
- iii) what the Area Committee's views were on the key service developments and what continued top priorities for Inner NE should be in planning for 2013/14, particularly in light of the expected further financial pressures

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

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

- The concerns expressed about leaf fall on roads and pavements and clarification of the current sweeping arrangements)  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and outlined the current arrangements)*
- Clarification of when more resources would be provided in relation to emptying additional bins  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and raised his current concerns about this service which was at saturation point)*
- The need to acknowledge that street furniture was still causing problems  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and agreed to investigate this issue further with the assistance of enforcement officers)*
- Clarification of how the department dealt with the issue of large mixed race communities i.e. Saville's and the Mexborough's)

- Clarification of the duties of agency staff/Continental Landscape employees and whether they would be able to respond to problems associated with snowfall and gritting in the three wards  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and could not give any guarantees of this type of service. It was noted that that such staff would continue de-leafing until January 2013)*
- The need to get more public engaged in relation to surveys and to raise awareness of the services provided by Environmental Services  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and confirmed that there was still more to do in this area. Despite resource issues, he confirmed that more press releases would be issued around surveys and that a review of sweeping blocks would be undertaken, together with addressing new ways of working with the Environmental Protection Teams)*
- The need to introduce an additional column showing what was outstanding in relation to the analysis of service requests responded to by the East North East Locality Team  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and agreed to address this issue within future reports)*

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted and welcomed.
- b) That the follow up issues raised above be addressed by the East North East Locality Manager and the East North East Area Leader.
- c) That this Committee notes that a further progress report on Period 3 would be submitted to the Area Committee in six months time.

**57 Environmental Sub Group Minutes**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report on the issues raised at the Environmental Sub Group meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

Appended to the report was a copy of the minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2012 for the information/comment of the meeting.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the contents of the Environmental Sub Group minutes held on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

**58 East North East Homes Leeds Grounds Maintenance report**

The Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes, Leeds submitted a report informing the Area Committee of the work and progress made by the Grounds Maintenance contractor, Continental Landscapes, from April to November 2012 on the East North East Homes Leeds Grounds Maintenance.

Steven Vowles, Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes, Leeds presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

He informed the meeting that the summary of performance monitoring (Appendix A refers) was still outstanding and he agreed to provide a copy to Members of the Area Committee via the East North East Area Leader for their information/retention.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report.

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

- The concerns expressed regarding the number of complaints received from residents about grass cuttings being deposited on the road and pavements and as a result becoming a potential safety hazard when wet
- The concerns expressed about grass cuttings being blown on to the road by grass cutting operatives

The Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes responded and agreed to address the comments made at the meeting.

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

#### **59 Inner North East Area Committee Priorities and Consultation**

Referring to Minute 90 of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the East North East Area Leader submitted a report on an update on the Inner North East Area Committee priorities agreed by the Area Committee at the March meeting, including the top three priorities for 2012/13 agreed at the last meeting using the agreed reporting mechanism.

The report also provided feedback on the Autumn 2012 consultation and the proposed priorities for 2013/14 and further consultation on these issues during Spring 2013.

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

- Area Committee (Inner North East) Performance Plan – November 2012 (Appendix 1 refers)
- 6 hats Community Consultation (Appendix 2 refers)
- Moor Allerton Priority Neighbourhood Action Plan 2012/13 (Appendix 3 refers)
- Leeds Citizens Panel – Membership Summary as at 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 4 refers)

Nicola Denson, East North East Area Officer presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

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

- The need for the four ambassadors to attend the Area Committee to discuss their work  
*(The East North East Area Officer agreed to co-ordinate this issue)*
- The need to re-promote the Volunteer Thank You event with a view to raising awareness and increasing the numbers  
*((The East North East Area Officer Leader responded and acknowledged that there was a need to address this issue. He agreed to report back at the next meeting with a view to the possibility of issuing individual awards in recognition of the excellent work being undertaken in this area)*
- Clarification of the progress being made to date in relation to The Open Door  
*(The East North East Area Officer reported on the latest developments and at the request of the meeting she agreed to liaise with the Corporate Lettings Team with a view to progressing this issue)*
- The need to acknowledge that there was a shortage of young people aged between 18-24 on the panel and the need for the team to engage with further education and young people's groups
- The need to invite representatives from the local Commissioning Groups to the Area Committee to discuss how the new process would work, especially in relation to doctors  
*(The East North East Area Leader responded and agreed to address this issue as part of the 'themed' Area Committee meeting concept)*

#### **RESOLVED-**

- a) That the report on the Area Committee priorities update be noted and welcomed.
- b) That in relation to the issue of how the Council should target its efforts to fill the gaps in Leeds Citizens Panel membership, this Committee supports the process as now outlined.
- c) That approval be given to the proposed 2013/14 priorities and further consultation in Spring 2013 in accordance with the report now submitted.
- d) That this Committee notes and approves the closure of Open Door as agreed with local residents and ward members.

#### **60 Apprenticeships Update**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report providing an update on city-wide initiatives to support growth in apprenticeships.

The report also provided an update on the proposal to offer two local partnership based apprenticeship, sponsored by the Inner East and Inner North East Area Committee.

Rory Barke, East North East Area Leader presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

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

- Clarification of the accreditation process and the progress being made

- Clarification if any other Area Committees were undertaking this initiative  
*(The East North East Area Leader confirmed that the East (Inner) Area Committee were also undertaking this initiative)*
- The need to acknowledge that the Apprenticeship Training Agency (ATA) was aimed at smaller agencies and to encourage the Hub to employ apprentices who were not at a higher level of apprenticeship

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted and welcomed.
- b) That this Committee notes the update provided within the report on strategic initiatives and the local Area Committee support to encourage the growth of apprenticeships.

**61 Area Chairs Forum Minutes**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report on the Area Chairs Forum minutes held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

Appended to the report was a copy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012 for the information/comment of the meeting.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the contents of the Area Chairs Forum minutes held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

**62 Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

Monday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 4.00pm at the Reginald Centre, 263 Chapeltown Road, Leeds 7.

(The meeting concluded at 6.10pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **NORTH EAST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Wilkinson in the Chair

Councillors N Buckley, D Cohen,  
P Harrand, J Procter and M Robinson

### **46 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the December meeting of North East (Outer) Area Committee.

### **47 Late Items**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Well-Being Fund Budgets – Revised Outer North East Area Committee Well-being Budget 2012-13 Appendix (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 55 refers)
- Well-Being Fund Budgets – Revised Well-being Fund Large Project Application – Wetherby and Harewood Farmwatch Patrols (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 55 refers)
- Well-Being Fund Budgets – Late Application – Wetherby and District Development Fund Project (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 55 refers)
- Environmental Services – Six Month Performance Update on the Services Level Agreement – Appendix C – Leeds Citizens Panel – Environmental Services satisfaction results (Agenda Item 10) (Minute 56 refers)

The documents were not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website.

### **48 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors A Castle, A Lamb and R Procter.

### **49 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

### **50 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.

**51 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and that this Committee formally ratifies the decisions taken at that meeting in relation to Minute numbers 43 and 44.

**52 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

a) East North East Health and Wellbeing Partnership Report (Minute 39 refers)

Carole Clark, East North East Area Officer referred to the above issue and updated the meeting on progress.

It was noted that additional information had been circulated to Members of the Area Committee in relation to Wrap Up Leeds and cavity wall insulation.

In concluding, the East North East Area Officer informed the meeting that the figures in relation to alcohol related illness or A&E admissions were as a result of long term related illness and not as a result of alcohol related accidents.

b) Children's Services – Update (Minute 43 refers)

The Chair referred to the above issue and informed the meeting that a decision had been taken to defer consideration of this item on today's agenda until the next meeting in February 2013 in view of the fact that the information contained within the report failed to provide the specific detail requested by Members at the last meeting. Also Councillor A Lamb, who had requested this information on behalf of the Area Committee, was unavailable at today's meeting.

**53 Children's Services**

(This item was withdrawn from the agenda and rescheduled for consideration at the next meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013)

**54 East North East Homes Leeds Grounds Maintenance report**

The Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes, Leeds submitted a report informing the Area Committee of the work and progress made by the Grounds Maintenance contractor, Continental Landscapes, from April to November 2012 on the East North East Homes Leeds Grounds Maintenance.

Steven Vowles, Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes, Leeds presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

He informed the meeting that the summary of performance monitoring (Appendix A refers) was still outstanding and he agreed to provide a copy to Members of the Area Committee via the East North East Area Leader for their information/retention.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report.

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

- Clarification of how much extra monies had been paid to Continental Landscapes for work undertaken over and above the terms and conditions outlined in the contract  
*(The Head of Partnerships responded and informed the meeting that the extra monies paid was minimal. He agreed to supply this information to the East North East Area Leader for dissemination to Members of the Area Committee. In the interim period, it was noted that Councillor P Harrand would raise this issue at the appropriate Scrutiny Board)*
- Clarification of the number of cuts undertaken by Continental Landscapes within the period of the contract and details of where the savings had gone  
*(The Head of Partnerships responded and provided a breakdown of cuts undertaken. He agreed to supply a copy of the financial information to the East North East Area Leader for dissemination to Members of the Area Committee)*

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

(Councillor J Procter joined the meeting at 5.40pm during discussions of the above item)

## **55 Well-being Fund Budgets**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report providing Members with an update on the current position of the capital and revenue well being budget for the Area Committee and highlighting the applications made for consideration by the Area Committee.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Outer North East Area Committee Well-Being Budget 2012-13' (Appendix 1 refers) for the information/comment of the meeting.

In addition to the above documents, the East North East Area Officer circulated a copy of a revised appendix of the Outer North East Area Committee Well-Being Budget 2012-13, together with a revised copy of the Wetherby and Harewood Farmwatch Patrols project application as supplementary information.

Also circulated, as supplementary information, was a copy of a late Wellbeing application regarding the Wetherby and District Development Fund Project.

Carole Clark, East North East Area Officer presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Inspector Paul Dwyer, West Yorkshire Police was also in attendance to provide the meeting with background information in relation to the Wetherby and Harewood Farmwatch Patrols project.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the spend to date and current balances for the 2012/13 financial year in accordance with the report now submitted.
- c) That the following projects be dealt with as follows:-

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alwoodley Community Association	Extension of equipment storage	Agreed £10,000 (2012/13)
Slaid Hill in Bloom	Environmentally Friendly Planting in an urban area	Agreed £1,419 (2012/13)
West Yorkshire Police	Wetherby and Harewood Farmwatch Patrols	Agreed £6,000 (Harewood £3,000/Wetherby £3,000) (2012/13) towards the daily running costs of two landrover 4x4 vehicles, namely fuel and tyres
East North East Homes Leeds	Verge Improvements, Moss Syke	Deferred for more information
Leeds City Council	Wetherby and District Development Fund	Agreed £20,000 (2012/13) for future projects in Wetherby

- d) That the following Wellbeing decision which was approved as a delegated officer decision due to the timescales for the project be endorsed:-

West Yorkshire Police Winter Crime Reduction - £2000 to be used to provide additional patrols in Wetherby Town Centre

- e) That in relation to the issue raised regarding skips and small grants within the Harewood ward, the East North East Area Officer be

requested to provide an update on progress at the next meeting in February 2013.

(Councillor P Harrand left the meeting at 6.00pm after consideration of the Verge Improvements, Moss Syke project)

**56 Environmental Services - Six Month Performance Update on the Services Level Agreement**

Referring to Minute 11 of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012, the Locality Manager (East North East Area) submitted a report which provided a half year update on the performance against the Service Level Agreement (SLA) between Outer North East Area Committee and the East North East Environmental Locality Team.

The report also provided the Area Committee with information of the range of functions being delivered across the area during this period against the priorities and commitments set out in the SLA, and how they were helping to make a difference on the ground/at the front line.

It was noted that the Area Committee had an opportunity to influence the service and budget planning process for 2013/14 and that views on service developments and continued top priorities for Outer NE were sought, particularly in light of the expected further financial pressures.

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Analysis of service requests responded to by ENE Locality Team during the reporting period May to October 2012 (Appendix A refers)
- Analysis of legal notices and Fixed Penalty Notices issued by the ENE Locality Team during the reporting period May to October 2012 (Appendix B refers)
- ENE Locality Team – Financial Position 2012/13 (half year update) (Appendix B refers)

In addition to the above documents, a copy of Appendix C - 'Leeds Citizens Panel – Environmental Services satisfaction results' was circulated as supplementary information.

John Woolmer, East North East Locality Manager, Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Beverley Kirk, Technical Enforcement Officer, Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate was also in attendance to provide background details around enforcement.

Prior to discussing the report, the Area Committee were requested to consider the following specific issues:-

- i) what aspects of the service they feel were working well and delivering against the commitments made in the SLA;
- ii) what aspects of the service do they feel were not working as well as they should against the commitments made in the SLA and would like to see improvements made;
- iii) what additional information Members would find useful in future performance reports to help make judgements about the delivery against the SLA commitments;
- iv) what the Area Committee's views were on the key service developments and what continued top priorities for Outer NE should be in planning for 2013/14, particularly in light of the expected further financial pressures

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

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

- Clarification of the locations identified for new litter bins within the three NE (Outer) wards  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and agreed to forward the relevant site location details to the East North East Area Leader for dissemination to Members of the Area Committee)*
- Clarification of the process in relation to the team away half-days held in October
- Clarification as to why the figures in relation to overgrown vegetation were significantly different within the three wards
- Clarification of the financial information in relation to cover for streets operatives (leave) as outlined in Appendix B
- The need to reduce flooding in certain areas i.e. Collingham and to ensure that Highways and Yorkshire Water were taking measures to replace gullies that had collapsed or become damaged  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and outlined the contracted arrangements that were currently in place. He made reference to regular meetings held with Highways and agreed to raise this issue at future meetings. Following discussions, it was also agreed to discuss this issue in more detail at the next Environmental Sub Group)*
- Clarification of the financial contribution received from Highways in relation to gullies and on the discussions being undertaken to date at the Environmental Sub Group regarding Area Committees taking on this delegated responsibility
- Clarification of the number of appraisals undertaken with all staff across the Locality Team  
*(The East North East Locality Manager responded and confirmed that 100% of all appraisals had been undertaken across the Locality Team with half yearly reviews pending. Arising from discussions, the Area Committee commended the East North East Locality Manager and his support team on such a high percentage rate of appraisals undertaken during the June/July period)*
- The need to prevent dog fouling and to try and prosecute those people who commit this offence

- Clarification if there had been a significant difference in prosecutions and levels resulting from dog control orders  
(*The East North East Locality Manager responded and agreed to look at the figures with a report back in due course*)

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted and welcomed.
- b) That the follow up issues raised above be addressed by the East North East Locality Manager and the East North East Area Leader.

(Councillor D Cohen left the meeting at 6.10pm during discussions of the above item)

**57 Wetherby and Harewood Town and Parish Council Forum**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report providing the Area Committee with the minutes from the meeting of the Wetherby and Harewood Town and Parish Council Forum a held on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

Appended to the report was a copy of the notes of the Harewood and Wetherby Town and Parish Council Forum held on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012 for the information/comment of the meeting.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the issues raised be noted and through this Area Committee, the Parish Council Forum be supported in resolving those issues.

**58 Environmental Sub Group Report**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report on the issues discussed at the Environmental Sub Group.

Carole Clark, East North East Area Officer presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report.

Councillor N Buckley made reference to 3.2.4 'Other issues' and informed the meeting that 'Nursery Lane' should have read as King Lane in the body of the report.

Carole Clark responded and apologised for this administrative error.

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

**59 Area Chairs Forum Minutes**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report on the Area Chairs Forum minutes held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

Appended to the report was a copy of the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012 for the information/comment of the meeting.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the contents of the Area Chairs Forum minutes held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012.

**60 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 5.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

(The meeting concluded at 6.30pm)

## EAST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Hyde in the Chair

Councillors A Hussain, B Selby, V Morgan,  
M Ingham, A Khan, R Grahame and  
R Harington

### 50 **Late Items**

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chair accepted one late item of business in respect of an additional submission to the Wellbeing Fund. It was reported that Ward Members were aware of the scheme and that a delay in the submission of the request would jeopardise the project (minute 60 refers)

Additionally, supplementary documents in support of the Area Update report were tabled at the meeting (minutes of recent Area Committee sub groups) as the minutes had not been cleared for inclusion at the time the agenda had been despatched (minute 61 refers)

### 51 **Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

### 52 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Khan and Councillor Maqsood

### 53 **Open Forum**

No matters were raised through the Open Forum

### 54 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be agreed as a correct record

### 55 **Matters Arising**

Minute 35 Open Forum – Councillor Grahame referred to the presentation in respect of the Beeches and Oaktree Tenants Management Organisation (BOTMO) and expressed his concern that the Committees' support had been sought for the BOTMO which could result in the ALMO's loss of control over local housing stock should the bid be successful. Members noted that the bid had yet to complete several stages of the application process.

(Councillor Selby joined the meeting at this point)

### 56 **Appointment of Co-optees to Area Committees**

The Chief Officer (Democratic and Central Services) submitted a report advising Members of the recent appointment of co-optees onto EIAC to support the work of the Committee. Mr Imran Khan to his first meeting as co-

optee representing Harehills Community Leadership Team (CLT) and it was noted that Grace Mangwanya had been elected as Gipton CLT representative  
**RESOLVED** - To note the contents of the report

## **57 Environmental Services - Six Month Performance Update on the Service Level Agreement**

The Locality Manager (East North East) submitted a report providing a half year update (May to October 2012) on performance against the Service Level Agreement (SLA) between EIAC and the East North East (ENE) Environmental Locality Team.

Mr J Woolmer presented the report and highlighted the principles and priorities set out in the SLA and the activities undertaken and the resources attributed to the Locality Teams through the three area wedge teams to deliver the service. Relevant case studies were discussed and areas highlighted where Members comments were sought. The Committee discussed the following key issues with the Locality Manager:

- Staff involvement in the decision making processes and improved staff morale
- the cross service meetings established to review working practices and experiences. Members noted that Councillor Grahame volunteered to attend a future service meeting in response to a request for Member involvement
- the intention to present detailed information by ward rather than by activity blocks
- case studies showing the results of cleansing projects
- statistics showing the outcomes of consultation with residents and showing the number of cases and actions undertaken in the previous six months
- activities undertaken in the Environmental Improvement Zones (EIZs)
- the reduced number of service requests generated from within the Killingbeck & Seacroft ward, noting that this could be attributed to the service provision offered by the ALMO

Finally the Locality Manager raised two resources issues for consideration in the future, namely a review of staff deployment and a review of vehicle hire contracts in order to provide continued value for money and ensure that service delivery continued to improve.

Members welcomed the contents of the report and the approach adopted and discussed the following additional matters:

- the ongoing review of the bulky item collection service and the public perception of the service provided
- the need to ensure the safety and security of empty properties and the links to West Yorkshire Fire Service and private landlords
- whether there was a more effective method of measuring resident satisfaction than the six monthly survey currently employed
- the need to ensure that residents and businesses within a designated EIZ were aware of the consequences of environmental crime

- the resources available for gully cleaning and the impact of weather conditions on service delivery. A comment regarding partnership working and sharing/re-using suitable vehicles was noted
- the responsibility for clearing some areas, such as recreation grounds and subways, lay with specific Council Departments, although it was noted that service requests to the Locality Team would be dealt with. Members supported closer working with the LCC departments and suggested a partnership working protocol be developed

Members noted the request for their direct input into service requests in respect of environmental issues and that the EIAC Environmental Sub Group would consider the issues of the bulky waste service and resources review and report back to EIAC in due course

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and the discussions held be noted
- b) That EIAC continue to support the SLA approach to the delivery of environmental services in the locality, noting those areas identified where good progress had been made
- c) Members noted the intention to include service information by ward in future performance reports to assist judgement making about delivery against the SLA commitments
- d) To note that in light of the expected further financial pressures, the Area Committee takes the view that the following matters should be the key service development and continued top priorities for 2013/14: the bulky waste collection service, the review of resources; and partnership working between the Locality Team and LCC departments and that these issues will be further discussed by the EIAC Environmental Sub Group with a report back to the full Committee in due course
- e) To request that the Area Management team pursue the partnership working suggestion with the relevant LCC departments

**58 East North East Homes Leeds Grounds Maintenance Report**

The Head of Partnerships, East North East Homes (ENEH), submitted a report informing EIAC of the work and progress made by the city wide Grounds Maintenance contractor, Continental Landscapes, during the April to November period 2012. Mr S Vowles attended the meeting to present the report and highlighted the following issues in discussions with Members:

- The good working relationship established between ENEH Leeds and Continental Landscapes and between ENEH and the ENE Locality Teams
- The benefits brought by the ENEH Leeds Estate Walkabout procedure which enabled residents to monitor the performance and appearance of their locality. EIAC noted the invitation for local ward Councillors and/or ENEH Leeds Area Panel members to participate in this process
- The valuable role of the ENEH Leeds Environmental Caretaking Teams in tackling environmental issues such as provision of the gardening services for those residents with no other means of assistance, garden clearing removal of flytipping and removal of bulky refuse from communal areas

It was noted that due to a software failure, the appendix to the report which was intended to show the detail of the works undertaken by ward was not available but would be despatched to members in due course (Councillor A Hussain joined the meeting at this point)

EIAC welcomed the report and noted comments providing differing perspectives of the service provided by the contractors, particularly in respect of areas where litter picking had not been undertaken prior to grass cutting and recreation spaces where responsibility for maintenance was not clear. Members noted a request for information to be provided directly to the service team in order that the issues could be dealt with

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and the discussions be noted

#### **59 Apprenticeships Update**

The East North East Area Leader submitted a report on the strategic initiatives undertaken in the city to establish an apprenticeships scheme. Members welcomed the report that Leeds City College would support the Apprenticeship Programme in order to provide a real learning experience for the trainees and further noted the intention to pursue the launch of the scheme in April 2013 even if a fourth business partner could not be secured. The Area manager agreed to pursue discussions with LCC Parks & Countryside Service over a suggestion that a landscaping apprenticeship scheme should be established

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report be noted and support be given to the growth of apprenticeships across Leeds and specifically within the Inner East and Inner North East areas

#### **60 Wellbeing Report**

The ENE Area Leader submitted a report providing an overview of spending to date and seeking consideration of a number of new projects requesting funding. Members noted receipt of a late submission for funding for the Multi Sports Training Project and that local ward Members had been briefed on the scheme.

The report referred to monies clawed back from schemes which had not yet claimed funds or where there had been scheme slippage. A revised version of Appendix 1 was tabled at the meeting showing an amended total available to spend 2012/13 taking into account the roll up of unspent funds.

The Area Leader responded to queries in respect of the Ebor Gardens and Rookwood schemes. Members noted the funding request for the three Neighbourhood Manager posts was included within the report and the update provided on the recruitment process.

Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Tasking – A query seeking to re-allocate Tasking monies to fund PCSOs was raised. It was noted that most of the Tasking budget had been allocated but that future allocation could be discussed at the ward Member briefings. Re-allocating monies to fund PCSO's could not be accommodated under current protocols and a subsequent request to review that rule was noted.

**RESOLVED –**

a) That having considered the project proposals, approval be given to the following grants:

Rookwoods Recreation Area - additional spend	£3,000
Haselwoods Bin Solution	£6,072.49
Lincoln Green IT suite- additional costs	£2,350
Burmantofts Community Gala	£3,500
Burglary alarms for South Seacroft Friends & Neighbours	£779
Monkswood Rise footpath	£2,588
Road Safety Scheme, Pigeon Cote Road	£5,000
Blossom Hill Domestic Violence	£1,768.64
Ebor Gardens Community Creche	£3,000
Harehills Child Sexual Exploitation Worker	£2,311.28
3x Neighbourhood Manager posts	£92,717
Pontefract Lane Boundary fence	£1,973.02

b) That in respect of the late submission, Area Committee approve the grant of £6,300 for the Multi Sports Training Project

c) To approve the reallocation of the unspent money detailed in Appendix F

d) To approve an additional £2,000 being added to the Gipton & Harehills Small Grant pot from the Gipton & Harehills Ward allocation.

e) To approve an additional £1,500 being added to the Killingbeck & Seacroft Small Grant pot from the Killingbeck & Seacroft ward allocation

f) To approve the reallocation of the Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Community Engagement pot, back to the Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward allocation and that the costs to date against that budget be set against the wedge wide Community Engagement pot.

**61 Area Update Report**

The ENE Area Leader provided an update on community engagement activity undertaken across the EIAC area and the key messages on work being carried out which is pertinent to EIAC priorities. The sub groups established to support the EIAC priorities had met during November and the minutes of those meetings had been despatched following the agenda

Members commented on the value of the responses from the Citizens Panel, noting that membership of the Panel from residents of the Inner area was much lower than the Outer area and the impact this may have on the results. It was agreed that the issue of encouraging membership of the Citizens Panel would be discussed at Ward member briefings and with the CLTs

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and the comments made by Members be noted
- b) That the contents of the minutes of the following sub group meetings be noted
  - a. Environmental Sub Group held 13<sup>th</sup> November 2012

- b. Community Centres Sub Group 15<sup>th</sup> November 2012
  - c. Planning Sub Group held 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012
  - d. Health & Wellbeing Sub Group held 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012
- c) That the issue of encouraging membership of the Citizens Panel would be discussed at Ward member briefings and with the CLT's

**62 Area Chairs Minutes**

Minute 3 – Youth Service Review - A request that information on the budget of all East Leeds schools, prior to the submission of the Annual Report from Children's Services to EIAC, was noted

Minute 5 Community First Update – Members commented on the establishment of the Community First panels and received assurance that the ENE Team had begun to establish a working relationship with the Community Organiser

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the minutes of the Area Chairs Forum meeting held 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012

**63 Any Other Business**

Councillor R Grahame tabled two newspaper reports for Members information to highlight his concerns in respect of local policing:

- Armed robbery in Cross Green reported in the Yorkshire Evening Post 6<sup>th</sup> December 2012
- Police resource and procurement practices reported in The Mail on Sunday 25<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

**RESOLVED** – Members noted a request from Councillor Grahame that a representative of West Yorkshire Police be invited to attend a future Area Committee to discuss Police resources and local policing

**64 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - To note the date and time of the next meeting as Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 5:30 pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

## **EAST (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY, 11TH DECEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A McKenna in the Chair

Councillors J Cummins, M Dobson,  
P Grahame, P Gruen, M Harland, M Lyons,  
K Mitchell, T Murray and K Wakefield

**41 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the December meeting of East (Outer) Area Committee held in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

**42 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

**43 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors S Armitage and J Lewis.

**44 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.

**45 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

**46 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

- a) Sports and Active Lifestyle Service – Officers update (Minute 36 refers)  
Councillor P Gruen referred to the above issue and enquired on what specific actions would be taken by officers following this presentation at the last meeting.

Councillor M Dobson also referred to ongoing discussions between Garforth and Swillington ward members and officers regarding the possibility of an Outer East area 10k run being held in 2013.

Arising from discussions it was agreed to revisit this issue at the ward member meetings or to discuss it further at the next Area Committee meeting in February 2013.

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds agreed to co-ordinate this issue.

- b) Outer East Area Committee Business Plan 2012/13 (Minute 38 refers)  
Councillor M Dobson referred to the above issue and informed the meeting that Garforth and Swillington ward members would be meeting Aberford Parish Council and interested parties w/c 17<sup>th</sup> December 2012 to discuss the Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor M Lyons enquired if funding for projects in 2012/13 that was committed was safe from being claimed back from central finance.

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds responded and confirmed that everything that was committed for 2012/13 was safe. The definition of committed being where an order has been raised for that project. He further confirmed that all projects approved at Area Committee in 2012/13 had had an order raised and were therefore committed.

#### **47 Wellbeing Budget (Revenue) 2012/13**

The South East Area Leader submitted a report updating Members on the Well Being Budget for Outer East in 2012/13; including how the Area Committee decided to allocate the funds against specific work streams and seeking approval for new project work.

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

- Neighbourhood Improvement Officer – Job Description (Appendix 1 refers)
- Outer East small grant position as at 29<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 2 refers)

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Detailed discussion ensued on the proposal to create a new post of Neighbourhood Improvement Officer to support Locality Working.

At the conclusion, Members of the Area Committee agreed to withdraw this item from the agenda.

Specific discussion also took place in relation to the funding request to support Neighbourhood Elders Team (NET) to provide support to luncheon clubs in Outer East in relation to funding applications, book keeping, acting as an arbitrator in disputes etc. Members were generally in support of this and the Area Committee agreed that further discussions with NET needed to happen.

Members raised issues about support being provided for groups who found it difficult to read and write and had problems completing forms.

In relation to the Temple Newsam Park Run, the Area Committee welcomed this event and requested that the event organisers be invited to attend the next meeting in February 2013 to talk in more detail about the running of the event.

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds agreed to co-ordinate this issue.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Committee notes the progress regarding discussions with the Neighbourhood Elder Team.
- c) That the Small Grants approved to date be noted.
- d) That the following projects be dealt with as follows:-

<u>Project</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Primrose House Sheltered Complex Disabled wc	Agreed £2,865
Staithe Riverside Sensory Garden Project	Agreed £2,233
Temple Newsam Park Run	Agreed £2,250
Nineland Land Zebra Crossing	Agreed £10,000

**48 Summary of Key Work**

The South East Area Leader submitted a report providing information on priority work carried out in the area over recent weeks and on the minutes relating to partnership and sub-group meetings.

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

- Kippax Traders Association – Minutes of a Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and 21<sup>st</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 1 and 1a refers)
- Dog Control Orders – Schedule of Land covered by Dog Control Orders/Advisory Leaflet explaining the different types of Dog Control Orders in place (Appendix 2 and 2a refers)
- Swarcliffe and Stanks Forum and PACT meeting – Minutes of a Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 3 refers)
- Halton Moor Forum - Minutes of a Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 4 refers)
- Cross Gates Forum - Minutes of a Meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 5 refers)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting to be held on Tuesday, 12th February, 2013

- Halton Forum – Minutes of a Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 6 refers)
- Kippax and Methley Forum - Minutes of a Meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 7 refers)
- Garforth and Swillington Forum - Minutes of a Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 8 refers)
- Area Chairs Forum - Minutes of a Meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012 (Appendix 9 refers)
- Leeds Citizens Panel – Membership Summary as at 1<sup>st</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 10 refers)
- Outer East Environmental Sub-Group – Minutes of a Meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012 (Appendix 11 refers)
- East North East Divisional Community Safety Partnership – Minutes of a Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012 (Appendix 12 refers)
- South East Leeds Health and Wellbeing Partnership – Minutes of a Meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 13 refers)

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

Specific reference was made to the minutes of the Kippax Traders Association held on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (Appendix 1 refers). Councillor K Wakefield referred to the issue regarding the alleyway between Jason's and Truffles (Jumbo Nicks) and reiterated the importance of keeping the alleyway gated to avoid a recurrence of anti social behaviour. His view was that a retrospective gating order be approved.

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds responded and agreed to convey these comments to Safer Leeds and Public Rights of Way.

Discussion ensued on the need to appoint a Member to the role as Fuel Poverty Champion and Councillor M Dobson expressed an interest to undertake the role which was supported and welcomed by the Area Committee.

In concluding discussions, the Chair welcomed representatives from Thorpe Park Business Park and Scarborough Developments who were attending the meeting to report on progress on their pre-application proposals for underdeveloped land at Thorpe Park Business Park, junction 46 of the M1, in Leeds 15.

Detailed technical information was provided in relation to the delivery of the East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR) and Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR), together with the latest planning progress. Reference was also made to the highway issues and latest discussions, together with the retail element of the scheme.

In conclusion, an update was also provided on the Green Park application which was hoped to be submitted in conjunction with the Thorpe Park application.

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

- The need for the developers to be aware of local deliberations in the area
- Clarification why the developers were unable to have a dialogue with their partners in relation to the MLLR scheme
- The view expressed that the project needed infrastructure
- Clarification of other aspects of industry the developers were intending to build apart from retail
- The need for the developer to be more specific when referring to 'job opportunities' with a view to emphasising more on 'jobs' than opportunities

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That in relation to appointing a member to the role of Fuel Poverty Champion, Councillor M Dobson be appointed to this position.
- c) That a further update be submitted to the next meeting in February 2012 on the highway/employment issues relating to proposals for underdeveloped land at Thorpe Park Business Park.
- d) That this Committee notes the steps the Council should target with a view to filling the gaps in Leeds Citizens Panel membership.

(Councillor M Dobson left the meeting at 5.00pm during discussions of the above item)

#### **49 South and Outer East Locality Team Service Level Agreement Performance Update**

The Locality Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) submitted a report providing an update on performance against the Service Level Agreement between Outer East Area Committee and the South South-East Environmental Locality Team for the period 1<sup>st</sup> July 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012.

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

- Outer South Ward Priorities (Appendix A refers)
- Priority Land Actions (Appendix B refers)
- Summary Performance Information (Appendix C refers)

Paul Spandler, Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds), Environment and Neighbourhoods presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

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

- The need for an additional column to be provided in the tables referred to in Appendix C which highlighted the national picture in terms of whether or not the service provided in Outer East was either good or poor  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and outlined the crossover/resource issues. He agreed to follow up this request with a report back at the next meeting)*
- Clarification of the current progress in relation to mobile CCTV to tackle flytipping issues in Methley  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and agreed to report back progress at the next meeting)*
- The need for the Area Committee to be supplied with a report on the success of CCTV at the next meeting  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and agreed to provide a report on this issue at the next meeting)*
- The need to add Austhorpe Road to the list of priority areas within the Crossgates and Whinmoor ward  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and agreed to revise the document accordingly)*
- Clarification of the priority areas in relation to Selby Road/Church Lane in the Temple Newsam ward and whether or not it should have referred to as 'Church Lane/School Lane'  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and agreed to investigate the issue)*
- The need for future reports to specify numbers as opposed to percentages in relation to the mechanical cleansing rotas in the Outer East wedge and clarification of the reasons why 20 routes did not run  
*(The Service Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) responded and acknowledged this request)*

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

## **50 Derelict and Nuisance Sites**

The South East Area Leader submitted a report providing the Area Committee with background to the derelict and nuisance property programme established in 2011.

The report also provided information on actions undertaken and pending along with successes of the project in the South Leeds area in the projects first year.

Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds presented the report and responded to Members' comments and queries.

Discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

Specific reference was made to the following issues:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 12th February, 2013

- Clarification of the current position in relation to a Compulsory Purchase Order for The Hermitage  
*(Martin Hackett, Area Improvement Manager, South East Leeds responded and agreed to follow up this issue with a report back on progress at the next meeting in February 2013)*
- The concerns expressed that East Leeds Sports Centre had been identified as a derelict and nuisance property  
*(Councillor P Gruen agreed to remove this building from the list)*

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That this Area Committee notes and welcomes the progress made in South Leeds in addressing the issue of derelict and nuisance sites.

**51 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 4.00pm at St Gregory's Youth & Adult Centre, Swarcliffe.

(The meeting concluded at 5.30pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SOUTH (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Gabriel in the Chair

Councillors J Blake, D Congreve, P Davey,  
K Groves, M Iqbal, E Nash, A Ogilvie and  
P Truswell

### **33 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **34 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **35 Late Items**

There was one late item submitted to the agenda and accepted by the Chair, Agenda Item 13 – Update on Integrated Health and Social Care Teams.

Supplementary information was circulated to the Committee at the meeting in relation to Agenda Item 11 – Summary Key Work. The Supplementary information included the following:

- Area Committee Fuel Poverty Champion;
- Community First panel Update; and
- Bin Collection Cottingley Hall Estate.

### **36 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests'**

Councillor Truswell declared a significant other interest in Agenda Item 8 - White Rose Learning Centre Update and Agenda Item 9 Employment and Skills Update Report, his wife being an employee of the Department for Work and Pensions.

### **37 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **38 Minutes - 26th September 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were approved as a correct record.

### **39 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 member of the public addressed the Area Committee asking about the latest position of the Beeston Hill & Holbeck (having confirmed with the team dealing with this project it is the correct name for the scheme) PFI scheme. The Chair confirmed she would write to Cllr Gruen requesting an update.

A member of the public requested that the Area Committee ask the Police to undertake further work to prevent prostitution in South Leeds. Members agreed that this was an important issue and that the best way forward is prevention and for related arrests to be publicised.

### **40 Update on Integrated Health & Social Care Teams**

In agreement with the Chair the Late Item – Agenda item 13 – Update on Integrated Health & Social Care Teams was heard as the first substantive item by the Area Committee.

Chris Reid from the Leeds South and East Clinical Commissioning Group presented an update on integrated Health and Social Care Teams in the Garforth and Kippax Area and progress made in the rest of the City.

Members sought clarification on where Health Centres would operate from including maps of the boundaries to help identify which wards fit into which areas. Mr Reid confirmed that he would circulate this information after the meeting.

Members also expressed the importance of integration with social care services provided by the Council and that there should be one point of contact which would help stop any duplication. In response to questions about working with Childrens Services Members were informed that this is operational and that young people are being identified at an early stage.

Members also sought assurance that people at risk had been identified. Members were pleased with the approach being taken and commented that the impact would be a reduction in the amount of appointments made with GPs.

Members requested that an update report be brought back to the Area Committee for the first meeting on the municipal year 2013/14.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that information requested by Members in relation to the Locations of Health Centres be circulated;

- (b) that an update report be brought back to the Area Committee for the first meeting on the municipal year 2013/14; and
- (c) that the report be noted.

#### **41 White Rose Learning Centre Update**

The Head of Employment and Skills presented her report. The report provided an update on the employment and skills development opportunities for young people and adults at the White Rose facility.

Members considered the report and requested that information be provided on where the people using the White rose facility were coming from to potentially help target recruitment.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that a breakdown of where young people using the facility at the White Rose Centre come from; and
- (b) that the report be noted.

#### **42 Employment and Skills Update Report**

The Head of Employment and Skills presented her report. The report identified some of the challenges in engaging and supporting those adults and young people not in employment. The report also outlined initiatives being taken forward by the Council in partnership with others to maximise opportunities for local people to secure employment.

Members discussed the report in detail initially asking about the approach taken by Employment and Skills where people are faced with redundancy and also the approach taken to people with disabilities. It was confirmed at the meeting that information would be circulated with regards to the support offer for people facing redundancy and that where disabilities are encountered experienced staff in jobs shops are sensitive to their needs.

Members expressed a desire to ensure more people are trained effectively so their skills match the jobs available in the area and highlighted the need for more resources in the South Inner area to help with this.

Members went on to discuss the opportunities for apprenticeships in South Leeds and requested a breakdown of the current apprenticeships being offered.

Members sought assurance that BME groups had the same opportunities in relation to apprentices and also which organisations were targeted to ensure that this happens.

The demise of the careers service was also discussed and the need for children to be given the right skills to successfully obtain jobs particularly in light of the changing nature of the work place. The Area Committee thought it

vital that they play a more significant role in working with teachers and that this should be an area for the Employment Sub Group to look further into. Members requested that they be provided with promotional material relating to the Apprenticeship Training Agency (ATA) and its launch next week to allow them to promote this across all wards. Also requested was a breakdown of the youth contract.

Members also discussed with officers whether there was any opportunity for a 'role model scheme' to get local young people who are in work to talk to younger ones about their futures.

It was brought to the Committee's attention that schools did not require the £1k funding previously allocated for the market place events as they were happy to run these themselves.

Members confirmed that the job shop in Hunslet has moved to Hunslet Library and been a success and in its new ideal location.

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

- (a) that information be provided to Members about the regional support offer to people at risk of redundancy;
- (b) that statistics be provided on the current apprenticeships being offered;
- (c) that Members be provided with promotional material relating to the ATA and its launch next week to allow them to promote this across all wards; and
- (d) that the report be noted.

#### **43 Wellbeing report**

The Area Officer presented a report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance). The report provided:

1. Confirmation of the 2012/13 revenue allocation and the 2011/12 carry forward figure.
2. An update on both the revenue and capital elements of the Well being budget.
3. Details of revenue funding for consideration and approval.
4. Details of revenue projects agreed to date (as shown at Appendix 1 to the report)
5. Members were also asked to note the current position of the Small Grants Budget

Members discussed the Community Safety ring fencing provision and agreed to receive an update on the off road bikes capacity at the moment in light of one officer currently being of sick.

Domestic violence was considered by Members and it was requested that figures split over wards should be provided as apart of a report to the Area Committee.

Members considered that small grant and skips needed to be promoted more effectively.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) That report be provided to the Committee detailing the figures relating to domestic violence across all wards;
- (c) that the Well Being Budget as set out at paragraph 3.0 be noted;
- (d) that the points raised under ring fencing arrangements set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report be noted;
- (e) that the Well Being revenue projects previously agreed as set out in Appendix 1 be noted;
- (f) that the following be agreed in respect of Wellbeing funding allocations, as detailed within paragraph 4.0 of the submitted report:

Name of Project	Name of Delivery Organisation	Decision
Middleton Park Ward Bins	South East Area Support Team	£7,000 (Revenue) All Middleton Park. <b>APPROVED</b>

- (g) that the small grants situation as set out in paragraph 5.0 to the report be noted.

**44 Summary of Key Work**

The Area Leader submitted a report which provided brief details of the range of activities with which the Area Support Team are engaged based on the Area Committee Business Plan priorities & actions, that are not addressed in greater detail elsewhere on this agenda. It provided opportunities for further questioning or the opportunity to request a more detailed report on a particular issue.

It was confirmed that Councillor Groves would become a Member of the Environmental Sub Group replacing Councillor Truswell.

It was agreed by that Councillor Truswell would become the Area Committee Fuel Poverty Champion as part of his role as Health & Wellbeing Champion.

Members discussed schemes that have previously been funded by the Area Committee and whether some of these successes could be presented to the Committee.

Lengthy discussion took place surrounding the demolition of the Garnets housing estate and the handling of this as nothing has been built to replace these properties. Members expressed their desire to have more influence over local planning.

Members suggested that Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI should be changed to West Hunslet and Holbeck PFI to better reflect the geographical area covered by the scheme.

Members also discussed the possibility of holding a celebration event for the community first successful applicants.

#### **RESOLVED -**

- (a) that the report be noted;
- (b) that Councillor Groves become a Member of the Environmental Sub Group;
- (c) that Councillor Truswell be appointed as the Area Committee Fuel Poverty Champion;
- (d) that the issues surrounding the demolition of the Garnets be raised with the appropriate officers;
- (e) investigate the possibility of the Beeston Hill and Holbeck PFI be changed to West Hunslet and Holbeck PFI; and
- (f) that consideration be given to holding a celebration event for the community first successful applicants.

#### **45 Dates, Times and Venues of Future Meetings**

6:30pm Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2012.

The meeting closed at 8:30pm.

## **SOUTH (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY, 3RD DECEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors N Dawson, J Dunn, J Elliott, R Finnigan, B Gettings, S Golton, T Leadley, L Mulherin, K Renshaw and S Varley

### **40 Minutes - 15 October 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **41 Matters arising from the minutes**

#### Minute No. 37 – Summary of Key Work

Members requested an audit of Youth Provision in Outer South on a ward by ward basis.

#### Minute No.33 – Proposals for Changes to Fire Service Emergency Cover in West Yorkshire

The Chair informed Members of correspondence that had been sent on behalf of the Committee in response to the consultation regarding the proposals for changes to fire service emergency cover in West Yorkshire. It was reported that the next meeting of the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Fire Authority would be held on 21 December 2012 when the results of the consultation would be known.

#### Minute No. 36 – Garden Maintenance Service Evaluation 2011-12

Work is underway to develop a report addressing the value for money of the scheme and that this report will be available in the New Year. The report will contain a comparison of other schemes of this nature.

### **42 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.

On this occasion, there were no members of the public present.

#### **43 Children and Young People Out of School Activities 2012/13: Interim Report**

The report of the Area Leader, South East Leeds outlined the activities carried out by the Outer South Clusters of Rothwell, Morley and Ardsley/Tingley (CATSS) from March 2012 to present and the proposed use of funding to 31 March 2013.

Jo Shiffer and Helen Kerr, Cluster Managers for Rothwell, Morley and CATSS Clusters were present for this item.

The following issues were highlighted from the report:

- £20,000 was allocated for activities in Outer South.
- The process for commissioning activities.
- Identifying activities for vulnerable young people.
- Spend on advertising/commissioning – there had been a lot of ‘in-kind’ services provided including use of venues and staffing.
- Most activities were held locally and were heavily subsidised with some being provided free of charge.

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

- Provision in Morley – there had been difficulty with access to Morley schools during the summer holidays due to building work.
- Motorcycle Maintenance scheme – this had been provided in conjunction with the Youth Service
- Reluctance of young people travelling to other areas for activities and transport issues.
- Attendance figures for the individual activities were requested.
- Distribution of leaflets and advertising material.
- School facilities and the use of PFI school facilities.
- Elected Member involvement in shaping local provision.
- Absence of a Local Authority Partner in the Rothwell Cluster. The Area Leader offered to liaise with Councillor Blake and Childrens Services in this regard.
- Members went on to discuss a number of issues relating to the operation and governance of the clusters.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted and that the Chair write to Councillor Judith Blake and Councillor Peter Gruen to raise Members concerns particularly in relation to cluster accountability.

#### **44 South and Outer East Locality Team Service Level Agreement Performance Update**

The report of the Locality Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) provided an update on performance against the Service Level Agreement (SLA) between

South Leeds (Outer) Area Committee and the South South-East Environmental Locality Team. The report covered the period from 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012.

Tom Smith, Locality Manager (South and Outer East Leeds) presented the report.

Issues highlighted in relation to the report included the following:

- Ward based priorities.
- Enforcement activity.
- Priority areas of land had been allocated to named officers.
- Ginnels – work had gone more slowly than anticipated and work was ongoing regarding the pooling of resources with Aire Valley Homes.
- Ward based patrols and covert CCTV.
- PCSOs had received training for enforcement in relation to dog fouling.
- Partnership work with Parks and Countryside.
- Seasonal work – leaf clearing.

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

- Gritting and snow clearance – a winter plan had been agreed with Highways Services.
- Leaf clearance – this was not all reactive and there were designated routes.
- Cover for sickness and absences.
- Inspection of work and quality assurance.
- Detailed and relevant performance reporting
- Fly tipping and particular instances at a site off the A61.

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

#### **45 Morley Literature Festival 2012 - Evaluation Report**

The report of the Area Leader (South East Leeds) introduced the 2012 Evaluation Report of the Morley Literature Festival as part of the Wellbeing fund monitoring process. It also confirmed funding already agreed for the 2013 festival and asked Members to consider Wellbeing funding in 2013/14 to support the festival in 2014.

Tom O'Donovan, Area Improvement Manager presented the report.

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

- The Area Committee was thanked on behalf of the Morley Literature Festival Committee for its funding support.

- The Morley Literature Festival was now established on the national literature festival calendar.
- Work with schools – involvement of teachers and important outcomes for children and young people.
- Thanks were expressed to Jenny Harris, the Festival Director for her work in the successful delivery of this year's festival.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That funding already ringfenced for the 2013 festival, be confirmed.
- (3) That 2013/14 wellbeing funding be ringfenced for the 2014 festival subject to Executive Board approval of the 2013/14 revenue Wellbeing budget.

**46 Priority Neighbourhood Worker Update**

The report of the Priority Neighbourhood Worker provided an interim report on the initial work carried out since her appointment. It presented the early findings of a review of the support offered to residents groups in former NIP and supported areas in the Outer South. The review was ongoing and a further update would be presented to a future Area Committee. The report also set out the proposals for developing future streams of targeted work in priority neighbourhoods.

Tom O'Donovan, Area Improvement Manager presented the report along with Ellie Rogers, Priority Neighbourhood Worker who was also in attendance for this item.

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

- Ellie Rogers would be attending Ward Member briefings.
- Morley North – no active resident associations had been identified but there would be visits to Morley Elderly Action and Children's Centres to explore the situation further.
- The role and development of community champions.
- It was hoped to bring an update to the Area Committee in February 2013.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That the proposal for further support to former NIP and supported areas be approved.
- (3) That the further development of community leadership through a community champion model be approved.

#### **47 Reappointment of Trustees to the Archbishop Margetson Fund**

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) & the Director of Resources sought Members approval for the reappointment of the current group of trustees of the Archbishop Margetson Trust Fund. This group draws on representatives of Drighlington Parish Council and Drighlington Primary School, with Leeds City Council being represented by a local ward member, Councillor Gettings.

Councillor Gettings gave the Committee a brief overview of the role of the Archbishop Margetson's Trust and the excellent work that was carried out with local schools.

**RESOLVED** – That the re-appointment of the current trustees to the Archbishop Margetson Trust Fund, with the four local representatives serving for a period of three years be approved.

#### **48 Summary of Key Work**

The report of the Area Leader (South East Leeds) presented an update on the key work taking place within the Outer South Leeds area not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

Tom O'Donovan, Area Improvement Manager presented the report.

Issues highlighted included the following:

- Neighbourhood Planning Appendix 1.1
- Morley Police Station – opening hours
- White Rose Steering Group – following discussion at the last meeting it had been agreed to nominate a Member of the South Outer Area Committee
- The Citizens Panel

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

- Funding application for bicycles at Morley Police Station – paperwork had been sent out for this but had not been returned.
- Citizens Panel – consultation on council tax benefits, it was reported that a report should be available in January 2013.
- Funding towards keeping the Morley Police Station help desk open.
- Area Committee Environmental Sub Groups – it was reported that these had developed at a different pace across the City. Members requested minutes of the South Outer Environment Sub Group.
- Citizens Panel – It was reported that there were now over 4,000 residents involved in the Citizens Panel and whilst there was a good demographic spread, more people under the age of 30 and from BEM communities were required. There would be more future thematic consultations.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That a funding application to the February 2013 meeting in respect of Morley Police Station opening hours be requested and based on the proposal summarised in the report.
- (3) That Councillor Gettings be the nominated as the representative to the Point Steering Group with Councillor Bruce as deputy and Area Support Team to make detailed arrangements.

### **49 Well Being Budget Report**

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive provided Members with the following:

- Confirmation of the 2012/13 revenue allocation.
- The current position of the Wellbeing Budget.
- Details of capital and revenue funding for consideration and approval.
- Details of revenue projects agreed to date.
- Details of capital projects agreed to date.
- A summary of the revenue for 2011/12 and 2012/13 already approved and linked to the priorities and actions in the Area Committee Business Plan
- The current position of the Small Grants Budget.

Tom O'Donovan, Area Improvement Manager presented the report.

Members attention was brought to the current balance of revenue funding available to all Wards. Members were encouraged to bring forward project ideas for development and the Oulton Society request for a Small Grant of £250 to support the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Plan.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That the position of the Wellbeing Revenue Budget be noted.
- (3) That the revenue projects already agreed be noted.
- (4) That the capital projects already agreed be noted.
- (5) That the following project proposals be approved:
  - Alleygates – Tingley Crescent - £140 capital approved from the Morley South allocation.
  - Community Heroes Event - £1,000 revenue approved
- (6) That the small grants situation be noted and the small grant of £250 for the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Plan be approved.

**50 Dates, Times and Venues of Future Meetings**

Monday, 4 February 2013 at Morley Town Hall

Monday, 25 March 2013 at Rothwell One Stop Centre

Monday, 13 May 2013 at Morley Town Hall

All meetings commence at 4.00 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

## WEST (INNER) AREA COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 12TH DECEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor J McKenna in the Chair  
Councillors C Gruen, T Hanley, J Harper  
and N Taggart

**CO-OPTTEES** H Boutle (Armley Community Forum)  
E Bowes (Armley Community Forum)  
K Ritchie (Bramley and Stanningley  
Community Forum)  
K Smales(Bramley and Stanningley  
Community Forum)

Apologies Councillor A Lowe

### 57 Late Items

In accordance with his powers under Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to accept the following late information:

- Well-being application in relation to Bramley Grit Bins (Minute No. 68 refers)

### 58 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary and other interests.

### 59 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillor Lowe.

### 60 Minutes - 25th October 2012

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 25th October 2012 be approved as a correct record subject to the amendment of minute 47(6.4) to read , 'Members were advised that Morbaine construction would not develop the site in Armley until it was clear that the supermarket development in Wortley was not to proceed.

### 61 Open Forum / Community Forums

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.

The Fire Station Commander provided the Area Committee with an update on 3 main issues;

- a) Firefly Systems – Currently the systems are being fitted by crews in the Inner West area.
- b) West Leeds Project – Teenagers from the West Inner and Outer areas are taking part in a young fire fighters course to assist them to achieve an NVQ and some structure to their lives.
- c) Arsonist – members were brought up to date with the current concerns that emergency services have regarding an arsonist(s) in the Raynville area who has to date carried out in the region of 40 arson attacks, work is being carried out to stop this by either Criminal or Civil action and the introduction of additional CCTV.

Vince Foster, Youth Work Manager for the Inner West area provided the Area Committee with an update on work to date including a presentation on;

- Detailed statistics since April 2012
- Accreditation opportunities for young people
- Armley Case Study
- LAZER Centre Case Study
- Bramley Centre Case Study
- Recent activities
- Future Plans
- Barge Project

There was also detailed discussion on a number of issues, particularly:

- Corporate Parenting
- Work with Foster Carers
- Difference of usage and outcomes between Bramley and Armley Ward.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That a report be submitted to this Committee on Corporate Parenting.
- b) That Members be provided with information outside of the meeting in respect of , Youth work support to Rainbow House and to Foster Carers/children.

(Councillor Taggart arrived at the conclusion of this item at 17.55 pm)

#### **62 Minutes - Community Forum**

**RESOLVED –** That the minutes of the Armley Community Forum meeting and PACT meeting held on 18th September 2012 be received and noted:

#### **63 Matters Arising - Armley Community Forum and PACT Meeting**

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 20th February, 2013

Further to minute 4.8 of the meeting it was explained that TRO referred to Traffic Regulation Order.

**64 Minutes - ALMO INNER WEST AREA PANEL**

The Area Committee received an update on additional funding for Clyde Walk considered by the ALMO Inner West Area Panel.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the ALMO Inner West Area Panel meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012, be received and noted.

**65 MINUTES - AREA CHAIRS FORUM**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the Area Chairs Forum meeting held on 11th September 2012, be received and noted.

**66 WNW Environmental Services Locality Team**

The Locality Manager (West North West) submitted a report which provided an update on performance against the Service Level Agreement between Inner West Area Committee and the West North West Environmental Locality Team.

The report covered the period from May to November 2012 and provided details on a range of functions being delivered across the area during this period against the priorities and commitments set out in the SLA. The report also noted the good progress to date but also recognised the need for more focussed and targeted work with partners in the agreed priority areas of New Wortley and the Broadleas.

The following appendices accompanied the report:

- Appendix A – Service Level Agreement update – Inner West Leeds
- Appendix B – Service Requests (11<sup>th</sup> June to 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

Jason Singh Locality Manager (West North West) presented the report and responded to Members queries and comments.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices including:

- Performance
- Developmental Work
- Accountability
- Restructuring of the Service
- Improvements in the Bramley area
- Bin provision on bus stops
- Refuse Collection on Highborne View

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 20th February, 2013

- (ii) That additional bins be trialled on or near to bus stops at 10 locations in the Bramley Area.

## **67 Inner West Neighbourhoods Improvement Board**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which provided an update on progress made on the new Inner West Neighbourhoods Improvement Programme.

Members discussed in detail the role and responsibilities of the two Community Organisers that have recently started working in New Wortley and Fairfield and are hosted by Barca but employed through a Government backed programme.

### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be noted
- b) That a report be submitted to the next meeting on the work of the Community Organisers and that a worker be invited to the meeting.

(Councillor J Harper left the meeting at the conclusion of this item at 18.35pm)

## **68 Wellbeing Monitoring Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report which provided an update on the budget position for the well-being fund for 2012-13 and was also seeking funding for projects.

Kate Sibson, Area Projects Officer, Customer Access and Performance, presented the report.

Members discussed the current requests for funding in detail and also considered possible schemes for the 2013-14 Commissioning Round.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the current budget position for the well-being fund for 2012-13, be noted
- (b) That the customer contribution be lowered to £25 for target hardening works to encourage greater resident take up of the scheme.
- (c) That an additional £1,000 funding be reserved for the Bramley Floodlight Scheme subject to the Scheme receiving the relevant Planning permissions in time and that this funding be authorised by the relevant Area Leader via a delegated decision subject to consultation with Ward Members.

- (d) That the following decisions be made in relation to applications for well-being funding:
- Bramley Events Budget (Music Festival £700/Rodley Festive Lights £875) - £1,575 - APPROVED
  - Bramley Grit Bin refills - £528.78 - APPROVED
  - Aston Drive Ginnel Closure – Option 1 (£2,350) and Option 2 (£4,285) - £6,635 - APPROVED
  - LAZER Centre Motorbike – £3,500 – APPROVED
- (e) That the appropriate documentation be prepared by officers for the following schemes in the 2013/14 Commissioning Round;
- Park keeper for Rodley Park/Bramley Park/Falls Park and Stanningley Park
  - War Memorial in Rodley

## **69 Area Update Report**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report which provided information on key services and other activities delivered in the inner west area since the last meeting in October 2012.

Kate Sibson, Area Projects Officer, Customer Access and Performance, presented the report.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the report be noted and that Kate be thanked for her efforts in respect of the Armley Festive Lights Switch On.
- (b) That any ideas for increasing resident engagement with the Citizen Panel should be submitted to the Area Project Officer.

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

Wednesday, 20<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 5.00pm  
(St Bartholomew's Primary School, Strawberry Lane, Armley, LS12 1SF)

(The meeting concluded at 7.10pm.)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Minutes of the meeting of the Leeds Initiative Board held on 04 December 2012

### Members Present:

Cllr Keith Wakefield (Chair)	Leader Leeds City Council – Labour Group
Cllr Barry Anderson	Leeds City Council – Conservative Group
Cllr Stewart Golton	Leeds City Council - Liberal Democrat Group
Dr Ian Cameron	NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds /Leeds City Council
Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons	Third Sector Leeds (Diocese of Ripon and Leeds)
Nigel Foster	Business (Leeds Chamber of Commerce)
CS Paul Money	West Yorkshire Police
Mr Tom Riordan	Leeds City Council
Mr Andrew Slade	Leeds Metropolitan University (sub for Prof S Price)
Mr David Smith	Voluntary Action Leeds (sub for Aquila Chaudry)

### Executive Councillors present:

Cllr Peter Gruen (PG)	Executive Lead Member for Housing, Planning & Support Services
-----------------------	--

### Officers Present:

Mr Martin Dean	Leeds City Council, Localities and Partnerships
Mr Neil Evans	Leeds City Council, Environment & Neighbourhoods
Mr Martin Farrington	Leeds City Council, City Development
Ms Kathy Kudelnitzky	Leeds City Council, Localities and Partnerships
Mr James Rogers	Leeds City Council, Customer Access & Performance

### In Attendance

Mr David Harling (Secretary)	Leeds City Council, Localities and Partnerships
Mr Mike Love	Together for Peace

### Apologies:

Aqila Choudhry	Third Sector Leeds (People in Action)
Cllr Mark Dobson	Leeds City Council, Executive Member for Environment Business (Create CIC)
Ms Sarah Dunwell	Higher Education (University of Leeds)
Mr Martin Holmes	Leeds City Council, Adult Social Services
Mrs Sandie Keene	Leeds City Council, Executive Member for Leisure and Skills
Cllr Adam Ogilvie	Higher Education (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Prof Susan Price	Leeds City Council, Children's Services
Mr Nigel Richardson	Leeds City College
Mr Peter Roberts	

		ACTION
<b>98.</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	Councillor Wakefield welcomed all to this meeting of the board. Apologies were given.	
<b>99.</b>	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 07 September 2012</b>	
99.1	The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record of events.	
<b>100.</b>	<b>Matters arising from the minutes</b>	
	Positive feedback was given from many regarding the State of the City event held on 28 November 2012. The Chair thanked all for their contributions to the event.	
<b>101.</b>	<b>Leeds Poverty Challenge</b>	
	Cllr Peter Gruen, Executive Lead Member for Housing, Planning & Support Services, and Mike Love from Together for Peace, gave an update on the Poverty Truth Commission.	
101.1	The Poverty Truth Commission has been renamed 'Leeds Poverty Challenge'.	
101.2	The Poverty Challenge will recruit 20 - 30 people experiencing different aspects of poverty in Leeds. These 'testifying members' will be invited to meet together regularly over a specific period to develop their ability to express and articulate their lived experience as well as to begin to explore their own views on how to effectively tackle poverty long term.	
101.3	The 'Testifying members' will be speaking from their own experience rather than as representatives of any kind, but it is anticipated that their lives will be representative of many others'.	
101.4	When this group is ready they will nominate up to 15 people from their own group and invite 15 strategically chosen civic and business leaders (who will bring both resource and influence) to join them. This group of 30 will then: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ progress a mutual understanding of the different aspects and impacts of poverty in Leeds</li> <li>▪ unpick some of the routes into poverty</li> <li>▪ better protect and progress routes out of poverty; and</li> <li>▪ identify a few strands of work that can be significantly progressed by joint action.</li> </ul>	
101.5	<b>The Aims of the Leeds Poverty Challenge</b> The Leeds Poverty Challenge will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inspire new thinking and innovation in responding to poverty in Leeds.</li> <li>▪ Be action focussed</li> <li>▪ Identify, protect, value and enhance what is currently working to lead and keep people out of poverty in Leeds</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create a shared ownership of the problems, solutions by individuals, neighbourhoods, agencies and the city.</li> </ul>	
101.6	It was recommended that the Leeds Initiative Board support the proposal to establish a Leeds Poverty Challenge, and that partners welcome an invitation to participate.	
101.7	Those in attendance agreed that for this challenge to be successful, full support and commitment would be needed from all partners. All involved in the project must collectively solve any problems that are identified.	
101.8	The Leeds Poverty Challenge will be an independent commission which will choose its own work strands.	
101.9	The timing for this project is favourable due to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation launching its National Poverty Strategy. Leeds is currently one of the most unequal cities in the UK with regards to wealth and this needs addressing.	
101.10	The general support of the Leeds Initiative Board was given to the Leeds Poverty Challenge.	
<b>102.</b>	<b>The Work of the Sustainable Economy and Culture Board and its Vision for the Future</b>	
102.1	Martin Farrington, Leeds City Council – City Development, gave a presentation on the work of the Sustainable Economy and Culture Board.	
102.2	The immediate challenge facing Leeds is the city's continuing development in a post 'credit crunch' environment. The Sustainable Economy and Culture Board's role is to ensure Leeds capitalises on all opportunities to drive forward our ambitions and make links to the new high growth sectors identified in the Leeds Growth Strategy.	
102.3	<p>Milestones achieved over the last 14 months include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the completion of the A65 Quality Bus Lane</li> <li>▪ the formation of Leeds and Partners</li> <li>▪ securing government funding for NGT</li> <li>▪ superfast Broadband; and</li> <li>▪ the delivery of Leeds Gold.</li> </ul>	
102.4	<p>Projects that are moving to completion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the opening of Leeds Trinity</li> <li>▪ the Leeds Arena; and</li> <li>▪ the establishment of the Apprenticeship Training Agency.</li> </ul>	
102.5	<p>The Board has identified three areas of opportunity and focus for the immediate future, they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Low Carbon</b> – Specifically in relation to the opportunities for large scale district heating in the city.</li> <li>▪ <b>The Health Hub</b> – Specifically in relation to releasing the latent potential in</li> </ul>	

	<p>the Leeds economy for post 'credit crunch' growth in areas such as the medical research sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Public Relations and Communications</b> – This has been identified as the most important area for promoting Leeds as the 'Best City'.</li> </ul>	
102.6	<p>Future challenges were identified. How do we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ maximise growth in new sectors?</li> <li>▪ clarify what makes Leeds different?</li> <li>▪ ensure everyone benefits?</li> <li>▪ deliver a step change in transport?</li> <li>▪ deliver on low carbon/low energy city?</li> <li>▪ create sustainable economic activity and spread the benefits across the city?</li> <li>▪ ensure maximum leverage from our extensive cultural offer?</li> </ul>	
102.7	<p>Those in attendance stressed the importance of effective partnership working and of having a few key 'obsessions' that the Board can focus on and promote.</p>	
<b>103.</b>	<b>Performance Management</b>	
103.1	<p>As part of the performance management process, strategic partnership boards are required to assess whether each priority is broadly on track by assigning a red/amber/green rating.</p>	
103.2	<p>Of the 18 priorities, one is assessed as red, seven as amber and 10 as green.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The red rated priority is <b>Health Inequalities</b></li> </ul> <p>Smoking is an amber rated priority. There is some concern that the smoking cessation service is becoming less effective as less people have successfully quit at 4 weeks. This is recognised as a national issue.</p>	
103.3	<p>The performance reports for 'regeneration investment to deliver affordable housing' and 'housing growth' are both assessed as green but there remains a number of challenges. The number of affordable houses built was lower than expected in Q2 although assurance has been given that the housing investment programme will be delivered within the allotted timeframe.</p>	
103.4	<p>On a positive note however, the three Children's Trust Board obsessions have continued to show improvement in Q2. The number of looked-after children has dropped by 3% since the end of the 2011-12 financial year.</p>	
103.5	<p>Burglary and Anti-Social Behaviour has also shown improvement in Q2. The burglary rate continues to fall and there have been significant improvements in customer satisfaction for the multi-agency ASB service.</p>	
103.6	<p>Street cleanliness is also showing an improved position on the baseline with 91.5% of streets assessed as being clean. This is currently above the 5% improvement target that has been set for the year.</p>	

<b>104.</b>	<b>Future role of the Leeds Initiative Board</b>	
104.1	James Rogers, Leeds City Council – Assistant Chief Executive, informed those in attendance of a review that has been underway regarding the effectiveness of the Leeds Initiative Board. All of the members of the Board were interviewed and their responses collated.	
104.2	Some of their responses included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Members of the Board feel the culture of the board disengaged</li> <li>▪ The Board is a reviewing body – it only reports on things that have already happened.</li> <li>▪ The Board doesn't challenge</li> <li>▪ There is minimal partner contribution to agenda setting</li> <li>▪ The Board is council dominated.</li> </ul>	
104.3	A new approach has been devised. Instead of the top down approach we currently have, there will be a bottom up approach. There will be a 'Best City Leadership Network'. This will be a broad network of influential partners. This Leadership Network will meet once or twice a year at State of the City conference style events.	
104.4	There will also be citywide summits which will meet four or five times a year in less formal settings. These summits will set up specific task groups for time bound projects.	
104.5	It was also agreed that the Leeds Initiative branding would be discontinued. The Leeds Initiative brand has existed for a long time and has been a valuable tool but it feels appropriate to retire it as partnership working is no longer an 'initiative' but is the way the city conducts its business.	
104.6	It was agreed that the Leeds Initiative brand and Board be discontinued. The branding will now be replaced by the use of the "Best City for..." brand where appropriate.	
104.7	The need for the Best City Leadership Network to have a high quality membership was stressed. It is important that it not just be a 'newsletter' that goes out to many recipients.	
104.8	The summits were perceived as being a good idea in bringing together the various partners and will probably be a more creative environment than the current format. The importance of having a strong private sector representation was also highlighted.	
104.9	The Leeds Initiative Brand has been important to the Third Sector for many years. It is important that all involved know that partnership working will continue.	
104.10	The performance reports will continue and the summits will help to focus on specific issues that need addressing. There is still a need to develop a good communications plan so that the changes are easily understood.	
104.11	It was suggested that the meeting of the Chairs of the five strategic partnership	

	boards continue, perhaps on a yearly basis.	
104.12	The Chair noted that this is a positive change and thanked members of the Leeds Initiative Board for their support over the last few years.	
104.13	James Rogers will write up the key messages and circulate so that there is a clear understanding of the new processes and why they are taking place.	<b>JR</b>
<b>105.</b>	<b>Affordable Warmth</b>	
	A report was presented by the Sustainable development unit. Cllr Barry Anderson welcomed the report and it was noted that partnerships have been taking fuel poverty seriously and that this is a positive step.	
<b>106.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	At the suggestion of Revd. Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons the board thanked Leeds Initiative staff for all of the hard work they have done over the past 20 years, and looked forward to a similar commitment in the new Best City arrangements.	

## DRAFT Minutes of the meeting of the Housing and Regeneration Board held on 11 December 2012

### Members Present:

Cllr Peter Gruen (Chair)	Leeds City Council, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning & Support Services, Labour Group
Cllr Barry Anderson	Leeds City Council, Conservative Group
Neil Evans (NE)	Leeds City Council, Environment & Neighbourhoods
Martin Farrington	Leeds City Council, City Development
Steve Hoey (SH)	Third Sector (Canopy Housing Project)
Dily Jones (DJ)	Homes and Communities Agency
Matthew Walker (MW)	Leeds Registered Social Landlords (Leeds Federated Housing Association)
Karen Wint (KW)	Private Sector, Leeds Building Society

### Officers Present:

Liz Cook (LC)	Leeds City Council, Environment & Neighbourhoods
Martin Dean (MD)	Leeds City Council Partnerships Group
Sue Morse	Leeds City Council Development Department
Janey Haigh (JH)	Leeds City Council, City Development

### In attendance:

Peter Anderson Beck	Leeds City Council, City Development
Colin Blackburn	Leeds City Region Team

### Apologies:

Cllr Richard Lewis	Leeds City Council, Executive Member for Development and Economy, Labour Group
George Mudie MP	Member of Parliament
<b>Miles Pickard (MP)</b>	<b>Private Sector (Pickard Properties)</b>
Christine Addison (CA)	Leeds City Council, City Development

		ACTION
1.	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>	
	Councillor Gruen welcomed all to the meeting of the board. He reported that Jonathan Morgan had tendered his resignation to this board. All members were asked to consider suggested alternative private sector, and other sector representation for the new year.	All
2.	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012</b>	
2.1	The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record; and the status of actions was noted.	
3.	<b>Matters Arising from the minutes and action plan</b>	
3.1	In particular it was agreed that the Investment mapping exercise can be circulated The Council's plans for investment in the empty homes strategy were noted .	

3.2	SH asked if decisions had been made regarding the use of New Homes Bonus to support the Empty Property strategy. LC reported that Executive Board had agreed a contribution of £1.5m to support the strategy, and that the challenge was to prove this could support the drawdown of New Homes Bonus in future years.	
3.3	It was noted that further follow up on Child friendly pledges was needed	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Housing Investment</b>	
4.1	Sue Morse (Housing Investment Team, Leeds City Council) briefed members of the Board housing investment and progress against the programme strands.	
4.2	Issues referred to included:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable Housing programme outcomes</li> <li>• Level of s106 Completions</li> <li>• Firstbuy programme</li> <li>• HRA Newbuild</li> <li>• The Leeds Empty Property strategy</li> <li>• Housing for Older people</li> <li>• Mortgage Indemnity</li> <li>• Institutional investment and the private rented sector.</li> <li>• Brownfield Land programme</li> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Opportunities from the stimulus package</li> </ul>	
4.3	In relation to the delivery of the Affordable Housing Programme members were reassured that delivery of the programme where RSLs had commenced delivery would proceed to plan and the forecasts recorded in the paper would be achieved The board was not convinced that we had sufficient pipeline of prepared projects for the future likely programme, or to take advantage of any additional delivery which can be achieved within city region programmes. It was agreed that further work was needed	MF
4.4	Members expressed frustration at the slow take up of 'firstbuy'.	
4.5	Members noted ongoing work with colleagues in Adult Social Care to present proposals on Older Peoples Housing, and this will result in a paper to Executive Board Paper in February 2013	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Briefing on the Lending Industry and the Impact on the Housing Market</b> <b>Karen Wint Operations Director at Leeds Building Society gave a presentation and slides were circulated.</b>	
5.1	The presentation provided an overview of lending market conditions through the credit crunch of 2007/8 to the present time	
5.2	Overlaid with key economic projections which will have an impact on the availability of credit and the willingness of the consumer to borrow, and the more stringent tests which will be applied to potential borrowers	

5.3	<p>Set out forecasts for the lending opportunity for small (comparatively) lenders such as Leeds Building Society.</p> <p>Noted the market is dominated by a small number of lenders, some of whom are more focussed on building liquidity than growing their lending.</p> <p>The presentation showed modest projected growth in mortgages to first time buyer and those moving and remortgaging from a much lower 2012 baseline.</p> <p>Buy to Let lending is strong and is projected to grow.</p>	
5.4	<p>The chair thanked Karen for the presentation – which was very welcome and considered new ground for many board members and would give us all a lot to think about</p>	
6.	<p><b>Leeds City Region</b></p> <p>Colin Blackburn Leeds City Region Project Manager introduced a paper which set out Housing activity and coordination at the city-region level, prepared jointly with the HCA.</p> <p>It set out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues</li> <li>• Strategic Policy Context</li> <li>• City Region Deal</li> <li>• Leeds City Region Green Deal Scheme</li> <li>• Urban Eco settlements Programme</li> <li>• Private Rented Sector</li> <li>• Government announcements</li> </ul>	Housing activity and coordination
6.1	<p>Members welcomed the clarity around the arrangements and opportunities at the city-region level to secure support for Leeds ambitions</p>	
7.	<p><b>Aire Valley Leeds</b></p> <p><b>Peter Anderson Beck Aire Valley Leeds Programme Manager and Paul Bingham Planning services gave a presentation and slides were circulated</b></p>	
7.1	<p>Presentation covered</p> <p>Introduction to the Aire Valley Leeds</p> <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGT</li> <li>• Radial Bus Routes</li> <li>• Orbital Bus Routes</li> <li>• Inward Services</li> <li>• Sustainable links</li> </ul> <p>Housing Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan characteristics</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South bank – mixed use flatted and family</li> <li>• East bank family and flatted</li> <li>• Richmond Hill retrofit for energy</li> <li>• Hunslet – retrofit for energy</li> <li>• New Dock and Brewery Wharf</li> <li>• Skelton Grange – family</li> </ul> <p>Enterprise Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term focus to help companies expand</li> <li>• Medium term attract new companies to Leeds</li> <li>• Large site to attract bio medical</li> <li>• Location to attract distribution and manufacturing</li> </ul>	
7.2	<p>Member asked .about the scale of the housing opportunity in the area. It was explained that 8 – 12000 units was the expectation, along with 5 – 9000 jobs over 25 years..</p> <p>The Board noted the scale of the opportunity and the quantum of housing, employment and regeneration opportunity it represents. The extent of ongoing delivery was noted</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Sub Boards</b>	
8.1	<p>East Leeds Regeneration Board</p> <p>The chair provided a verbal update on the key issues and challenges which this board is working through.</p>	
8.2	<p>Housing Forum</p> <p>Minutes if the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> were circulated for information.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Performance Management Reporting</b>	
	Scorecards were circulated for information	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
10.1	<p>MD reported changes to the city-wide partnership arrangements agreed at the Leeds Initiative Board on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012.</p> <p>The creation of a Best City Leadership Network to replace the Leeds Initiative Board</p> <p>To brand partnership activities around the ‘Best City’ aspiration of the Vision for Leeds , and retire the separate Leeds Initiative Brand</p> <p>City Summits convened from the Network to tackle and take action on the key issues which the city faces</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Date/time of next meeting</b>	
	<p>Friday 22nd February 2013 2.00pm Leeds Civic Hall</p> <p>Monday 8th July 2013 8.00am Leeds Civic Hall</p> <p>Monday 30 Sept 2013 4.00 pm Leeds Civic Hall</p> <p>Monday 16 Dec 2013 4.00 pm Leeds Civic Hall</p>	

## Leeds Children's Trust Board

### Minutes of the meeting held on 05 November 2012 at the Civic Hall

**Present:**

Cllr Judith Blake (Chair) (JB)	Leeds City Council - Executive Lead Member for Children's Services
Cllr Sue Bentley	Leeds City Council – Elected Member
Cllr Ted Hanley	Leeds City Council – Elected Member
Nigel Richardson	Leeds City Council – Director of Children's Services
Jane Held	Local Safeguarding Children Board – Independent Chair
Ian Cameron	NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds – Director of Public Health
Matt Ward	NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds – Associate Director of Commissioning
Diane Reynard	SILC Principals – East SILC
Bridget Emery	Leeds City Council – Environment and Neighbourhoods
Martin Fleetwood	Secondary Headteachers – Principal, Temple Moor High School
Supt Keith Gilert (KG)	West Yorkshire Police – Chief Officer, Community Safety
Neil Moloney	West Yorkshire Probation – Head of Leeds Probation
Ann Pemberton	Young Lives Leeds – Manager, Home Start Leeds
Doreen Escolme	Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust (for Sam Prince & Item 3di)
Christine Chapman	Jobcentre Plus (for Alison France)
Andy Peaden	Leeds Youth Offending Service

**In attendance:**

Anne Little (AL)	Leeds City Council Children's Services – Governance and Partnerships
Arfan Hussain	Leeds City Council Children's Services – Secretary
Cllr Judith Chapman	Scrutiny Board Children & Families – Chair
Nicola Engel	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2a)
Becky Hill	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2a)
Lisa Martin	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2a)
Sue Rumbold	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Items 2b, 3a & 3b)
Steve Walker (SW)	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2b)
Paul Bollom	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2c)
Paul Harris	Leeds City Council Children's Services (for Item 2d)

**Apologies:**

Cllr Jane Dowson	Leeds City Council – Elected Member
Cllr Alan Lamb	Leeds City Council – Elected Member
Sam Prince	Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust
Peter Roberts	Leeds City College – Chief Executive
Alan Bolton	Academy representative – David Young Community Academy
Chris Radelaar	Children's Centre Manager – Shakespeare Children's Centre
Jim Hopkinson	Leeds Youth Offending Service – Head of Service
Alison France	Jobcentre Plus

Item		Action by
1.0	<b>Standing Items</b>	
1.1	<b>Welcome, introductions, apologies and alternative representatives</b>	
	Cllr Judith Blake welcomed all colleagues and apologies were noted.	
1.2	<b>Minutes of the meeting on 21 September 2012 and matters arising</b>	
	The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.	
1.2.1	Minute 1.2.1 – A meeting has been arranged for 15 November 2012 between Cllr Blake, Nigel Richardson and the representatives of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to discuss the role of the CCGs within the Children’s Trust Board and Children’s Services. Feedback to be given at the next Children’s Trust Board meeting.	<b>JB</b>
1.2.2	Minute 2.1.2.5 – The need for the board to have a representative from the Business community to be undertaken as part of the wider review of the Children’s Trust Board to occur in December 2012.	
1.2.3	Minute 2.2.2.4 – Anne Little is to meet with Anne McMaster, Leeds Initiative Partnership, to consider how the links between the Children’s Trust Board, Safer Leeds and Health & Wellbeing Board can be strengthened to allow for joint working to tackle issues that impacts across the boards.	
1.2.4	Minute 2.5.3 – Board members were asked to consider if they wished to remain as obsession leads or if other members would like to become a lead for one of the obsessions. The board agreed for members to contact Anne Little if they wish to volunteer as a lead and for the following members to be leads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAC                                      Jane Held &amp; Matt Bridget Emery</li> <li>• Attendance                              Keith Gilert &amp; Matt Ward</li> <li>• NEET                                      Martin Fleetwood &amp; Alison France</li> </ul>	
2.0	<b>A Items</b>	
2.1	<b>Workshop – Quarter 2 Report Cards and Scorecards</b>	
	Members split into three groups to focus on the Quarter 2 Report Cards and Scorecards for the three obsessions; Looked After Children, Attendance and Not in Education, Employment, or Training. Outcomes of the group discussion is detailed in the report “Quarter 2 CYPP performance report – proposed actions from obsession workshops”, attached at the end of the minutes.	

<b>2.2</b>	<b>Inspection Preparation &amp; Continuous Improvement – 9 point plan</b>	
	<p>Sue Rumbold, Chief Officer Partnership Development &amp; Business Support, and Steve Walker, Deputy Director for Safeguarding, Specialist and Targeted Services, presented a report to the board covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The progress that Children’s Social Work Service has made following the previous OfSTED inspection and the Munro Review.</li> <li>• The development of a 9 point action plan to continue to improve the service to realise the ambition of Leeds being the best city for children and young people.</li> <li>• An overview of the OfSTED Inspection process for ‘Local Authority Arrangements for the Protection of Children’.</li> </ul>	
<b>2.2.1</b>	Sue Rumbold’s and Steve Walker’s briefing focused on:	
<b>2.2.1.1</b>	The progress made in restructuring the Children’s Services that has resulted in the creation of Safeguarding, Specialist and Targeted Services, which brings together key services to support vulnerable children, prevent duplication and ensure joint work with a clear direction. Furthermore, local arrangements for services and families working together have been strengthened through investment and wider support for Clusters and the re-organisation of social work teams on a locality basis.	
<b>2.2.1.2</b>	The welcomed signs that the restructure has resulted in Leeds beginning to ‘Turn the Curve’ on the level of looked after children and NEETs.	
<b>2.2.1.3</b>	It was emphasised that the OfSTED inspection has a greater focus on practice and the quality and impact of services on the life of each child. Moreover, that the standards expected have been raised with 4 out of 7 local authorities inspected so far having been judged as inadequate.	
<b>2.2.1.4</b>	The recognition of continued challenges that exist to improve and strengthen practice, which will be led by Lisa Banton, Workforce Development Lead. This is to occur through 9 priorities highlighted in the document ‘Supporting Children and Families, Strengthening Social Work: A Child Friendly Leeds Action Place’.	
<b>2.2.1.5</b>	Children’s Services have developed an Improvement Hub dedicated to preparing for the OfSTED inspection. Partnership organisations are to be invited to a weekly briefing session so that they are involved in the process.	
<b>2.2.1.6</b>	<p>Jane Held, Chair of LSCB and the Birmingham Safeguarding Children Board, spoke on her experience of the Birmingham’s OfSTED September 2012 inspection. She stated that the inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not focus solely on the local authority arrangements, but on multi-agency arrangements.</li> <li>• Is robust and challenging with a greater focus on case files with the overall strategy judged on its practical impact on the life of a child.</li> <li>• Has a robust and challenging interview process, which starts from the case files,</li> </ul>	

	<p>requiring officers to know the 'front door'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses on the voice of the child.</li> <li>• Has raised the expected standards.</li> </ul>	
2.2.2	Extensive discussion covered the following:	
2.2.2.1	<p>Members of the board wished for further clarification on the new ICT system on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data migration – A project team is in place to ensure that no data is lost or altered. In addition, that cases are being reviewed and the use of supervision to ensure migrated data is accurate. Data migration will occur between April – June 2013.</li> <li>• Ease of use – Children’s Services is working with the supplier to ensure that the new ICT system is bespoke to the needs of Leeds. This has been practice led with the ongoing involvement from practitioners, administration staff and other relevant officers.</li> <li>• Safeguarding – Leeds Safeguarding Children’s Board will monitor and challenge the safeguarding arrangements for the new ICT system.</li> <li>• Information sharing with partners – A key aspect for the new ICT system is its ability to allow for the sharing of data between systems and will have the ability to block sensitive data depending on the individual users’ access level. Further work is needed on producing an information sharing policy.</li> </ul>	
2.2.2.2	Nigel Richardson stated that resources for the action plan partly refer to the investment into professional ability and strategic direction. It also relates to aspects of the Children and Young People Plan and the obsessions, which aims to invest in the present to save in the future. For instance, the savings gained by reducing the number of looked after children can be used in other areas. Furthermore, the need for partnership organisation to invest together strategically for joint benefit.	
2.2.2.3	Ann Pemberton emphasised the need for the voluntary sector to be greater involved contributing to an integrated practice and highlighted the need for their systems to be compatible with the new ICT system and part of the Information Sharing policy.	
2.2.2.4	Matt Ward stated that health would like a health commissioner to be involved. Furthermore, he informed the board that Health and Adult Services are close to completing an Information Sharing policy. It was highlighted that Information Sharing policy already exists between the local authority and health, which will need cross-referencing with the new policy. The board agreed for Matt Ward to follow up.	<b>MW</b>
2.2.2.5	The board agreed for the report to be shared with the LSCB and the Young Lives Leeds Forum through Jane Held and Ann Pemberton.	<b>JH &amp; AP</b>
2.2.2.6	The board agreed for members of the Children’s Trust Board to strengthen linkages with members of the LSCB who are part of the same organisation.	<b>ALL</b>
2.2.2.7	Nigel Richardson highlighted the need to reflect on the progress Leeds have made since the previous OfSTED inspection and emphasised that we are on the journey to Outstanding	

	status in the future. He emphasised that Leeds have a plan for its weaknesses and can use this opportunity to accelerate the improvement being made.	
2.2.3	The chair thanked Steve Walker and Sue Rumbold for the report.	
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Commissioning Prospectus</b>	
2.3.1	<p>Paul Bollom, Head of Service Commissioning and Market Management, presented to the board a draft version of the Commissioning Prospectus 2012-13. It is a partnership document developed with colleagues from Health and the voluntary sector within the Children's Trust Board Commissioning and Finance sub group. The document has three objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To act as a communication document to reach a diverse range of providers stating the areas of commissioning spends for Children's Services for 2012-13.</li> <li>• To provide commissioned providers with alignment against the Children and Young People Plan and the aspirations for Leeds to become a Child Friendly City.</li> <li>• To reinforce outcomes against the obsessions and priorities for commissioned external providers.</li> </ul>	
2.3.2	Extensive discussion covered the following:	
2.3.2.1	The board welcomed the document as a positive piece of work that helps providers understand the complexities of commissioning.	
2.3.2.2	The board agreed for the document to be presented to the Leeds Education Challenge Elected Members and Governors Boards when established to ensure governors are aware that when schools become academies, they can still continue to purchase from the local authority.	AL
2.3.2.3	The board agreed for the document to include the Child Friendly Leeds logo, explicit reference to Children's Services commitment to Family Group Conferencing, Kinship Care, etc. and strategic direction, which should be reflected by providers.	
2.3.2.4	Jane Held stated that the Commissioning Prospectus will also need to go to the LSCB as stated in the national terms of reference. Jane Held and Paul Bollom to follow up.	JH & PB
2.3.3	The chair thanked Paul Bollom for the report.	
<b>2.4</b>	<b>CRB and Vetting &amp; Barring Checking</b>	
	<p>Paul Harris, Deputy Head of Human Resources, presented a report to the board outlining the changes that have occurred to the scope and eligibility of CRB/Vetting and Barring checks following the amendments to the Protection of Freedom Act. This has resulted in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reduction in the need for CRB checks.</li> <li>• A redefined definition of adult and children regulated activities.</li> <li>• The abolition of control status.</li> </ul>	
2.4.1	Paul Harris' briefing focused on:	
2.4.1.1	The preparations made by Children's Services and the need to tackle internal inconsistencies between former Education Leeds, schools and the local authority.	

2.4.1.2	There are concerns surrounding that staff that have access to sensitive information but do not have direct access to young people and children are not within the scope of the newly defined regulated activities to have a CRB check. The legislation also allows members of staff who have been employed by a school for a number of years to not have a CRB check. Paul Harris emphasised the need for members to raise these safeguarding issues at the appropriate regional and national levels.	
2.4.2	Extensive discussion covered the following:	
2.4.2.1	Ann Pemberton stated that currently all voluntary workers are checked for free, but any role that is voluntary that is no longer regulated will not be free. Furthermore, that trustees of charity boards are no longer regulated. This would mean that voluntary sectors will either have to pay for CRBs or not carry them out, which is a significant safeguarding concern due to the sensitive data voluntary groups have access to. She highlighted the need for further support from partnership organisations.	
2.4.2.2	The board expressed universal concern over the changes to CRB/Vetting and Barring checks. The board agreed for a letter to be sent from the Chair highlighting the issue to ministers, LGA, Children's Board, Leeds MPs, ADCS, NSPCC and other relevant bodies.	PH & JB
2.4.3	The chair thanked Paul Harris for the report.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>B Items</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>The State of the City Report</b>	
3.1.1	Sue Rumbold presented the State of the City Report for 2012 to the board, which provides an overview of the trends, issues, and challenges in Leeds and requested feedback from members.	
3.1.2	The board agreed for the report to include reference to the School Funding Reforms for Dedication School Grants.	SR
3.1.3	The board agreed for feedback to be given to the Leeds Initiative regarding concerns over the density of the document and the lack of a clear summary of key points that can be easily communicated to partnership organisations and have their input.	SR
3.1.4	The board agreed for the report to go the Third Sector Partnership group, chaired by Sandy Keane, to allow for greater dissemination.	SR
3.1.5	The board agreed to receive feedback on the outcome of the Restorative Practice themed workshop for elected members at Full Council.	SR
3.1.6	The chair thanked Sue Rumbold for the report.	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Child Poverty Steering Group progress report</b>	
3.2.1	The board received an update report on the progress on the delivery of the Child Poverty strategy presented by Sue Rumbold. It registers the need to refresh the child poverty strategy for re-launch in March 2013 alongside the refresh of the Children and Young People Plan.	
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Review of the CTB &amp; the role of Scrutiny Board</b>	
3.3.1	Anne Little informed the board that a Children's Trust Board event has been arranged for 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2012, 18:00-20:00, which will aim to review the arrangements of board, involve	

	children and young people through the attendance of members of the Youth Council and provide information to the Scrutiny Board Children & Families as the board's 'critical friend'.	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Reports from sub-groups/other partnerships</b>	
<b>3.4.1</b>	Complex Needs Partnership Board	
<b>3.4.1.1</b>	Doreen Escolme presented a report to board proposing a new Complex Needs Partnership Board as a sub group of the Children's Trust Board. The Complex Needs Partnership Board will be a strategic interagency group which will develop the Complex Needs Strategy for Leeds, define the Complex Needs cohort and set the direction.	
<b>3.4.1.2</b>	Jane Held highlighted that the Complex Needs Partnership Board needs to deal with the theme of safeguarding.	
<b>3.4.1.3</b>	The board approved the formation of the Complex Needs Partnership Board and agreed the terms of reference.	
<b>3.4.2</b>	<b>Minutes from Leeds Education Challenge Board</b>	
<b>3.4.1</b>	The board received the minutes of the Leeds Education Challenge Board that took place on Friday 19 October 2012.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Other Items</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Any other urgent business</b>	
<b>4.1.1</b>	No other business was raised.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Date and time of next meeting:</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Wednesday 12 December 2012, 18:00-20:00, East Room, Civic Hall</b></li> <li>• <b>Monday 17 December 2012, 09:30 – 12:30, Room 6/7, Civic Hall</b></li> </ul>	

This page is intentionally left blank

## Minutes of the meeting of the Leeds Safer and Stronger Communities Board held on 25 October 2012

### Members Present:

Cllr Peter Gruen	Leeds City Council Executive Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services (Chair)
Bishop John Packer	Third Sector (Diocese of Ripon and Leeds) (Vice Chair)
Chief Supt Paul Money	West Yorkshire Police
Cllr Jonathan Bentley	Leeds City Council Liberal Democrat Group
Mr Adrian Curtis	Third Sector (Groundwork Leeds)
Mr David Jackson	Leeds City Council – Community Safety
Mr Mike Love	Third Sector (Together for Peace)
Mr Neil Evans	Leeds City Council – Environment and Neighbourhoods
Mr Nick Smith	West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Ms Liz Jarmin	Leeds City Council – Community Safety

### In attendance:

Cllr Barry Anderson	Leeds City Council – Scrutiny Chair
Mr Martin Dean	Leeds City Council – Partnerships
Ms Maggie Gjessing	Leeds City Council – Regeneration service

### Apologies:

Cllr Les Carter	Leeds City Council – Conservative Group
Cllr Mark Dobson	Leeds City Council Executive Member for Environmental Services
Dr Ian Cameron	NHS Leeds/Leeds City Council
Mr Hanif Malik	Third Sector (Hamara)
Mr Neil Moloney	West Yorkshire Probation
Mr Steve Hunt	East North East Homes
Mr Steve Walker	Leeds City Council – Children’s Services
Ms Helen Freeman	Leeds City Council – Environment and Neighbourhoods
Ms Maggie Allen	Third Sector (Foundation Housing)
Ms Rachael Loftus	Leeds City Council – Partnerships

		ACTION
<b>21</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	Councillor Peter Gruen welcomed all to the meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Board.	
	<b>Minutes of the meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Board held on 23 April 2012.</b>	
	The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of events.	
	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	The meeting reviewed progress with the agreed actions.	
	Neil Evans (NE) and Martin Dean (MD) provided feedback on better engagement including the item on safeguarding communities later on the agenda	
	NE provided an update on the position with the transition from the LCC Asylum contract to that held by G4S. The Council was concerned that the process of rehousing was not proceeding to plan, and there was impact on the wellbeing of the individuals concerned. LCC will continue to act responsibly while seeking support from Borders Agency for any costs incurred.	
	All other actions had been completed	
<b>22</b>	<b>Updates from sub boards/ work streams</b>	
<b>22.1</b>	<b>Safer Leeds Executive</b>	
	NE provided an update reflecting the success in reducing the 12 month rolling burglary figures to under 6000 (from a baseline of 9000) Supt. Paul Money (PM) agreed the partnership had made good progress in these areas and with other challenges such as offender management and Anti Social Behaviour. The consideration of additional priorities including re-offending and domestic violence were reported, and welcomed by the board.	
	Bishop John Packer (JP) asked about the role of the voluntary led hostels in future offender management arrangements PM indicated they were fully involved	
	Cllr Gruen (PG) noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) election will be taking place on Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> November and this will represent a fundamental change in local governance arrangements for the Police service. Including :- From April 2013 all Home Office community safety funding (currently £1.38m for Leeds) will be pooled in the PCCs West Yorkshire budget. Chief Constables will retain responsibility for operational matters but Councillors on Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) will have responsibilities to scrutinise and support the decisions of the PCC.	

		ACTION
	<p>Currently a number of Safer Leeds service programmes (Anti-social Behaviour Team, Burglary Reduction, Drug Intervention and PCSOs) rely directly on the funding received from the Home Office grant, including the contributions from West Yorkshire Police. This will now be decided by the PCC rather than the Safer Leeds Executive.</p> <p>Cllr Anderson indicated there were challenges about which issues would be considered by LCC scrutiny panels and which by the PCPs.</p>	
<b>22.2</b>	<b>Stronger Communities Partnership</b>	
	<p>Cllr Gruen reported that the partnership had met on 18<sup>th</sup> October where it has considered further work on an agreed and understood definition of what we mean by stronger communities.</p> <p><b>! ACTION</b> The definition to be finalised and circulated.</p>	MD RL
	<p>He further reported discussion about concerns about the transfer of the Asylum housing contract from Leeds City Council to G4S. NE updated the board on the slow progress and ongoing actions by LCC to deal with this situation as effectively as possible.</p>	
	<p>ML reported the discussions about the board's proposal to take forward a Poverty Truth Commission. He explained that feedback had been received from the Leeds Initiative Board and a task group of partners was to meet with colleagues from the Scottish commission to work up the proposal for further consideration at the December Leeds Initiative Board.</p> <p><b>! ACTION</b> Circulate a copy of the LI Board report to the Safer and Stronger Board.</p>	ML RL & Stronger
<b>22.3</b>	<b>Greener Cleaner issues</b>	
	<p>NE reported developments including proposals to pilot alternative week collections, progress with the Energy from Waste facility, and work undertaken to provide training and placement opportunities to prisoner before their release.</p>	
	<p>AC commented on the potential which effective 3<sup>rd</sup> sector involvement has to deliver change work to encourage local residents to adapt to the new pattern of service.</p>	
<b>23</b>	<b>Leeds' Financial Prospects 2013/14 – 2016/17</b>	
	<p>Doug Meeson Chief Officer Financial management gave a presentation which set out the financial challenges faced by local government in general and Leeds City Council in particular. (Slides circulated separately.)</p>	
	<p>Members noted the high level of challenge and an environment of further cuts over the next 4 years.</p>	

		ACTION
	MD mentioned that a consultation prior to the setting of the 2013/2014 budget had commenced and members of the public and organisations were invited to take part. He confirmed that the materials explained the context of the choices faced and encouraged the public to respond in a realistic way. The website is at <a href="http://www.leeds.gov.uk/youchoose">www.leeds.gov.uk/youchoose</a>	
<b>24</b>	<b>Safeguarding Communities</b>	
	Neil Evans introduced the paper explaining that the work grew from a wish to have a better understanding of the extent of new and emerging communities in the city, such as Afghan and Kurdish communities, in order that partners can be more effective in connecting with these communities. David Jackson explained further the work which had been undertaken and responded to members' questions. <b>! ACTION</b> - It was agreed to circulate the initial Safeguarding communities priorities for partners to understand further the benefits offered.	<b>DJ</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>Update on Housing and regeneration board</b>	
	Maggie Gjessing provided the board with an update on the work of the Housing and Regeneration Board. The partnership noted there was important overlaps with the work of this board including some of the areas in the board's forward work programme, for example welfare reform, neighbourhood planning and the impact of regeneration on communities.	
<b>26</b>	<b>Performance Reports</b>	
	The performance reports were reviewed and the ratings agreed by the board.	
<b>27</b>	<b>State of the City</b>	
	MD introduced the State of the City activity including the annual report and the Council meetings which are planned. It was noted that the Safer stronger seminar was planned as part of the February meeting	
<b>28</b>	<b>Leaders for Leeds</b>	
	ML explained the work of the Leaders for Leeds project and members were invited to register to attend the event on 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2012	All
<b>29</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	Councillor Anderson asked officers to set future dates as soon as possible	RL

## Safer &amp; Stronger Communities Board

the Leeds Initiative

## ACTION PLAN – Issue date 23/04/2012

Meeting Date	Minute ref no.	Action	Responsible for Output	Others involved	Status RAG
23/04/2012	6.7	! <b>ACTION</b> Martin Dean and Neil Evans to bring a focused response to the national paper on the riots back to a subsequent meeting. The paper should include engagement with the third sector and clearly show who is leading on the work.	MD, NE		A
16/07/2012	17.6	! <b>ACTION</b> Cllr Gruen asked Martin Dean to ensure Cllr Carter and others were made aware of the member briefings and capacity building opportunities open to elected members.	MD		A
25/10/12	22.2	! <b>ACTION</b> The definition to be finalised and circulated.	MD RL		
25/10/12	22.2	! <b>ACTION</b> Circulate a copy of the LI Board report to the Safer and Stronger Board.	MD RL		
25/10/12	24	! <b>ACTION</b> - It was agreed to circulate the initial Safeguarding communities priorities for partners to understand further the benefits offered.	DJ		
25/10/12	29	! <b>ACTION</b> Officers to set future dates as soon as possible and circulate.	MD RL		

This page is intentionally left blank

## LEEDS CITY REGION LEADERS' BOARD

THURSDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Box (Chair)	- City of Wakefield MDC
Councillor Alton	- Harrogate BC
Councillor Alexander	- City of York Council
Councillor Crane	- Selby DC
Councillor Green	- City of Bradford MDC
Councillor Khan	- Kirklees MC
Councillor Wakefield	- Leeds City Council
Councillor Swift	- Calderdale MBC
Councillor Weighell	- North Yorkshire CC

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillor Houghton	- Barnsley MDC
Councillor Knowles-Fitton	- Craven District Council

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Tom Riordan	- Leeds City Council
Joanne Roney	- City of Wakefield MDC
Merron McRae	- Calderdale MBC
Tony Reeves	- City of Bradford MDC
Wallace Sampson	- Harrogate BC
Darren Richardson	- City of York Council
Adrian Lythgo	- Kirklees MC
David Curtis	- HCA
Robert Norreys	- LCR Secretariat
Colin Blackburn	- LCR Secretariat
Sue Cooke	- LCR Secretariat
Sally Hinton	- LCR Secretariat
Andy Haigh	- LCR Secretariat
Kevin Tomkinson	- Leeds City Council

### 29 Late Items

There were no late items.

### 30 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

Councillor Box declared a possible disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of the matters relating to agenda item 11, entitled LEP funding update and future governance of growing places fund and regional growth fund as a shareholder of an organisation which could possibly be the recipient of funding.

### 31 Minutes of the Last Meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved as a true and correct record.

### **32 Matters Arising**

Further to minute 22 of the previous meeting (Leeds City Region Deal Implementation Plan) Members received an update on the Plan and noted that Government had requested a progress tracker on the Plan. Leaders noted that most activity was on schedule, although there were a couple of issues relating to skills that need to be resolved urgently.

### **33 Leeds City Region Green Deal Scheme**

The Chief Officer submitted a report presenting the Leeds City Region Green Deal Business Case, outlining the key proposals and proposed Leeds City Region Green Deal Business Scheme, including the significant potential for sustainable local job creation. The report also sought support to enter into the next stage of Scheme preparation.

The report set out a summary of the scheme and its potential for the following direct benefits:-

- Generation and protection of up to 24,000 jobs.
- Injection of over £5 billion in the local economy.
- Creation of over £1.7 billion GVA growth.
- Energy savings to householders.
- Reduction in CO<sup>2</sup> emissions.

Officers also gave a brief presentation to Members on the details of the scheme:-

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report be referred to the LCR Green Economy Panel to consider the scheme in more detail.
- b) That, following the consideration of the matter by the LCR Green Economy Panel, the scheme be resubmitted to the next meeting of this Board for further consideration.

### **34 Duty to Cooperate**

Further to minute 40 of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2012, the Chief Officer submitted a report providing an update on the progress being made across the partnership in implementing the strategic planning arrangements necessitated by the introduction of the Duty to Cooperate in the Localism Act 2011 (The Duty) and the associated policy guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The report described how local authorities had been working individually and collectively to establish what local arrangements should be put in place through the Partnership to facilitate the implementation of the Duty. Much of the work had been carried out using the Kirklees Core Strategy as a live example of how we need to work together.

The report which was prepared in response to a recommendation at a previous meeting on 2nd February 2012 sought Leaders' endorsement of the approach taken to the collective work on the Duty and the outcome of the specific work on the Kirklees Core Strategy. The outcome of the work on the Kirklees Plan was set out in Appendix A to the report.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the methodology to capture the 'beyond the plan area' implications that has been applied to the Kirklees plan be endorsed.
- b) That the pursuit of joint approaches to technical work, whenever this is practical, be endorsed.
- c) That the objective of using all reasonable measures to minimise the instances where objections are made to Plans being drawn up by other authorities in the Partnership be endorsed.
- d) That the actions or responses specified in column 8 of the Kirklees Duty to Cooperate Statement, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be endorsed.

**35 Skills Implementation and Next Steps**

The Chief Officer submitted a report updating Members on the next steps for implementing the Apprenticeship Hub element of the City Deal and sought endorsement of these and other priority skills actions currently taking shape.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the roll out of Apprenticeship Hub implementation plans be endorsed.
- b) That the work taking place on the ESB's 'Better Informed Choices' project and the opportunities to connect this activity fully into local young people's services/schools, where appropriate, be noted.
- c) That the work in hand to develop a LCR Skills Plan by March 2013, as part of our obligations under the City Skills Fund be noted.
- d) That the plans by the CEOs to progress the 'Civic Leadership on Skills' element of the ESB Work Plan be endorsed.

### **36 Vacation of the Chair**

Having declared a possible disclosable pecuniary interest in the following item, Councillor Box vacated the Chair in favour of Councillor Wakefield and left the room.

Councillor Wakefield in the Chair.

### **37 LEP Funding Update and Future Governance of Growing Places Fund and Regional Growth Fund**

The Chief Officer submitted a report updating Leaders on the application for Round 2 of the Leeds City Region LEP Growing Places Fund and the development of the Regional Growth Fund Programme, and to consider future governance in relation to these two funds.

The report set out details on the following:-

- Growing Places Fund – Round 1.
- Growing Places Fund – Round 2 update.
- The next steps – Assessment of the expressions of interest and short listing.
- Current Governance Arrangements.
- Proposed changes to Growing Places Fund governance processes.
- Regional Growth Fund – Programme Development update.
- Proposed governance structure for Regional Growth Fund.
- LEP Investment Panel.
- Delegation from Leaders Board.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the loan to GPF2 of £1.46m be endorsed.
- b) That the GPF applications received and progress on RGF to date be noted.
- c) That the LEP's recommendation on the suggested governance principles (including all delegated powers) for GPF Round 2 and RGF, as detailed in paragraphs 6.1 and 8.1, be approved.
- d) That Councillor Khan be nominated to join the LEP Investment Panel.

### **38 Vacation of the Chair**

Councillor Wakefield vacated the Chair and Councillor Box resumed the Chair at this point.

### **39 LCR HCA Board Review**

The Chief Officer submitted a report setting out the LCR HCA Board's recommendations for the review of the LCR HCA Board arrangements.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the recommendation of the LCR HCA Board to move to a governance arrangement based on Option 2b be endorsed.
- b) That a revised LCR HCA Board Terms of Reference and a joint Concordat between the city region and the HCA, as prepared in accordance with the principles set out in the report, be supported.
- c) That the continuation of close working with the HCA on housing, regeneration and economic policy and investment be welcomed.

### **40 Leeds City Region Budget 2013-14**

The Chief Officer submitted a report which reviewed the budget for 2012/13 and set out the key issues relating to the setting of a draft City Region Budget for 2013/14, which is required to enable local authorities to set their 2013/14 budgets and to allow the Leeds City Region to plan for the year ahead.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the proposal to freeze local authority contributions despite the significant increase in workload and associated core team costs be endorsed.
- b) That the increase in non-local authority income to support the administration and management of City Region projects and priorities be noted.
- c) That the need for the specific provision of funding for the implementation of major projects including the development of the Investment Fund be endorsed.
- d) That a mid-year review of the budget position be undertaken and reported back to this Board.

### **41 Any Other Business**

#### **City Deal 2**

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 7th February, 2013

Members agreed that early discussions should take place in respect of City Deal 2 with a view to a report being submitted to the next meeting of this Board providing possible options.

**42 Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting would take place on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 1.00pm in Leeds.

**WEST YORKSHIRE JOINT SERVICES COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PRESENT: Bradford**  
Councillor M Slater  
Councillor V Slater

**Calderdale**  
Councillor K Barret

**Kirklees**  
Councillor M Akhtar  
Councillor A Pinnock

**Leeds**  
Councillor P Harrand  
Councillor N Taggart

**Wakefield**  
Councillor T Dean  
Councillor J Drysdale

**41. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Booth, C Hudson, M Walls and C Winterburn, and J Badger (Director of Finance).

**42. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman reminded Members that there will be an opportunity to tour the new Archive Service facilities after the meeting.

**43. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**44. MINUTES**

**Resolved** - That the Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 27 September 2012 be signed as a correct record.

**45. 2012/13 REVISED AND 2013/14 DRAFT REVENUE BUDGETS**

A report of the Chief Officer summarised the 2012/13 revised and 2013/14 draft revenue budgets. The Finance Manager informed Members of the current financial position and reported that budget monitoring for 2012/13 indicated that all required savings are on target. The Manager explained the main area of

concern remains ASWYAS and additional information was circulated to ensure Members were aware of the latest position. The Manager summarised the reserves position and the Divisional Manager (Resources) updated on the recent meeting with the Directors of Finance. Members were informed that the budget strategy will be presented to the Leaders on 6 December.

**Resolved** – (1) Members approved the 2012/13 out-turn budgets for each service area.

(2) Members approved the 2013/14 draft revenue budget.

**Reason for the Decisions** – (1) The Joint Committee is required to submit to the District Councils required estimates of income and expenditure in relation to the discharge of the functions of the Joint Services Committee in accordance with clause 7 of the Joint Services Agreement.

#### **46. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/13 TO 2017/18**

A report of the Chief Officer detailed the capital programme requirements over the the next five year term and the Divisional Manager (Resources) summarised the programme which was appended to the report and outlined that in all cases further investment only takes place following consideration of the resources and financing options available at the time. Members requested that further reports are brought back to the Joint Committee when any significant items within the draft capital programme are implemented.

**Resolved** – Subject to further approval by the Constituent Authorities where appropriate, Members approved the Capital Programme 2012/13 to 2017/18 as representing the recurring capital expenditure necessary for effective operation of the services for which the Joint Committee is responsible.

**Reason for the Decision** – To ensure Members are aware of the capital programme developments of the Joint Services for the period 2012/13 to 2017/18.

#### **47. ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2011/12**

The Divisional Manager (Resources) introduced a report of the Section 151 Officer informing Members of the content of the Annual Audit Letter which was appended to the report. The Manager explained that this will be the last report from the Audit Commission and introduced the new External Auditor Graham Kettles from KPMG to the meeting. The Manager confirmed the report was considered by the Governance and Audit Sub-Committee on 15 November who recommended that the contents of the letter be supported.

**Resolved** – Members supported the contents of the Annual Audit Letter which will now be published on the website.

**Reason for the Decision** – To ensure Members are aware of development with regards to the progress and performance of Joint Services and the Joint

Committee in its corporate governance role and any issues raised by the Appointed Auditor.

#### **48. GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATE**

A report of the Chief Officer was provided following a request from Members to update the Committee on the membership of the Governance and Audit Sub-Committee and proposals to ensure there is regular attendance and that the Sub-Committee is fully effective. The Committee discussed Member development and the Divisional Manager (Resources) reported that Officers will work with WMDC and KPMG to organise Member training which will be made available to all Members.

**Resolved** – (1) Members supported the continuation of the Governance and Audit Sub-Committee and agreed that when attendance by an elected representative is not possible, attendance by another Member of the Joint Services Committee will be permitted.

(2) Members agreed to support a structured programme of Governance and Audit Sub-committee Member Development in accordance with arrangements within the Support Servicing Authority and requested that all Members be invited to attend training as appropriate.

**Reasons for the Decisions** – (1) To strengthen the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the sub-committee through the delegation of decision making powers wherever possible.

(2) To identify gaps in skills, knowledge and experience with a view to providing additional training and support where possible.

#### **49. PERFORMANCE MONITORING 2<sup>nd</sup> QUARTER 2012/13**

A report of the Chief Officer was introduced regarding the achievements of Joint Services in the second quarter of 2012/13 against targets set in the Service Delivery Plan. Detailed appendices accompanied the report which included quarterly performance against targets for each service area together with an explanation of some of the key variances. The Divisional Manager (Policy) confirmed that satisfaction levels in relation to Trading Standards Officers remain high and the level of sickness absences remain low. Members debated performance indicators relating to food sampling which were amended following Members' approval on 29 September 2012, to include both LA and private sector clients and set a more realistic target for samples completed on time.

**Resolved** – (1) Members noted the report.

(2) Members will continue to scrutinise the Service's targets and results to help ensure performance is maintained.

**Reason for the Decision** – The Service Delivery Plan is prepared and approved by Members before the start of the financial year. It requires that Members

receive regular reports of achievements against targets, and other corporate issues.

#### **50. WEST YORKSHIRE JOINT SERVICES – SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN 2013/16**

Members received a draft of the Service Delivery Plan 2013/16 and the Divisional Manager (Policy) summarised the proposed contents. Members discussed changes to the key priorities and requested that proposals to amend these be included in the resolutions. Members were pleased to note that the documents will mainly be made available via the internet but asked Officers to consider readability.

**Resolved** – (1) Members approved the updated format of the WYJS Service Delivery Plan 2013/16 and Service Business Plans.

(2) Members approved the amendments to the key priorities as follows:

Children and Young People  
Safer, Stronger Communities  
Health and Wellbeing  
Sustainable Economy and Culture

(3) Members agreed that further draft Service Delivery Plan and Service Business Plans be presented to the 31 January meeting of this Committee for consideration.

**Reasons for the Decisions** – (1) The West Yorkshire Joint Services' Service Delivery Plan and Service Business plans outline the corporate ambitions and targets for Joint Services. The Service Delivery plan (printed document) is used both to cover some of the overarching priorities and contributions to the District Priorities, but also as an introduction to Joint Services. As this document covers a three year period, it is important to ensure it contains information relevant over the period of the plan.

(2) If the Service Delivery Plan is deemed to be relevant throughout the three year lifetime of the plan then printed copies can be used up until 2016. The documents that are subject to change and updating, for example with the latest performance information would be electronic documents only. This would mean that there would be minimum expenditure and waste and greatest value for money.

#### **IN PRIVATE**

#### **51. RECRUITMENT OF CHIEF OFFICER AND REVIEW OF WYJS (EXEMPT UNDER PARAGRAPH 3)**

Members considered a report relating to the review of West Yorkshire Joint Services by the Association of West Yorkshire Authorities.

**Resolved** - Members agreed to support the review process.

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

## MINUTES

### POLICE AUTHORITY

21 SEPTEMBER 2012



#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Kiran Bali	David Kirton
Mark Burns-Williamson OBE	Trevor Lake
Leslie Carter	Ann Liston
Sarah Ferriby	Alison Lowe
Roger Grasby	Sheila Saunders
David Hall	Kenneth Smith
	Michael Walls

All members were present for the entire meeting unless stated above.

#### OFFICERS PRESENT

##### West Yorkshire Police

Sir Norman Bettison – Chief  
Constable  
John Parkinson - Deputy Chief  
Constable (20 – 34)  
Jeff Bridgeman – Executive Officer  
(20 – 34)  
Mark Milsom – Assistant Chief  
Constable – Specialist Operations  
(20 – 32)

##### West Yorkshire Police Authority

Fraser Sampson – Chief Executive  
Judith Heeley – Treasurer  
(20 – 34)  
Neil Rickwood – Audit Manager  
(20 – 34)  
Sharon Waugh – Consultation Officer  
(20 – 34)  
Joanne Colley – Consultation Officer  
(20 – 34)

The meeting commenced at 10.15 pm.

#### PART 1 – IN PUBLIC

#### 20. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Richard Baldwin, Mohammed Iqbal, Steven Rollinson and Janet Spencer

#### 21. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Mark Burns Williamson declared an interest as a prospective candidate for Police and Crime Commissioner for West Yorkshire.

## **22. MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON 22 JUNE 2012**

A Member queried the Membership of Senior Appointments Committee. It was agreed this would be addressed outside of the meeting.

(Following the query it was subsequently agreed that the Membership was correct.)

### **RESOLVED**

**The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June were signed as a correct record.**

## **23. MATTERS ARISING**

A report of the Chief Executive which detailed progress with the matters arising from the meeting on 22 June 2012 was discussed by Members.

## **24. CHAIR'S URGENT ITEMS**

### **Hillsborough Report**

The Chair indicated he had an urgent item. He stated members would be aware that following the publication of the Hillsborough Report on 12 September, the Authority's Special Committee had met and agreed to record a complaint against the Chief Constable. This was immediately referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) for investigation.

A number of factors led to the Committee taking the decision to refer the complaint to the IPCC, including the gravity of the subject matter, the wholly exceptional circumstances and a pressing need to maintain public confidence in both policing governance and the police complaints system.

So the matter could be discussed in more detail it was agreed that it would be discussed as an urgent item in the private (minute number 35 refers).

## **25. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

### **RESOLVED**

**That the public and press be excluded from the meeting for consideration of agenda item no's 15 and 16 (minute no's 34 and 35 refer) on the grounds that they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.**

## **26. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**The Chair gave the following announcements:**

**a) Greater Manchester Police Officers** - Following the tragic events in Manchester earlier in the week the Chair stated he had written to express the authority's condolences to the Greater Manchester Police Authority. The Authority's thoughts

were with the family and friends of the two police officers involved and all their colleagues on the force.

#### **b) HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary) Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) Budget**

HMIC had recently conducted a follow up to the PCC preparedness inspection earlier in the year, which focussed predominantly on preparations for the 2013/14 budget.

The meeting which was attended by Nigel Brooke, Judith Healey and Trish Holder and verbal feedback from HMIC on the day was very positive.

The original intention was for HMIC to publish a public facing report for the Authority, but owing to tight timescales due to the local pre election period which started on 8 October, the formal feedback would be in the form of a letter, with a short national thematic report. Both of these were expected to be published by the end of September 2012.

### **27. TRANSITION UPDATE**

Members received an update on the Authority's transition programme work which consisted of twelve projects. Each project had a lead officer, police authority member(s) and officers together with force and partner representatives. Advice and steer for the overall programme was provided by the Transition Board whose members included representatives from criminal justice services, local authority, police force, health, third sector and police authority.

Les Carter who Chaired the Board wished to thank all members and staff involved in transition work.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That members considered progress made to achieve the programme's outputs leading to the development of subject based options for the forthcoming Police and Crime Commissioner.**

### **28. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

The report explained that the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011 required that the Authority's Statement of Accounts for 2011/12 be presented to members for their approval by 30 September 2012. The accounts must be signed and dated by the Responsible Financial Officer (the Treasurer) to certify that they represent a true and fair view of the Authority's financial position. Following approval, the accounts must also be signed and dated by the person presiding at the meeting, to signify formal completion of the approval process.

As set out in the District Auditor's Annual Governance Report at item 10 on the agenda (minute no 29 refers), no material errors were identified by the audit. A number of minor presentational and classification amendments have been made to the draft accounts. As a result of the changes needed it was not possible to include the final version on today's agenda which was distributed on 14 September.

In order to give members sufficient time to consider the final version of the Accounts prior to approval, it was requested that this be delegated to the Resources Committee meeting on 28 September. The District Auditor had been consulted on this proposal and was in agreement with the course of action outlined.

## **RESOLVED**

**The approval of the final Statement of Accounts for 2011/12 be delegated to the Resources Committee.**

## **ACTION**

**All members to be invited to the Resources Committee on 28th September to consider approval of the Accounts**

### **29. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE REPORT**

Paul Lundy and Julie Talbot were in attendance to present the Audit Commission's Annual Governance Report for 2011/2012. The report summarised the findings for 2011/2012 which were substantially complete.

## **RESOLVED**

**Members welcomed the position in the context of a difficult year.**

### **30. COMMITTEE HIGHLIGHTS**

## **RESOLVED**

**A copy of the committee highlights booklet containing minutes of committee meetings held since the last Full Authority meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.**

### **31. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

This agenda item was withdrawn.

### **32. THE NATIONAL POLICE AIR SERVICE (NPAS)**

The Authority received an update to the Police Authority on progress towards West Yorkshire hosting the National Police Air Service (NPAS) under a Lead Force model. On the 30 March 2012 the Police Authority approved the proposal for West Yorkshire Police to host NPAS under a Lead Force model, subject to certain conditions being met highlighted in the report.

NPAS was due to launch on 1 October 2012 in the South East region and sequentially thereafter at 3 month intervals there will be a role out in the North West, North East, South West, Central Counties and finally the Metropolitan Police area in January 2014.

Concerns were expressed at the lack of both force and police authority involvement in the NPAS launch.

ACC Mark Milsom stated he would look in to the matter

## **RESOLVED**

**That the Police Authority endorses the progress made towards West Yorkshire Police becoming the Lead Force for NPAS.**

## **ACTION**

**ACC Milsom to ensure recognition of West Yorkshire's role to be included in the NPAS launch on 1st October**

### **33. CHIEF CONSTABLES QUESTIONS/ITEMS**

The Chief Constable reported to the authority on policing issues of current concern and interest which included an overview of current performance as it stood at the end of August 2012.

In particular he highlighted:

- Public confidence stood at 54.9%
- 86.3% of service users were happy with the service provided
- BME satisfaction was the highest ever at 82.3%
- Acquisitive crime had reduced by 25% when compared with the previous year
- Perceptions around ASB were on target
- The sanction detection rate was 29.5%
- Burglary had reduced by 35%
- Total crime had decreased by 11000 incidents (25.2%)

Members discussed crime recording and the fact that attempt burglaries were recorded as crimes which did not take account of case hardening. It was agreed that the matter should be raised once again with HMIC.

A copy of the question raised by Councillor Mark Burns-Williamson and the Chief Constable's answer is attached to the minutes at Appendix A.

## **ACTION**

**Letter to the Home Office about the recording of attempt burglary in the context of the disincentive to target hardening.**

## **PART 2 – IN PRIVATE**

### **34. CHIEF CONSTABLE'S SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

The Chief Constable spoke about a series of arrests made in Keighley and Calderdale in relation to child sexual exploitation.

### **35. HILLBOROUGH INDEPENDENT PANEL REPORT**

Members considered the issues arising out of the Report of the Hillsborough Independent Panel (“the Report”) published on 12 September and their impact on the policing of West Yorkshire.

Members heard from the Chief Constable about how the Report summarises activity by the police and criminal justice processes over a period extending across two decades since the Hillsborough disaster in 1989. Members noted that the Report sets out what was known and already in the public domain by the time of the Panel’s inaugural meeting in February 2012 and how it goes on to provide a detailed account, in 12 further chapters, of the recently disclosed documents and other material that “adds to public understanding of the context, understanding and aftermath of the disaster”.

Members noted how, since the publication of the Report there had been constant and extensive interest from the media, attracting comment from the Government, leading political, community and other public representatives and individuals, not just around West Yorkshire but also around the UK. The degree of media and political interest in the Police Authority meeting itself illustrated the intense level of public and media scrutiny that the unresolved issues arising from the Report were attracting

Members noted that, so far as the West Yorkshire Police and the West Yorkshire Police Authority were concerned, the focus of the political and public interest had been the Chief Constable himself and his involvement, both at the time of the disaster and its aftermath and also since his issuing of the very public statements on 13 and 14 September. Members heard how the Report and the many subsequent allegations of criminal conduct made by families and friends of those killed or injured in the disaster continued to receive considerable political and public attention.

Members noted how specific complaints about both aspects of the Chief Constable’s conduct had been received, considered and recorded promptly by the relevant committee – the Special Committee – and referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) for investigation. Members were clear that this had been the proper course of action and one that had been roundly endorsed by both the Chief Constable himself and others, including the Chair of the Hillsborough Families Group.

Members were very clear that their role was not to consider these complaints but to discuss and address the wider strategic issues and risks facing the Authority and the force in light of the events of the previous weeks. Members considered all the relevant circumstances including the response of the Chief Constable and his addressing of the meeting.

Members asked for advice on the legal and procedural aspects of the complaints investigation, the position of the Chief Constable in statutory and contractual terms and the potential powers available to them to minimize the risks to the public interest

in the policing of West Yorkshire. Members were further advised on the powers of the Home Secretary.

Members discussed the Chief Constable's possible retirement date and any necessary succession planning along with the relevant statutory and contractual considerations.

Members resolved that these matters needed to be addressed promptly and asked the Chair and Vice Chair to meet separately with the Chief Constable after the meeting.

It was agreed that the Authority would hold a special meeting on Tuesday 25 September to review the issues.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **WEST YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE HEADQUARTERS, BIRKENSHAW, ON FRIDAY 21 DECEMBER 2012**

Present : Councillors M Khan (in the chair), T Austin, C Burke, D Davies, J Dodds, D Gray, S Hamilton, P Harrand, L Holmes, J Hughes, A Hussain, B Selby, B Smith, A Taylor, G Thornton, A Wainwright, A Wallis, P Wardhaugh and G Wilkinson

Apologies: Councillors Grahame and Townsley

#### **40 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### **Welcome to Councillor D Davies**

The Chair extended a welcome to Councillor Debbie Davies from Bradford who had been appointed as a replacement for Councillor Valerie Binney who had left the Authority on 10 November 2012.

##### **Retirement – M Redfearn, Director of Service Support**

On behalf of the Members, the Chair thanked the Director of Service Support, Martyn Redfearn, for his work and commitment to the Authority during his time with West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and, particularly in the latter years when he had taken office as the Director with responsibility for human resources. Members wished him well in his retirement which would take effect in January 2013.

A warm welcome was also extended at the meeting to Mr Dave Walton – the newly appointed Director who would commence duties on 2 January 2013.

##### **Presentation – Fundraising Brigade of the Year**

The Chair presented Crew Manager Stuart Wilson and Watch Manager Paul Austin with the Spirit of Fire Award (Fundraising Brigade of the Year 2012) in acknowledgement of their hard work and commitment in raising monies throughout the Brigade.

#### **41 ADMISSION OF THE PUBLIC**

The meeting determined that there were no items which necessitated the exclusion of the public.

## 42 URGENT ITEMS

### **Financial settlement – verbal update**

The Chief Finance Officer updated Members on the financial settlement which had been announced on Wednesday 19 December.

It was reported that the effect of the settlement would mean that the Authority would lose £4.1m in revenue support grant which was a reduction of 7.96% (compared to a national average reduction of 8.3%).

This, coupled with a reduction in precept freeze grant of £1.07m made a total grant loss of £5.17m in 2013/14. There would be a further loss of £3.38m of grant in 2014 / 15 which would bring the total over two years to £8.55m.

Members were also advised that, although the general level of council tax / precept increase (which would require a referendum) had been set at 2%, there was a dispensation for fire and rescue authorities. This dispensation would allow the eight authorities who have the lowest band D precepts (including this Authority which at £52.41 is the second lowest) to increase these by up to £5 per year without the need for a referendum.

Finally Members were informed that the Authority's bid for £11.25m capital grant phased over 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 to fund the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) building programme had been successful and that, in total, the Authority would receive £14.65m of capital grant over the two-year period.

A detailed report would be submitted the Finance and Resources Committee on 25 January 2013.

### **Executive Minutes – 17 December 2012**

The Minutes of the 17 December 2012 meeting of the Executive Committee had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting for information.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Executive Committee held on 17 December 2012 be received.

[The Chair had agreed to add the Minutes to the agenda as the Committee had not taken place by the time of despatch of the Authority papers].

### **Finance and Resources Committee Minutes – 21 September 2012**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting held on 21 September 2012 be considered at agenda item 10 (Min no. 49 refers)

[The Chair had agreed to add the Minutes to the agenda as these had been omitted in error].

#### **43 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest made in any matter under discussion at the meeting.

It was reported that dispensations in respect of agenda item 15 and 16 (items relating to the Integrated Risk Management Plan, Min nos. 54 and 55 refer) in accordance with Section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 had been granted by the Authority's Monitoring Officer to Councillors T Austin, D Gray and B Selby. These dispensations had been noted in the Authority's register.

#### **44 AUTHORITY AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which advised of a change in membership of the Authority as notified by Bradford Metropolitan District Council. The new appointment had formally taken effect on 11 November 2012. This change had consequent effects on Committee membership.

##### **RESOLVED**

- (i) That the appointment of Councillor Debbie Davies (Conservative) to replace Councillor Valerie Binney (Conservative) as Member of the Fire Authority be noted; and
- (ii) That Councillor Davies be appointed as substantive member of the Community Safety Committee and Consultation and Negotiation Panel and Councillor Harrand be appointed as substantive member of the Audit Committee and as replacement for Councillor Binney on the Community Safety Briefing Group.

#### **45 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

##### **RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2012 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

#### **46 MINUTES OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

##### **RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Audit Committee at a meeting held on 14 September 2012 be received.

**47 MINUTES OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Human Resources Committee at a meeting held on 2 November 2012 be received.

**48 MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Community Safety Committee at a meeting held on 11 November 2012 be received.

**49 MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Finance and Resources Committee at meetings held on 21 September and 30 November 2012 be received.

**50 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION - MINUTES**

The Chair drew Members' attention to Minute no. 5 (Legislation update – Metal theft) in the Minutes of the Safer and Stronger Communities Board of 11 September 2012. This had been an issue in which Members of the Authority had taken great interest and had given their support to a change in legislation.

The Chair also took the opportunity to draw Members' attention in their role as District Councillors to Min no. 1 of the Safer and Stronger Communities Board of 5 November 2012 which related to the financial modelling of the domestic violence services.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) That the Minutes of the Fire Commission at meetings held on 19 October 2012 and 7 December 2012 be received;
- (ii) That the Minutes of the Safer and Stronger Communities Programme Board at meetings held on 11 September and 5 November 2012 be received; and
- (iii) That the Minutes of the Fire Services Management Committee at meetings held on 14 September 2012 and 16 November 2012 be received.

## **51 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT**

The Director of Corporate Resources submitted a report which outlined the activities of the Brigade in the areas of operations and technical matters for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 October 2012.

Members commented specifically on the excellent results which had seen a decrease in primary fires over the previous 10-year period of 70% and a reduction in all incidents over the same period of 42%. The Director of Service Delivery advised Members in detail of the figures relating to smoke alarm ownership and the impact this had had in the overall reduction in fires and increase in safety for the people of West Yorkshire.

Further comment was made about the attacks on firefighters and the pleasing results in terms of arrest and charges made in this regard.

### **RESOLVED**

- (i) That the report be noted; and
- (ii) That Officers be commended for their good work in reducing the incidence of primary fires and all other activity requiring a Fire Service response.

## **52 CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE ASSESSMENT**

Members considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which provided Members with an update on the attainment of the Customer Service Excellence full compliance standard (including 9 compliance plus) against all 57 elements of the award.

### **RESOLVED**

That the attainment of the Customer Service Excellence standards with full compliance be noted.

## **53 COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT – CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

The Director of Corporate Resources submitted a report which advised Members of responses made to Communities and Local Government (CLG) on the following documents;

- guidance on Statements of Assurance for Fire and Rescue Authorities in England
- protocol on Government intervention action on Fire and Rescue Authorities

Members were advised that the responses had been drafted in conjunction with the political group leaders of the Authority.

## **RESOLVED**

That the consultation responses as detailed in the report now submitted be noted.

### **54 INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (IRMP) – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which presented the outcome of the formal 12-week consultation process in relation to the eleven Integrated Risk Management Plan proposals originally submitted to the Fire Authority on 7 September 2012.

Members were advised in detail of the comments received in relation to the eleven proposals including submissions received on behalf of the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) and the Fire Officers' Association (FOA). It was also reported that a number of comments had been received since the end of the formal consultation period – these responses had been duly logged and noted.

A copy of all the responses received had been made available to Members prior to the meeting.

Members expressed their appreciation for the excellent, professional and equitable manner in which the consultation exercise had been conducted and the commitment of officers to attend meetings and draft responses to issues raised by members of the public. It was reported that the process itself had been audited and had received substantial assurance from internal audit.

## **RESOLVED**

That the consultation responses to the Integrated Risk Management Plan proposals received during the 12-week consultation period be noted.

### **55 INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (IRMP) – PROPOSALS**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Strategic Development which presented a range of proposals for changes to emergency cover having had regard to the relevant and substantive issues raised during the 12-week consultation period.

The changes would result in significant efficiency savings (£7.2m) which would help address the shortfall in funding whilst maintaining levels of emergency response and could be achieved without the need for any whole-time compulsory redundancies by aligning the introduction of the changes to the retirement profile. A copy of detailed risk based planning assumptions associated with the proposals was included in the report now submitted.

It was reported that, in response to comments and concerns raised during the consultation process, some of the original proposals had been amended to incorporate alternative risk based options.

Members were advised that the final proposals for changes to emergency cover during 2013 – 2020 were as follows;

- Fairweather Green  
Amended proposal – removal of second appliance and replacement by a Fire Response Unit (FRU) **and** alternate (dual) crew the Command Unit and Welfare Unit with the FRU (net saving £97,750)
- Haworth and Keighley  
Amended proposal – removal of appliance from Keighley in 2013 **and** delay closure of Haworth Fire Station for a maximum of two years pending evaluation of feasibility of alternative options raised (net saving £970,000)
- Idle and Shipley  
Merger of two existing stations and building of new replacement station (net saving £885,000)
- Odsal  
Amended proposal - removal of one appliance from Odsal and replacement with Command Unit at Fairweather Green (not Odsal) (net saving 736,000)
- Halifax  
Provision of one Combined Aerial Rescue Pump (CARP) and one alternative appliance (net saving £880,000)
- Marsden, Slaithwaite and Meltham  
Closure of Marsden fire station (net saving £225,000)
- Stanningley  
Removal of second fire engine and replaced by Fire Response Unit and alternate (dual) High Volume Pump, Hose Layer and Welfare Unit (net saving £408,000)
- Hunslet and Morley  
Amended proposal – stations to remain in current locations, Hunslet reduction to one fire appliance(wholetime shift duty system), Morley to stay as one fire appliance (day crewing duty system) (net saving £1,013,250)
- Cookridge and Moortown  
Merger of Cookridge and Moortown fire stations (net saving £885,000)
- Garforth and Rothwell  
Amended proposal – Rothwell and Garforth remain in current locations with application of Day Crew duty systems at both stations (net saving £1.36m)
- Ossett and Wakefield  
Removal of one fire engine from Wakefield and construction of new fire station to replace Ossett (net saving £677,500)

It was reported that the difference between the original proposals and in the final recommendations was insignificant in terms of overall impact on average response times.

Members commented on the excellent work that had been done by officers to address what had been a very difficult issue and acknowledged the fact that this had not been done through choice but rather through financial necessity. The Chief Fire Officer also reassured Members that the proposed changes ensured that the Authority continued to meet its statutory duties under the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 and the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

Two motions for amended proposals in respect of changes to Shipley / Idle and to Marsden were put to Members by Councillors Gray and Burke respectively. The amendments both proposed delays in a decision in both station areas pending consideration of alternative options. Having considered a technical response from the Deputy Chief Fire Officer and Director of Strategic Development in respect of the amendments, on being put to Members, the motions were both lost.

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) That the following proposals be approved as part of the Authority's Integrated Risk Management Plan for 2013 - 2020;
  1. Removal of one fire engine from Fairweather Green and replacement with a Fire Response Unit to be dual crewed with the Command and Welfare Units. The current wholetime shift duty system to apply ensuring immediate response 24 hours per day.
  2. Removal of second fire engine from Keighley and a maximum 2-year suspension of closure of Haworth fire station to allow a detailed feasibility study to be completed on any possible alternatives.
  3. Closure of Shipley and Idle fire stations and replacement with a new fire station and one fire engine at a site in the vicinity of the Leeds Road / Cragg Road / Briggate area to ensure a response within the Risk Based Planning Assumptions (RBPA) to the higher risk areas. Application of current wholetime shift duty system to ensure immediate response 24 hours per day.
  4. Removal of one fire engine from Odsal.
  5. Removal of one fire engine from Halifax and provision of a fully equipped Resilience Pump which can be utilised when required as an alternative to the Combined Aerial Rescue Pump.
  6. Closure of Marsden fire station.
  7. Removal of second fire engine at Stanningley and replacement with the Fire Response Unit for Leeds District, to be dual crewed with the High Volume Pump, Hose Layer and Welfare Unit. Application of current wholetime shift duty system to ensure immediate response 24 hours per day.

8. Retention of Hunslet and Morley fire stations in their current locations and removal of one fire engine from Hunslet. Day Crew staffing to apply at Morley and current wholetime shift duty system at Hunslet to ensure immediate response 24 hours per da.
  9. Closure of Cookridge and Moortown fire stations and replacement with a new fire station with one fire engine at a suitable location to provide appropriate cover for both areas. Application of current wholetime shift duty system to ensure immediate response 24 hours per day.
  10. Retention of Rothwell and Garforth fire stations in their current locations. Day Crew staffing to apply at both stations.
  11. Removal of one fire engine from Wakefield and provision of fully equipped Resilience Pump which can be utilised when required as an alternative to the Combined Aerial Rescue Pump and construct a new fire station to replace Ossett at Junction 40 of the M1 motorway; and
- (ii) That annual update reports on progress with the Integrated Risk Management Plans be submitted to each December meeting of the Authority.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

**AT A MEETING OF THE WEST YORKSHIRE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
AUTHORITY EXECUTIVE BOARD HELD IN WELLINGTON HOUSE  
ON FRIDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Lewis (Chair)

Councillors A Carter, Y Crewe, R Downes, E Firth, D Hardy,  
K Hussain, M Lyons and L Smaje

In attendance: Councillors R Lewis (Leeds), P McBride (Kirklees) and  
V Slater (Bradford)

Observers: Councillors M Graham, G Reid and Z Shah

**13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**14. DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no pecuniary interests declared by members at the meeting.

**15. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ITA EXECUTIVE BOARD HELD ON  
27 JULY 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting of the ITA Executive Board held on 27 July 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair.

**16. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE DISTRICT LIAISON COMMITTEES**

**RESOLVED** -

- (i) That the minutes of the meeting of the Leeds District Liaison Committee held on 9 July 2012 be approved.
- (ii) That the minutes of the meeting of the Kirklees District Liaison Committee held on 11 July 2012 be approved.
- (iii) That the minutes of the meeting of the Bradford District Liaison Committee held on 12 July 2012 be approved.
- (iv) That the minutes of the meeting of the Calderdale District Liaison Committee held on 17 July 2012 be approved.
- (v) That the minutes of the meeting of the Wakefield District Liaison Committee held on 19 July 2012 be approved.

**17. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE PASSENGER CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES**

**RESOLVED -**

- (i) That the minutes of the meeting of the Leeds Passenger Consultative Committee held on 9 July 2012 be approved.
- (ii) That the minutes of the meeting of the Kirklees Passenger Consultative Committee held on 11 July 2012 be approved.
- (iii) That the minutes of the meeting of the Bradford Passenger Consultative Committee held on 16 July 2012 be approved.
- (iv) That the minutes of the meeting of the Calderdale Passenger Consultative Committee held on 17 July 2012 be approved.
- (v) That the minutes of the meeting of the Wakefield Passenger Consultative Committee held on 19 July 2012 be approved.

**18. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN COMMITTEE HELD ON 18 JULY 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting of the Local Transport Plan Committee held on 18 July 2012 be approved.

**19. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 23 JULY AND 22 AUGUST 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meetings of the Integrated Transport Scrutiny Committee held on 23 July and 22 August 2012 be noted.

**20. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUS SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 25 JULY 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting of the Bus Services Scrutiny Committee held on 25 July 2012 be noted.

**21. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 3 AUGUST 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting of the Audit & Governance Committee held on 3 August 2012 be approved.

**22. MINUTES OF THE JOINT PCC SEMINAR ON A BUS QUALITY CONTRACT SCHEME AND LEEDS CITY REGION DEAL HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2012**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the joint PCC Seminar on a Bus Quality Contract Scheme and Leeds City Region Deal held on 5 September 2012 be approved.

**23. CAPITAL PROGRAMME APPROVALS**

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive on the release of expenditure to the following schemes:

- NGT Project Development
- SmartCard and Information Programme (SCIP)

**NGT Project Development**

The ITA Executive Board was advised that further expenditure of £3.5m during the 2012/13 financial year was required to fund work to progress the submission of the Transport and Works Act Order and the completion of the procurement strategy. The £3.5m sum would be funded from the LTP allocation of £1.8m and a separate contribution of £1.7m from Leeds City Council. It was reported that those costs were in line with forecasts included in the Best and Final Funding Bid submitted to the DfT in Spring 2012.

**SmartCard and Information Programme (SCIP)**

It was reported that the SmartCard and Information Programme (SCIP) aimed to achieve efficiencies, cost savings and provide a better service to customers through a number of ongoing projects which had been mainly funded through the Better Bus Area Fund.

The ITA Executive Board was advised that to further progress the SCIP project, approval of £100,000 was being sought from the indicative Local Transport Plan (SCIP) allocation.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the NGT scheme development expenditure of £4.7m in 2012/13 which comprised the previous approval of £1.2m be noted and that further expenditure in the sum of £3.5m to be funded through LTP allocation of £1.8m and a separate contribution of £1.7m from Leeds City Council be approved.
- (b) That expenditure in the sum of £100,000 for development of activity costs relating to the SmartCard and Information Programme (SCIP) to be funded by the Local Transport Plan be approved.

## 24. LTP CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/2013

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive giving an update on:

- Outcome of the LTP3 Capital Programme Review
- Approval of the revised outline programme for 2012-2014

It was reported that a review of Metro's Capital Programme had been undertaken as a result of the recent funding announcements and the programming of projects that had not yet received full approval. That review had identified a revised capital programme which was attached at Appendix 1 of the submitted report.

The ITA Executive Board was informed that the proposed changes to the Capital Programme had been considered by the Integrated Transport Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 24 September 2012.

The most significant of those changes were to the following schemes:

- Castleford Interchange
- New Generation Transport
- Heckmondwike Combined Bus Station and Library Information Centre
- Rail Devolution Development Costs
- Development of Quality Contracts Scheme

**RESOLVED** - That the revised outline Capital Programme as detailed in Appendix 1 of the submitted report be approved.

## 25. STRATEGIC UPDATE

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive giving an update on a number of strategic transport developments including:

- A65 Quality Bus Initiative
- West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund
- Rail Devolution
- Major Scheme Funding Devolution

### **A65 Quality Bus Initiative**

It was reported that the new £21m Quality Bus Scheme had been developed in partnership with First and Leeds City Council and had now been officially opened by Norman Baker MP. Members were advised that the scheme included 4km of dedicated bus and cycle lanes and the introduction of a new fleet of buses by First.

The ITA Executive Board requested that in view of the predicted 13% increase in bus trips on the corridor, periodic updates be reported to the Bus Services Scrutiny Committee and ITA Executive Board monitoring its progress.

### **West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund**

It was reported that work was continuing on the identification and specification of potential schemes. The ITA Executive Board was advised that the initial list of schemes including their GVA impact and the proposed overall funding of the package would be available in October and presented to a meeting of the West Yorkshire Leaders (AWYA) shortly thereafter.

### **Rail Devolution**

The ITA Executive Board was given a progress report on work currently being undertaken on the development of the proposals. It was reported that a response by the DfT to the Expression of Interest submitted by Metro, SYPTA and Greater Manchester Authorities was expected in the Autumn. Comment was also made that a letter had been sent by the Leaders of Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester Councils seeking a meeting with the Secretary of State to discuss the proposals for rail devolution.

In noting the work carried out to date, Members welcomed the emphasis placed on governance to ensure that local authorities outside of West and South Yorkshire and Greater Manchester were being fully involved and represented and that there was proper accountability throughout the devolution process.

### **Major Scheme Funding Devolution**

It was reported that following the Government's decision and subsequent consultation to devolve funding from major transport schemes from 2015, the DfT had now issued a response setting out the next steps in the process.

In noting the main points of the response and the DfT's request for an early indication of the proposed geography, the ITA Executive Board was informed that in view of the fact that the LEP Areas in the Leeds City Region overlapped, the DfT had agreed to an extension to the September deadline to allow time for West Yorkshire, York and North Yorkshire Authorities to reach a decision on the local geography.

### **RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the report be noted.
- (b) That progress reports on the A65 Quality Bus Initiative be prepared for future meetings of the ITA Executive Board and Bus Services Scrutiny Committee.

## 26. BUS UPDATE

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive updating members on:

- English National Concessionary Travel Passes
- Smartcard Ticketing
- Bus Quality Contract Scheme
- Better Bus Areas and Bus Service Operators Grant

### **English National Concessionary Travel Passes**

It was reported that there was a requirement to renew over 270,000 travel passes that expire in March 2013. The ITA Executive Board was advised that an online renewal facility for senior citizen passes had now been established and a facility for disabled/blind persons would be made available in October 2012. In response to a question raised by members, it was commented that it would be possible to renew passes at Travel Centres or through Metroline by the end of the year.

### **SmartCard Ticketing**

The ITA Executive Board was given an update on the roll out and implementation of the smartcard ticketing scheme in West Yorkshire.

Members were advised that a deployment plan was being finalised with bus operators with regard to the introduction of young persons' entitlement passes, period tickets and pay as you go tickets being launched in 2013.

### **Bus Quality Contract Scheme**

It was reported that following the decision taken by the ITA to proceed with a bus quality contract scheme work was continuing on the 'Statement of Case' document which set out Metro's Quality Contract proposals in more detail and demonstrated how the scheme met the five Public Interest tests. Members were advised that stakeholder engagement meetings had also been held with District Councils, neighbouring authorities and Trade Unions.

### **Better Bus Areas and BSOG Devolution**

It was reported that the Department for Transport had now published a consultation document on the devolution of the Bus Service Operator Grant (BSOG) and the criteria for Better Bus Areas.

The ITA Executive Board expressed their serious concerns that the DfT's proposals would financially penalise transport authorities who were proposing to operate a Quality Contract Scheme as they would not be eligible for BSOG payments which for West Yorkshire could be up to £5-6 million per year. Members considered that the DfT's document heavily favoured partnership working between local transport authorities and operators. It was therefore

suggested that a report be prepared for the next meeting of the ITA Executive Board outlining partnership offers and the development of Quality Contract Schemes in other local transport authority/ITA areas. A further concern was that under the proposals, AccessBus would be ineligible for BSOG which would increase annual costs.

It was proposed that a joint response to the consultation be prepared with pteg, supporting the principle of devolution but highlighting concerns over the proposed implementation. Members also proposed that a supplementary West Yorkshire response be submitted to the DfT.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the report be noted.
- (b) That a report be submitted to the next meeting of the ITA Executive Board outlining partnership offers and the development of Quality Contract Schemes in other local transport authority/ITA areas..

**27. BOXING DAY BUS SERVICES**

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive on the planning for bus services on Boxing Day 2012.

It was proposed to run half hourly services between 0800 and 1800 hours for a flat fare of £3 per passenger on each of the core high frequency routes into the centres of Leeds and Huddersfield. Those services would also provide links to other centres in West Yorkshire and enable access to out of town shopping centres and hospitals.

Members were also advised that Metroline would provide a service during the hours of operation.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) That the arrangements to secure the operation of Boxing Day 2012 services as detailed in the submitted report be approved.
- (b) That the outcome of discussions with the retail sector and the award of contracts be reported to the Bus Services Scrutiny Committee.
- (c) That a report be submitted to a future meeting of the ITA Executive Board detailing a breakdown of fares basket and, if possible, the types of journeys made.

**28. PROTECTION OF FREEDOMS ACT 2012 (“THE ACT”)**

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive detailing the impact of the Act on the ITA’s publication scheme.

It was reported that the Act received Royal Assent on 1 May 2012 and contained several provisions which would directly affect Metro due to the amendments that the Act made to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act (SVGA).

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

## **29. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The ITA Executive Board considered a recommendation to exclude the press and public from Agenda Item 18, which contained exempt information defined in Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A, Local Government Act 1972.

It was agreed that because disclosure of the report might prejudice future negotiations, the public interest would be better served by maintaining the exemption and, therefore, the press and public be now excluded from the meeting.

## **\*30. APPROVALS TO REVISED BUDGETS AND UPDATED FINANCIAL STRATEGY**

The ITA Executive Board considered a report of the Passenger Transport Executive on changes to the 2012/13 budget and the latest position on the medium term financial strategy.

It was reported that work on further budget reductions and cuts that could contribute to improving the reserves position as set out in the medium term financial strategy had been completed. A list of further cuts achievable in 2012/13 was detailed in the submitted report for members' approval.

It was reported that officers had recently attended a meeting of the West Yorkshire Chief Executives on 24 September 2012. At that meeting the ITA's difficult funding position and the limited scope for achieving further savings was recognised. In that context, the ITA Executive Board highlighted the increased opportunities and challenges faced by the Authority including the City Deal, Transport Fund, Combined Authority, Rail Development and developing Quality Contracts. They also stressed that at the future levy discussions with the West Yorkshire Leaders in October 2012, those challenges should be emphasised.

**RESOLVED** -

- (a) That the amendment to the 2012/13 budget as outlined in the submitted report be approved.
- (b) That the medium term financial strategy position be noted.