

CITY OF YORK COUNCIL

Resolutions and proceedings of the Meeting of the City of York Council held in Guildhall, York on Thursday, 18th July, 2013, starting at 6.30 pm

Present: The Lord Mayor (Cllr Julie Gunnell) in the Chair, and the following Councillors:

ACOMB WARD

Horton
Simpson-Laing

BISHOPTHORPE WARD

Galvin

CLIFTON WARD

Douglas
King
Scott

DERWENT WARD

Brooks

DRINGHOUSES & WOODTHORPE WARD

Hodgson
Reid
Semlyen

FISHERGATE WARD

D'Agorne
Taylor

FULFORD WARD

Aspden

GUILDHALL WARD

Looker
Watson

HAXBY & WIGGINTON WARD

Cuthbertson
Firth
Richardson

HESLINGTON WARD

Levene

HEWORTH WARD

Boyce
Funnell
Potter

HEWORTH WITHOUT WARD

Ayre

HOLGATE WARD

Alexander
Crisp
Riches

HULL ROAD WARD

Barnes
Fitzpatrick

HUNTINGTON & NEW
EARSWICK WARD

Hyman
Runciman

MICKLEGATE WARD

Fraser
Gunnell
Merrett

OSBALDWICK WARD

Warters

RURAL WEST YORK WARD

Gillies
Healey
Steward

SKELTON, RAWCLIFFE &
CLIFTON WITHOUT WARD

Cunningham-Cross
McIlveen
Watt

STRENSALL WARD

Wiseman

WESTFIELD WARD

Jeffries
Burton
Williams

WHELDRAKE WARD

Barton

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Orrell and Doughty

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

The following **prejudicial** interest was declared:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Description of Interest</u>
Wiseman	17 (ii) – Notices of Motion (Local Plan)	Husband's family owned land earmarked for future use in the Local Plan.

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the Annex to Agenda Item 8 (Recommendations of the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee) on the grounds that it contains information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual. This information is classed as exempt under paragraph 2 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as revised by The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

15. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 28 March 2013 and the Annual Meeting held on 23 May 2013 be approved and signed by the Chair as correct records.

16. CIVIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no civic announcements.

17. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Deputy Lord Mayor announced that one member of the public had registered to speak at the meeting. Gwen Swinburn had

registered to speak in relation to neighbourhood governance but did not attend the meeting.

18. PETITIONS

A. Petition regarding proposed Lendal Bridge trial closure

In view of the number of signatories, over 1,200 people, the e-petition asking the Council to rethink Cabinet's plan to close Lendal Bridge for a 6 month trial and stop the ensuing gridlock in York, was then discussed by members.

Councillor Reid moved and Councillor Aspden seconded that Standing Orders be suspended to allow Members to take a decision on the Lendal Bridge petitions request.

On being put to the vote the Motion was LOST.

Following the debate the Lord Mayor confirmed that the Cabinet Member would take note of the petition when considering the consultation responses.

B. Petitions Presented Under Standing Order 7

Under Standing Order 7, petitions were presented by:

- i) Cllr Ann Reid opposing Labour's plans to use Green Belt land across York to build 22,000 houses on over the next 15 years.¹
- ii) Cllr Ann Reid objecting to the proposals in the council's Local Plan for the development of land lying between Wetherby Road and Knapton Village. We believe that the site should continue to be included in the Green Belt as it protects the rural setting of the western approach to the city which will otherwise begin to merge with the outer ring road.²
- iii) Cllr Lynn Jeffries objecting to the proposal in the Council's Local Plan for the development of land lying between the existing urban area and the ring road. We wish to see this land retained in the "Green Belt". Instead we believe that the Council should concentrate any new buildings at previously developed, but now

unused, sites such as Terry's, Nestle South, British Sugar and the area behind the station. We specifically object to the inclusion of part of Acomb Moor as a development site (H9) in the Council's Local Plan. We believe the site should continue to be included in the Green Belt as it protects the western approach to the City and avoids the dominance that any building near the Great Knoll would have on the surrounding area. The Moor is an important informal recreation amenity for local residents and this should be recognised in the Local Plan.^{3.}

- iv) Cllr Lynn Jeffries calling upon the council to install a dog deterring fence around the play area off Grange Lane (next to Westfield School). We ask that more dog dirt bins, and litter bins, are provided close to the play equipment so that the health hazards, resulting from dog fouling and broken glass, can be tackled and to ensure that children can play safely on the equipment.^{4.}
- v) Cllr Keith Aspden calling on City of York Council to give residents in Fulford a fairer deal and improve the road surfaces particularly in Fulford Park, Cherry Wood Crescent, Eastward Avenue and St Oswald's Road.^{5.}
- vi) Cllr Ann Reid objecting to the designation of land west of Woodthorpe for house building (ST10). Successive local plans have indicated that this land is important in enhancing York's rural setting. The nearby Askham Bogs nature reserve could be adversely affected by any development. Residents are concerned that the development in this area would exacerbate the traffic congestion problems which are already evident at certain times of the day. We therefore petition that the land continue to be included in the "Green Belt."^{6.}

Action Required

- 1,2,3,5 and 6. Schedule items on the Forward Plan, if required, and keep relevant Member updated on progress. SS
- 4. Schedule item on the Forward Plan, if required, and keep relevant Member updated on progress. KS

19. REPORT OF CABINET LEADER AND CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS

A written report was received from the Cabinet Leader, Cllr James Alexander, on the work of the Cabinet.

A Questions

Notice had been received of nine questions on the written report, submitted by Members in accordance with Standing Orders. The first six questions were put and answered as follows and Cllr Alexander undertook to provide Members with written answers to the remaining questions:

(i) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Aspden

“Concerning the fall in unemployment in York, more than one million private sector jobs have been created nationally since the Coalition Government came to power. The Liberal Democrats now want to create a million more including in cities such as York. Would the Cabinet Leader support this campaign which builds on Coalition Government achievements, including a fall in youth unemployment, a record rise in apprenticeships, £5.5bn extra invested into science, high-tech manufacturing and renewable energy, and a £2,000 cash back on National Insurance contributions for employers who take on more staff?”

The Leader replied:

“I support any measures that will facilitate economic growth and increase the number of jobs. I should point out the trend of private sector employment increase started in mid 2009 following a low point after the economic crisis. Total private sector jobs in the UK is little more than it was in 2008 and much more needs to be done.”

(ii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Barton

“If the Council is to be “flexible” in seeing the Former Terry’s plans come to fruition, does this mean that the motion suggesting a 10:10 ratio on affordable housing proposed in Council by the Conservative Group and buried by this administration will now be reinstated?”

The Leader replied:

“You can't reinstate something that was never established. Flexibility is the key word here, saying 10% affordable housing is rigid. We may negotiate higher, we may negotiate lower. Flexibility on a site by site basis is what is needed.”

(iii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Warters

“The Council Leader reports that the Planning Minister made clear the Local Plan is a matter for York, can the Council Leader clarify if this is a matter for York residents or just himself, Councillors Merrett and Simpson-Laing as members of the secret Spatial Planning Member Steering Group?”

The Leader replied:

“It is a matter for all York residents, as demonstrated by the public consultation involving every household in York.”

(iv) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Reid

“Hillary Benn, Labour’s Shadow Communities and Local Government Secretary, recently said that "local communities should decide where they want new homes and developments to go and then give their consent in the form of planning permission.....it's the difference between having a say and having it done to you. Communities should be able to determine their own future and decide what their area should look like in 5, 10, or 20 years' time”. In regards to the Local Plan, does the Cabinet Leader agree with his Labour colleague and is he prepared to listen to the residents of York?”

The Leader replied:

“I do agree and I very much welcome your support for what my Labour colleagues in Westminster are saying. However, at the moment we have a Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government who disagree with this approach and we have to work within the constraints of national legislation. I look forward to a Labour Government giving more freedoms back to communities.”

(v) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Barton

“In the Comprehensive Spending Review report the Leader says that “Giving York taxpayer’s money to unelected bodies to administer sets a dangerous and undemocratic precedent.” Bearing in mind that this administration pays Your Consortium,

another unelected body, thousands of pounds to administer York tax payers money – does he not consider his words to be totally disingenuous and, if he is to take his own advice, demanding of the cancellation of Your Consortiums contract?”

The Leader replied:

“I don't think you understand my report. What I am talking about is money the Government promised York taxpayers, for a specific reason, but in line with other funding reductions to instead be taken away and then given to unelected quangos. What Your Consortium is doing is administering funding allocations to the voluntary sector, with the necessary support to ensure every pound spent is maximised in its full potential to make a difference. We have moved from a grant culture by habit to a results-based commissioning model. This ensures best value for taxpayer's money.”

(vi) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Warters

“The Council Leader highlights without a Local Plan powers will be taken away from democratically elected Councillors and given to unelected officials in London. Can the Council Leader outline just what input democratically elected non Labour Members have had into the production of the Local Plan, what power can they exert over the Spatial Planning Member Steering Group, and just what strategic planning decision making powers they have that Central Government can remove”.

The Leader replied:

“One way is to take part in the cross-party Working Group, but I understand you called on opposition councillors to boycott this Group. The Government can take away power over all planning decisions from this council if it so wishes. This is why a credible Local Plan is so important.”

(vii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Aspden

“In order to support the economic goals of ‘jobs and growth’ outlined in this report, it is crucial that York has clarity and impact in our economic partnerships. Could the Cabinet Leader therefore confirm whether York remains part of the York and North Yorkshire LEP and what he is doing to increase York representation on the Leeds City Region LEP Board?”

Reply:

"I agree. It is crucial York has clarity and this is what I outlined to my predecessor. I am working with Ministers over this issue. York giving indication to withdraw from the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership gave clarity where it was not forthcoming from Government. It followed the Heseltine report that recommended being a member in one LEP and given that clarity I discussed the issue with Vince Cable MP. However, where we have given clarity the Government has responded with confusion. It is concerned about changes in LEP geography and what this does for the LEP project.

The question should not be about representation on the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership, the question should be about what York gets out of the LEP. The City Deal signed off by Nick Clegg is a big step forward that allows us access to large capital funds for transport that cannot be acquired through any other existing means."

(viii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Barton

"Would the Leader care to expand on his amazing vision that sees the loss of the Law College as "providing opportunities"?"

Reply:

"When I said providing opportunities what I meant was the site itself provides an opportunity for alternative use, which I think is pretty straight forward. It's really not worth trying to make a political issue of the move when the reasons for that move were not ones we could influence, nor did the University of Law have any problems with the site, it simply moved for other reasons.

I look forward to hearing what sort of interest there is in the site in the months to come and feel confident that it will be put to good use."

(ix) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Aspden

"Labour Leader Ed Miliband has said he would not commit to reversing any of the cuts announced in the recent Spending Review and Labour Shadow Chancellor Ed Balls has said that if Labour win the next General Election they would stick to the coalition's 2015/16 departmental budgets. Does the Cabinet

Leader support their position and the impact it would have on York?

Reply:

“No.”

B Cabinet Recommendations

Neighbourhood Working

Cllr Alexander moved, and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 122 of the Cabinet meeting held on 2 April 2013:

[That Council] agree to the alteration of the Constitution to establish Resident Forums in place of Ward Committees, as described in paragraph 12 of the report, to include a revised mechanism to agree the allocation of ward funding, as described in paragraph 15 of the report.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendation in respect of Resident Forums be approved. ^{1.}

New Council House Building – Phase 1

Councillor Alexander moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 144 of the Cabinet meeting held on 7 May 2013:

[That Council] agree to recommend the use of £1m commuted sums, and thereby increase the approved capital programme (HRA) for new homes from £6m to £7m.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the recommendation in respect of the use of the commuted sum in the Capital Programme be approved. ^{2.}

Capital Programme Outturn 2012/13 and Revisions to the 2013/14-2017/18 Programme

Councillor Alexander moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 31 of the Cabinet meeting held on 16 July 2013, circulated at the meeting:

[That Council] agree to the restated 2013/14 to 2017/18 programme of £203.295m as summarised in Table 3 and detailed in Annex A of the report.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the recommendation in respect of the restated Capital Programme be approved.³

Combined Authority Governance Review and Scheme

Councillor Alexander moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 32 of the Cabinet meeting held on 16 July 2013, circulated at the meeting:

[That Council] agree to:

- (i) Note and support the findings of the West Yorkshire Review, set out in Annex A of the report, including that a Combined Authority for the area of West Yorkshire, and ultimately including the city of York, would be likely to improve:*
 - the exercise of statutory functions relating to economic development, regeneration and transport in the area;*
 - the effectiveness and efficiency of transport in the area; and*
 - the economic conditions in the area.*
- (ii) Consider and support the proposed Scheme for establishing a West Yorkshire Combined Authority, pursuant to section 109(2) of the Local Democracy, Economic*

*Development and Construction Act
(LDEDCA) 2009.*

- (iii) Confirm consent for the City of York Council to becoming a non-constituent member of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, pending assurance from proposed constituent members as to the decisions on which CYC as a non-constituent member will be given voting rights. ⁴.*
- (iv) Authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader and with the other West Yorkshire Authorities to undertake such steps as are necessary to facilitate the submission of the Scheme and CYC's non-constituent membership of the resulting Combined Authority. ⁵.*
- (v) Pursue full membership for City of York Council, and to consider the full details of this full membership as and when it becomes possible for the Council to join as a full member.*

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the recommendation in respect of the Combined Authority be approved.

Action Required

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Amend Constitution, as necessary, in relation to Residents Forums. | JC, AD |
| 2. Increase capital programme by £1m for new homes. | AK, PL |
| 3. Amend the capital programme accordingly. | RB, DM |
| 4. Confirm consent for becoming a non-constituent member of the WYCA pending requested assurances. | RW, KS |
| 5. CX, in consultation, to take such steps as necessary to allow submission of the Scheme and gain CYC membership. | RW, KS |

20. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFFING MATTERS AND URGENCY COMMITTEE

As Chair of the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee, Cllr Alexander moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded, the following recommendations contained in Minute 12 of the meeting of that Committee held on 10 June 2013:

REDUNDANCY

- (i) *[That Council]* agree the proposed dismissal on the grounds of redundancy, together with the associated expenditure detailed in the annex and notes the financial impact set out in the report.

- (ii) *[That Council]* agree that the wording of the Council's Pay Policy is amended to allow all future Chief Officer financial packages to be considered and approved at Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee.¹

On being put to the vote, the recommendations were declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendations of the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee meeting held on 10 June 2013 be approved.

Action Required

1. Amend wording of the Council's Pay Policy in respect of future Chief Officer financial packages. MB

21. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT STANDARDS COMMITTEE

As Chair of the Joint Standards Committee, Cllr Runciman moved and Cllr Horton seconded, the following recommendation contained in Minute 11 of the meeting of that Committee held on 26 June 2013:

RECRUITMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSON

[That Council] approve the appointment of Mr Nicholas Hall as an Independent Person.¹

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendation of the Joint Standards Committee meeting held on 26 June 2013 be approved.

Action Required

1. Amend Committee membership accordingly. JC

22. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

As Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, Cllr Potter moved, and Cllr Burton seconded, the following recommendations contained in Minutes 12 and 13 of the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 9 July 2013.

REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

[That Council] approve the revised terms of reference for the Audit and Governance Committee.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendation of the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 9 July 2013 be approved.¹

APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER TO THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

[That Council] approve the appointment of:

- (i) Mr Martin Whiteley as an Independent Member of the Audit and Governance Committee.*
- (ii) That this be a two-year term of office.*

On being put to the vote, the recommendations were declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendations of the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 9 July 2013 be approved.²

Action Required

1. Update Council's Constitution to include new Terms of Reference. JC
2. Update Committee membership. JC

23. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEMBER SUPPORT STEERING GROUP

As Chair of the Member Support Steering Group, Cllr Douglas moved and Cllr Runciman seconded, the following recommendation contained in Minute 8 of the meeting of that Committee held on 1 July 2013:

REVIEW OF MEMBER TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY

[That Council] agree the adoption of the revised Member Training and Development Policy.¹

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the above recommendation of the Member Support Steering Group meeting held on 1 July 2013 be approved.

Action Required

1. Implement new training and development policy. DS

24. AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Council received the Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee, covering the period October 2011 to April 2013, from Cllr Potter, as Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Potter then moved, and Cllr Brooks seconded acceptance of the report and it was

RESOLVED: That the Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee be received and noted.

25. SCRUTINY - REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE CORPORATE AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Council received the report of the Chair of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee at pages 129 to 131, on the work of the Committee.

Councillor Galvin then moved and Cllr Runciman seconded acceptance of the report and it was

RESOLVED: That the scrutiny report be received and noted.

26. REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER

Council received a written report from Cllr Looker, Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People.

Notice had been received of nine questions on the report, submitted by Members in accordance with Standing Orders. The first three questions were put and answered as follows and Members agreed to receive written answers to their remaining questions, as set out below:

(i) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

“Whilst thanking Jill Hodges for all the excellent work she has done in leading the city’s School Improvement team, I would like reassurance from the Cabinet Member that there will also be a replacement for our Senior Primary Adviser, who will be retiring shortly. If that is not the case, can she reassure me that the Standards agenda in the primary sector will be given the same expertise and attention that it has previously had?”

Cabinet Member replied:

“The LA has invested in School improvement Partners, particularly in the primary sector. They will also be renamed as York Challenge Partners to reflect our new programme around school improvement – the York Challenge. Maxine Squire will take up the position of Head of School Improvement from September. She will

be supported by the current Principal Adviser Primary on a consultancy basis until Easter 14 and also retiring primary Head teachers from within the city. There is a national shift to sector led improvement and our model of empowering clusters to drive school improvement reflects this agenda. However, there is a risk around funding for school improvement as this area faces reductions.”

(ii) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Brooks

“Can the Cabinet Member explain why, as of early July, nearly a quarter of York’s schools are in the categories ‘Requiring Improvement’ or Special Measures?”

Cabinet Member replied:

“I don’t dispute what is stated in your question but as from the end of this term the LA will have 78% schools rates as good or outstanding. This is an improvement on the position two years ago. This includes 8 schools, inspected since September 2012, that have moved from satisfactory to good. These serve areas of disadvantage in the city. Securing and embedding a good judgment takes time and we have been working with these schools over a period of 3-4 year.

These figures remain above the regional average and in-line with the national average, but of course we constantly support schools to improve, especially those that have not received good or outstanding ratings.”

(iii) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Brooks

“The Learning and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee has agreed to a scrutiny review on the take up of school meals. Does the Cabinet Member welcome the newly announced Government School Food Plan as an opportunity of making a difference to the lives of children in the city?”

Cabinet Member replied:

“The recently announced school food plan is an interesting development. The lengthy 149 page document has been produced by the DFE to assist schools in promoting the take up of nutritional

school meals. I look forward to hearing the views of head teachers and governing bodies regarding the advice, suggestions and best practice contained in the plan in due course.”

- (iv) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

“In respect of the changing brief of the Ofsted Sub-Committee, will the cabinet member say whether the members of that committee will review school improvement on a one off basis or will the committee take a longer term view?”

Reply:

“The intention is that this committee will review school improvement (Key Stage outcomes and Ofsted outcomes) on a termly basis. A change of name will also take place to reflect this more rigorous and challenging approach. All meetings will be minuted.”

- (v) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

“As the Cabinet Member emphasises the importance of cross-party working in Education, will she confirm that both of the main opposition parties will have a place on the York Education Partnership in the future to ensure that this agenda is taken forward with the support of all the main political groups?”

Reply:

“The membership and constitution of the York Education Partnership is a matter for the partnership itself to consider and to decide. Elected Members do not have voting rights on the Partnership but are invited to join debate and discussion as non-voting members. Currently one place is provided for the Cabinet Member with another place for the main opposition party. I will request that the Partnership considers this request for an additional opposition party place at next term's meeting.”

- (vi) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

“Will the Cabinet Member confirm that there will continue to

be investment by the city in early years care and education, as this is the most significant time in a child's development and lays down the foundations for the future?"

Reply:

"This period of a child's life is critical and the city will continue to place this as a key priority.

Whilst specific funding for early education places is anticipated, and work has developed over the last two years to develop strong and improved relationships with providers, there is a continuing risk that budget pressures across local government will impact on this area."

(vii) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

"Will the Cabinet Member reassure council that there will be sufficient primary and secondary school places should the significant house building programme proposed in the draft local plan take place and will she give details of these plans?"

Reply:

"We have made good progress in responding to recent increases in the demand for primary school places, and a very high proportion of pupils continue to receive offers of places at their preferred schools. I am pleased that work is progressing well at Knavesmire school which can now provide many more places for local children. We are also planning appropriate and timely increases in the number of places with governing bodies of other schools across the city as and when major developments, such as Derwenthorpe and Germany Beck, progress.

Given that the draft local plan is still subject to consultation it is too early to detail how, where and when additional school places will be provided. However, as plans for housing schemes progress and the local demand for school places can be accurately assessed, alongside the calculation of developer contributions, plans for school places will be developed for consultation with the Education Partnership and the wider community."

(viii) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Runciman

"Is the Cabinet Member aware that several local voluntary

youth group providers have expressed uncertainty about their future due to the gradually reducing funding coming from CYC and that they are anxious to continue to offer the successful services that they already provide? What will she do to ensure they are able to continue this work?"

Reply:

"The youth service is undergoing a significant transformation to ensure that we continue to meet the needs of those more vulnerable young people in the city. This transformation will see the development of a new co-production approach with local youth providers. Instead of a traditional grant allocation approach the service will offer a range of support including access to resources such as the Urbie buses, Zoo Skate Park, youth work staff and an allocation of time and consultation from our most skilled and experienced Youth and Community Development staff to grow and ensure both quality and resilience in local provision.

These plans are still being developed however; already the York Youth Network is building an infrastructure and supporting new collaboration approaches in the city."

(ix) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People Service from Cllr Brooks

"What is the Cabinet Member planning to do to ensure that all Members, and not just those on the Corporate Parenting Board, realise that they are Corporate Parents and what this entails?"

Reply:

- *"Co-opt certain members onto the Corporate Parenting Board for items that they may have a specific role, interest or responsibility for.*
- *Further Member briefings on the role of the Corporate Parent*
- *Challenge days / events between Members and Show Me that I Matter Panel*
- *LAC shadowing members in their elected roles"*

27. SCHEME OF DELEGATION FOR PLANNING MATTERS

Cllr Merrett, Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Sustainability presented a written report asking Council to amend the Scheme of Delegation for Planning Matters. A copy of the amended report was circulated at the meeting and republished in the online agenda. The recommendations asked:

[That Council] agree:

- i) That options A, C and D be adopted and the Scheme of Delegation for Planning within the Council's Constitution be amended as set out in Annex F to this report to reflect the requirements of those options.*
- ii) That Option B be considered for future introduction, to alter the frequency of meetings, if required.*

Cllr Galvin then moved, and Cllr Gillies seconded, the following amendment to the motion, as circulated in the additional papers circulated around the chamber:

“Amend the first resolution as follows:

Council is asked to agree:

*“(i) That options A, C and D be adopted and the Scheme of Delegation for Planning, within the Council's Constitution, be amended as set out in annex F to the report to reflect the requirements of those options, **subject to Ward Members being able to maintain their right to call in planning applications affecting their wards, without the need for consideration by the Chairs and Vice Chairs of Planning Committees and subject to Annex F being appropriately amended to also reflect this requirement.**”*

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was declared LOST.

Councillor D'Agorne had submitted a further amendment to the resolution however this was subsequently withdrawn.

Cllr Merrett then moved the original motion to amend the Scheme of Delegation, which was seconded by Cllr Horton.

RESOLVED: That the original motion in respect of the Scheme of Delegation for Planning Matters be approved.
1. & 2.

Action Required

1. Implement new Planning Scheme of Delegation. JC
2. Amend Constitution to reflect new Planning Scheme of Delegation. JC

28. ACTIVITIES OF OUTSIDE BODIES

Minutes of the following meetings had been made available for Members to view on the Council's website:

- Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation – 22 March 2013
- Without Walls – 27 March 2013
- Quality Bus Partnership – March minutes have not been approved and will not be for the foreseeable future as the partnership is possibly being disbanded.
- Safer York Partnership – 18 April 2013
- NHS Foundation Trust – 20 March 2013

No questions had been submitted to representatives on outside bodies.

29. NOTICES OF MOTION

At this point in the meeting, the guillotine fell and the following motions and amendments were put to the vote without debate having been deemed, moved and seconded.

(i) York's Outer Ring Road (proposed by Cllr Merrett)

“Council agrees with the need to upgrade York's Outer Ring Road to alleviate congestion which is increasingly a barrier to jobs and growth.

Council also endorses efforts to produce a funding package through the West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund to achieve this goal within a decade.

Council notes the MP for York Outer's earlier commitment to such an upgrade, as reported in The Press on 12th June 2007:

"Tory Julian Sturdy, who has made calls for dualling a key plank of his campaign to win the new York Outer seat at the next General Election" and "The high cost of dualling - estimated at about £140 million - means it would be impossible without Government funding".

Mr Sturdy has now been in office for over three years and has been a Parliamentary Private Secretary to a Department of Transport Minister for a year. Council therefore invites Mr Sturdy to a meeting of City of York Council to provide an update on any progress made towards his and the Council's shared aspiration of a completed dualled outer ring road for the city".

Amendment proposed by Councillor D'Agorne:

Delete first sentence and replace with: *"Council agrees that the proposed 4,000 home development north of Clifton Moor, the 1500 homes at Monks Cross, together with the community stadium and retail expansion at Monk's Cross would outpace congestion benefits from any of the potential upgrades to the ring road as modelled in 2008 by consultants Halcrow. Additional major investment in sustainable transport is urgently required for York to address the growing barrier to jobs and economic prosperity arising from congestion."*

In second sentence delete 'to achieve this goal within a decade'

In the final sentence delete 'and the Council's shared'

The amendment was declared LOST.

On being put to the vote, the original motion was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the original motion be approved.¹.

ii) Local Plan (proposed by Cllr Watt)

"Council agrees to respect the citizens of York and promises to produce a 'Local Plan' which acknowledges

and respects any clearly expressed wishes of the people, from their responses to the 'Preferred Options' consultation."

RESOLVED: That the motion be approved.²

(ii) Vision for a Greener Council (proposed by Cllr Aspden)

"Council notes the failure of the Labour Cabinet to build-on the achievements of the previous Liberal Democrat administration and bring forward a distinct vision for a greener council and greener York.

This approach has seen a fall in recycling rates, the closure of Beckfield Lane, the reduction in opening hours at Towthorpe, the introduction of unpopular green bin charges, the failure to bring forward a replacement to the successful 'Carbon Reduction Programme', the ending of the Green Jobs Task Group, and the failure to innovate and lead the development of new approaches to tackling climate change and improving the environmental credentials of York.

Council Resolves to:

Confirm its vision to make York the greenest city in the North of England with the highest unitary council recycling rates in the area, a long-term commitment to a food waste recycling scheme, and as a regional centre for Green Jobs.

Ask Cabinet to immediately bring forward the details of the next stage of the 'Carbon Reduction Programme' with renewed commitments to reduce emissions.

Agree to set-up a cross-party 'Green Policy Working Group' (which will incorporate a re-established the Green Jobs Task Group) and will seek to turn this vision into a detailed strategy. This Group should consider issues such as developing a renewable energy company, a sustainable food strategy, a waste minimisation programme and work on fuel poverty and energy efficiency. The Group should be supported in this work by the recently expanded 18-officer strong 'Policy, Performance and Innovation' Team."

Amendment proposed by Councillor D'Agorne:

Delete first and second paragraph.

The amendment was declared LOST.

On being put to the vote, the original motion was also declared LOST and it was

RESOLVED: That the original motion be not approved.

(iii) Spare Room Subsidy (proposed by Cllr Simpson-Laing)

“Council notes the distress that the Bedroom Tax is causing many York residents and their families.

Government claims that the Bedroom Tax is part of its policy to get residents into work. However, a majority of people receiving Housing Benefit in York are in work.

Government has also claimed that the Bedroom Tax is to ensure more appropriate use of Housing Stock. However, across the country there are not enough smaller homes for people to move to.

Whilst Government have attempted, nationally, to ensure that those who need a spare room are not penalised it is clear that many still are. Those still being penalised include:

Foster Carers who require more than one room due to the complexities of children they care for

Parents of service people based in Barracks Partners of people with health complications

Those with ‘Safe Rooms’ installed in their homes

Government informs that the Discretionary Housing fund is to help such people. However it is becoming clear, both locally and nationally, that this fund is not enough Council calls upon the Government to end the Bedroom Tax (Spare Room Subsidy) due to the hardship and distress that the policy is causing many residents.”

That the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to express Council’s concern and request that this Tax is abolished as soon as possible”.

Amendment proposed by Cllr D'Agorne:

Add the following to the end of the motion: “Council further resolves that where the Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods is satisfied that tenants affected by the introduction of the so called ‘bedroom tax’ “have done all they can to avoid falling into arrears and are actively engaging with housing staff, they should not be evicted for failing to pay the part of their rent which is due to the new restrictions”.

The amendment was declared LOST.

On being put to the vote, the original motion was declared CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED: That the original motion be approved.³.

Action Required

1. Invite Julian Sturdy MP to a meeting to provide an update on the dualling of the outer ring road. WB
2. Prepare Local Plan which respects citizens wishes in the 'Preferred Options' consultation. DR
3. Write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to express Council's concern and to request that the 'bedroom tax' is abolished as soon as possible. WB

30. QUESTIONS TO THE CABINET LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS RECEIVED UNDER STANDING ORDER 11.3(A)

Thirty seven questions had been submitted to the Cabinet Leader and Cabinet Members under Standing Order 11.3(a). The guillotine having fallen at this point, Members agreed to receive written answers to their questions, as set out below:

(i) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“How much has the Council spent to date on work connected with the tender for the Community Stadium and how much taxpayers’ money does the Leader now expect to invest in the project in total?”

Reply:

"The Council has spent a total of £299k on the tender process for the Community Stadium Project to date.

The level of public money that I expect to invest in the project is exactly the same as the figure agreed by the previous administration, £4m plus the initial feasibility and project costs incurred prior to this administration taking control of the project. It was your administration that took the decision to spend the public's money on this project and the level that funding would be. We simply provided the vision, political commitment and support to turn it into a reality."

(ii) To the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing and Adult Social Services from Cllr Jeffries:

"How long has Oliver House been empty, how much is it costing to maintain the building and when will it be brought back into use?"

Reply:

"I will give the same answer as when Cllr Aspden asked a similar question at the meeting of Council on the 28th March. 2013

I have no involvement in decisions on the future of the Oliver House site. Property services and the Capital Asset Board are dealing with this and this is not within my portfolio area.

I suggest Cllr Jeffries asks the question of the correct Cabinet Member."

(iii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Hyman:

"Would the Council Leader confirm how much the Council spent in assessing the suitability of the Bonding Warehouse for use as a media centre?"

Reply:

"A DIF bid of £25k has been spent on feasibility of the project but this is work largely transferred into the business plan for the Digital Media Arts Centre and is now being used to inform the planned site for the project; the Guildhall. I met with the owners of the Bonding Warehouse last week and I am pleased progress is being made to return this iconic York building back into use."

(iv) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Aspden:

“The Cabinet Leader recently welcomed the cross-party support for the Poverty Strategy. Would he agree with me that a cross-party approach to supporting residents with welfare reforms is also needed? If so, would he agree to set-up a cross-party welfare reform working group as soon as possible, including opposition councillors and relevant council officers, through which the council can objectively assess the effects of welfare changes in York, ensure that the council is using its staff and resources to help and inform the most vulnerable, and collectively lobby the government where necessary?”

Reply:

“Poverty in the city is a serious and very real issue for many that my administration wants to tackle and we will work constructively with anyone who shares that goal.

The work being undertaken by the Poverty Action Group is taking the impact of the Government's welfare reforms into account. This work is also intrinsically linked to the work of the Without Walls partnership at which the three main parties are represented.

It is clear Government reductions in local housing allowance, the 'bedroom tax', non-dependent deductions, the council tax benefit cut, disability living allowance cut, incapacity benefit cut, child benefit cut, tax credit cut, real term cut through 1% uprating and the introduction of the household benefit cap will make our vision to eradicate poverty all the more challenging.

Given that both local Liberal Democrats and Conservatives support these Government cuts, I don't believe the two parties are on the same page as Labour in their commitment to tackling poverty.

What is required is political leadership from the council, working in partnership with others such as community groups, charities, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and The Press to get to grips with the issue of poverty and that is exactly what we are doing.

But I welcome any lobbying of the Government you and your Party can undertake against these changes, however late in the day it may be.”

(v) To the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing and Adult Social Services from Cllr Barton:

“Does the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing & Adult Social services agree with the statement from York City of Sanctuary’s report that there are 4500 refugees on the Council’s housing waiting list and does she plan to fast track these applicants when the breath taking number of affordable homes cited on the Local Plan become available?”

Reply:

“I would point out to Cllr Barton that nowhere in the York City of Sanctuary report does it state that there are 4500 refugees on the Council’s waiting list - if there were 4500 refugees on the Waiting List this would make York the first city in the UK to have 100% of its housing list made up entirely of refugees. It states: “There is also the reality of 4500 already on the CYC waiting list”.

Indeed, elsewhere in the report, it states quite clearly ‘the number of refugees in the city is quite small.’ In the conclusion, the report says, ‘the scale of the situation is not insurmountable and overwhelming as some sections of the media would have us believe.’

The number ‘4500’ is mentioned as a reference to the total number of people currently on the CYC social housing waiting list – as a rounded approximate number at the time the report was written and the vast majority of these people have local connections in York. I would refer Cllr Barton to the Local Plan which will aim to help address the needs and the current crisis in housing.

It would appear that Councillor Barton has inadvertently misread the Report in framing his question. It is therefore not possible to agree with a statement which does not exist in the Report and I would state that such a suggestion is completely untrue, is without foundation and could lead to the spread of false information and possibly lead to undue alarm amongst residents. Finally, such a statement has the potential to damage the social cohesion of our City.

I trust Cllr Barton will take time to re-read the Report in order to recognise that his initial reading, and comments, are inaccurate. Priority for housing in York is as set out in North Yorkshire Home Choice (NYHC) scheme, which has just been reviewed and the revised policy agreed at my public decision session earlier today. All affordable housing in York is allocated in accordance with this policy.

All applicants for housing in York are managed through the NYHC where applicants can register online, paper applications are registered within a week.”

(vi) To the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing and Adult Social Services from Cllr Reid:

“Given the importance of the document, will the Cabinet Member make the ‘Get York Building Survey’ available for members and/or members of the public?”

Reply:

“I would remind Cllr Reid that the findings from the GYB consultation were summarised in the report considered by Cabinet in February. The conversations with individual developers, as she should realise being an experienced Councillor, often touched on commercially sensitive information and as such has been deemed confidential and it is not appropriate for this to be shared with the wider public. However, it is acknowledged that not all the information from developers is commercially sensitive and I have asked officers to prepare a redacted version.”

(vii) To the Cabinet Member for Crime and Stronger Communities from Cllr Barton:

“Can the Cabinet Member for Crime & Stronger Communities describe what tangible results were evident as a result of the £5000 invested in York City of Sanctuary by the CYC Transformation Fund and can she advise if she has plans to give further funds to this organisation?”

Reply:

“This £5k was one-off, ‘seedcorn’ funding to get the organisation established and to assist it to begin providing services to those who come to the city seeking sanctuary.

*The first Annual Report shows that in only 12 months York City of Sanctuary has developed working partnerships with **key** groups at work in the city, including York Racial Equality Network, Refugee Action York, North Yorkshire Police, local schools and both Universities to name but a few of the 63 organisations which are signed up to assist the York City of Sanctuary aims of encouraging the culture of welcome, security,*

and support to all who need to claim sanctuary in the city.

York City of Sanctuary has fulfilled every part of the four elements of the plan of action it presented with its application for Transformation Funding. It is now providing services directly to sanctuary seekers in York, offering advice and support to enable employment, access to housing, legal advice, and education. This is a helpful contribution to community cohesion in the city and to integrating people from a wide variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

The organisation has also sought to explore the reality of life for those who come to the city in need of refuge. That information is helpful, for example, in providing factual evidence about the numbers of refugees in the city, and of the issues they face. Amongst other groups for whom York City of Sanctuary has concern are those fleeing domestic violence, sexual, physical, or mental abuse; and those fleeing exploitation and racial harassment encountered in other parts of the UK. They too are part of the community, and are vulnerable and in need of support. That is also part of the organisation's remit.

York City of Sanctuary has not applied for further funding from the Transformation Fund. However, the Cabinet passed a resolution of support for the organisation's aims, back in October 2011, and will continue to provide support wherever appropriate. For example, I note that the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism will shortly be setting up a small bursary scheme which, through City of Sanctuary, will enable people to access cultural and active leisure provision who would otherwise not be able to.

I would like to congratulate York City of Sanctuary on the progress it is making."

(viii) To the Cabinet Member for Crime and Stronger Communities from Cllr Orrell:

"The so-called 'community contracts' are widely unpopular and often ignored in wards by members across political parties. Will the new Cabinet Member recognise that a different form of community governance is needed in York?"

Reply:

"Community contracts are just part of the new ways of working

in communities for ward councillors and are simply a tool that ward councillors can use to engage more effectively with their communities. Many ward councillors from all parties are using these new engagement tools very successfully to bring positive benefits to their local communities. The tools are completely flexible and put the onus on individual councillors to find the most effective ways of working in their wards. The Communities and Equalities team have recently produced a series of fact sheets to enable councillors to make better use of these tools and it is a shame that Cllr Orrell did not attend our recent open day to learn more about these fact sheets and help to shape the way we move forward with ward working, making community contracts successful in all wards. I hope that all ward councillors will engage positively with the work the team is doing to support us all to engage with our communities more effectively.”

(ix) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Firth:

“During the closure period on Lendal Bridge, what will be the average increase in:

- a) Mileage
- b) Journey time
- c) Cost

for private car drivers who otherwise would have used the bridge?”

Reply:

“Your question cannot be answered with certainty – that is why we are undertaking the trial. However the worst case scenario from the modelling work that was undertaken, which ignores, positive transfers to alternative forms of transport that we and coalition Government policy supports, shifts in times of travel, etc., indicates a 0.82% increase in km travelled, but is based on 2010 traffic levels which are higher than current flows. For the 630 motorists currently continuing to make cross river journeys by car in the hour over lunch,

- a) The average increase in mileage = 1.3 miles*
- b) Journey time to do this extra 1.3 miles = 5.7 minutes*
- c) Additional cost = 37 pence*

However if there was an 11% shift of drivers from cars to buses, cycles and walking, the average traffic reduction in a study of similar measures across Europe referred to in the previous

Cabinet paper, there would be a reduction in distance travelled (pcu/km) of 10.3% within the simulation network (roughly the CYC boundary). There would also be an improvement in driving conditions with an increase in average speed from the current 17.4 kph to 17.8 kph in the Inner Ring Road and Water End cordon area (it would go down to 16.9 kph without any overall traffic reduction), an increase of 2.3% in average speed.”

(x) To the Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Customer Services from Cllr Cuthbertson:

“How much were the Council’s fitting out and removal expenses connected with its move to West Offices and how does this compare to the allocated budget and Could the Cabinet Member also outline what steps he – and his predecessor – took to ensure that the move was completed within budget?”

Reply:

“The total cost of the Council’s fitting out and removal expenses connected with the move to West Offices was £1,824k, this was the allocated budget provision as reported at Cabinet.

The total cost of the West Offices move is likely now to come in £50,000 under budget and on schedule which is a significant achievement for projects of this kind.

Cabinet Members have received regular verbal briefings on this matter to ensure that the project remains on budget and on schedule.”

(xi) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“Will the Cabinet Leader agree to join me for a walk along the section of Millennium Way that passes through Heworth Without so he can fully understand the impact of the Local Plan Proposals on the natural environment?”

Reply:

“I appreciate the invitation but I have been to the site before and I fully understand the possible impact of the draft local plan on this site and others.”

(xii) To the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing and Adult Social Services from Cllr Jeffries:

“The Annual Report of the Head of Internal Audit found significant failings in budget control in adult social care and “no clear links between control of expenditure and budget responsibility in some areas”. Could the Cabinet Member explain what plans she has put in place to deal with this issue?”

Reply:

“A programme of work is under way to address the issues identified in the Audit Report. Officers in Adult Social Care are working with the Director of Health & Wellbeing and his team to improve finance and care management processes, and to review again any opportunities to reduce current spending levels. This is monitored by a Board, chaired by the Director of CBBS.

With specific regard to the links between control of expenditure and budget responsibility, Councillor Jeffries may be aware that, as with many Councils, York has arranged the Care Management Teams, who commit much of the budget spent on the support needs of vulnerable people, on the basis of the ‘care pathway’. This is recognised as good practice and the pathway is in line with guidance from Think Local Act Personal, which I understand you support.

However it does mean that one manager is unlikely to be responsible for authorising all the costs of care across the care pathway. I am assured that as an interim measure named managers have been nominated to take responsibility for budgets, and to work with their colleagues in respect of the activity across the pathway for that budget. This will be more time consuming, and so alternatives are now being explored.

The report also highlights the need to take action to mitigate significant overspends identified through budget monitoring. As Cllr Jeffries will be aware there will always be sensitivities around savings which may need to be made in this area of Council business and it is essential that options are always considered carefully in respect of the potential impact on vulnerable people. We are after all dealing with people who often have complex needs which I am sure she understands.

There is work underway to improve the information flows for

budget monitoring which it is anticipated will allow earlier identification of issues, and thus provide greater opportunity to address issues earlier. However, I would remind her she is a member of the Party of Government who has nationally raised the minimum care standard to substantial and is cutting money to Councils at a time of increasing need.”

(xiii) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Barton:

“The recent explosion in the numbers of geese populating the City and the consequential amounts of excreta they leave in some of our most attractive tourist sites are creating a deterrent to tourists and residents alike visiting the City Centre. Can the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture & Tourism explain what measures have been taken to implement a humane cull in an attempt to minimise the danger they present in terms of both health and safety?”

Reply:

“I accept that the presence of geese can be off putting to some; others like them and regard them as part of our city wildlife.

What I am curious to know is how Cllr Barton knows that there has been an explosion of geese in the city?

Does he really spend his time as a Councillor going around counting the number of geese in the city?

If he has, I would be grateful if he could let officers know what number he has found so that we can compare his findings with the numbers of geese in the city in 2009 when the national Bird Management Unit based at Sand Hutton undertook, on the Council’s behalf, a major study on geese and management options. (The estimated population at the time was 700 geese).

This study did offer the option of a humane cull during the summer moult (by cervical dislocation, lethal injection or shooting) – but also said that it would have to be undertaken every 2 - 5 years as non-breeding birds may also choose to moult elsewhere and can then repopulate an area the following year if not deterred.

This is a complex issue for which there is no simple solution. But we have been playing our part by treating eggs on nest sites

on Council land which helps to keep the populations down. We will continue to do this.”

(xiv) To the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing & Adult Social Services from Cllr Reid:

“Could the Cabinet Member outline the estimated unit cost of each Council house/flat (including a notional site value) being built on Newbury Avenue, Chaloners Road and Beckfield Lane, and with a number of 2 bedroomed properties currently being advertised for sale on the open market in York priced at around £100,000, and would the Cabinet Member say how much of the New Homes Bonus she is prepared to invest in purchasing these properties with a view to adding them to the pool of social rented accommodation available in the City?”

Reply:

“Cllr Reid should already be aware, from previous Council reports that the total scheme cost for the first phase of new council homes is in the region of £7m. Exact costs will be determined via a competitive tendering process for the building of the new homes. As part of the development of the programme, costs will be allocated out to each development. It is therefore not appropriate for the council to publicly set out before any competitive tendering process what it anticipates the estimated costs of each unit to be.

In relation to the open market sale of 2 bed homes for £100k, a quick search on Right Move today (16th July) shows only 5, 2 bed properties for sale under £100k, all of which are flats, 3 of which appear to be previous RTBs. There is one terraced property at £110k which seems to need a lot of work and then other terraced properties start at over £120k. As Cllr Reid will know if she has ever lived in one of the smaller terraced properties in York these are not ideally suited to families and often have poor insulation due to their age.”

(xv) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

“Would the Cabinet Member join with me in congratulating First York on arranging to consult with passengers before deciding what changes to introduce to routes in the autumn, and would he also join with me in urging First to publish the service reliability data that it holds for each route to ensure an informed

discussion on the need for changes?”

Reply:

“I am very pleased that following discussions I had with First and other local bus companies through the York Quality Bus Partnership, First York are undertaking such an open consultation, with sessions at 8 different venues across York. This demonstrates their awareness of the strength of feeling concerning the local bus network and the need for the Company to address issues with a number of their commercially operated services.

The Council has supported First through the provision of officer time at all 8 events to field any questions concerning the wider bus network (First is the largest of 10 bus operators in the City) and in recognition of the fact that not all of the questions from the public would relate purely to services operated by First Group.

We understand that First will be looking to implement changes resulting from the consultation over the coming months and we look forward to working with them and with the City’s other bus operators to deliver a local bus network which better meets the needs of York’s residents.

With regard to service reliability data, First operates services on a commercial basis, and continue to regard this data as commercially sensitive. Certainly this data is key to understanding how services might be improved and The Council will continue to work with First and with other bus operators, to encourage them to demonstrate, including to the public, that network improvements are evidence based and that any changes made produce improvements.”

(xvi) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Aspden:

“Last July, I asked the Cabinet Member what the Council is doing to fulfil the requirement of the Localism Act to maintain a list of "assets of community value". Could he update Council on this work?”

Reply:

“I understand, although it’s not my portfolio responsibility, that the process for creating and maintaining a list of ‘assets of

community value' have now been agreed and will be implemented shortly.

Guidance on the process details and the application form on the Council's will be published on the Council's website in September."

(xvii) To the Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Customer Services from Cllr Cuthbertson:

"Can the Cabinet Member state how many Freedom of Information requests have not been answered within the required 20 day timeframe for each month from May 2011 to June 2013?"

Reply:

Month	2011 -12		2012 -13	
	In time	Out of time	In time	Out of time
April	43	14	85	13
May	70	12	88	6
June	42	18	61	7
July	58	9	72	8
Aug	68	7	45	15
Sept	55	4	37	25
Oct	43	5	48	25
Nov	74	14	72	20
Dec	42	5	23	23
Jan	61	8	60	29
Feb	68	3	64	39
March	74	7	60	29
	2013- 2014			
April	70	23		
May	80	27		
June	44(27 ongoing)	17		

(xviii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

"How much funding does the Cabinet member intend to devote to reducing the number of accidents on roads in west York where there are no plans to introduce a 20mph limit, what schemes will this funding be used for, and what reduction in the annual toll of casualties can we expect to see as a result of this

investment?”

Reply:

“There has been a large amount of work undertaken in the west of York to reduce speeds and accidents over recent years. This was the focus of our early traffic calming work in the early 1990’s when we started introducing area wide traffic calming schemes in residential areas (e.g Chapelfields, Danebury Drive, Kingsway West etc.). We continued this work by targeting distributor roads with high speed and accident problems (such as Gale Lane and Foxwood Lane) and then introduced School Safety Zones at every school in the area. We have also introduced numerous junction improvements (such as replacing the Beckfield Lane/A59 junction with signals and building the Moor Lane A1237 roundabout), plus many new and improved crossing facilities for peds, and numerous on and off road cycling facilities (e.g along the orbital cycle route). We also continue to monitor accident patterns on an annual basis and look to tackle any concentrations identified. A recent example would be the work to improve conspicuity of the small Acomb “link road” roundabout at the Wetherby Road junction.

Separate capital budgets are provided for Local Safety Schemes, Speed Management and Danger Reduction schemes which is allocated to prioritised locations across the city. There is a £150k allocation in the 12/13 Capital Programme for these schemes.

The Local Safety Scheme budget is allocated following a review of the accident data so that the most effective use of the funding is made. This has been focussed on sites where a cluster of accidents have occurred and changes to the road layout will reduce the likelihood of incidents occurring. Owing to works undertaken across the city over the last 10 years there are now fewer locations which fall into this group. Our 13/14 local safety scheme programme does not include any cluster sites in the west York area, which tends to suggest the roads in this are experiencing low accidents numbers, which is considered to be a consequence of the work we have done in the area over recent years.

Speed Management schemes are identified through the Speed Management process which is operated with the Police and Fire Service. This process deals with locations where speeding has been identified by the public as a concern.

The Danger Reduction budget is allocated to schemes where there is a perception of danger identified by the public but no injury accidents have been recorded.

In addition we also undertake Road Safety Education, Training and Publicity (ETP) projects, which tend to cover the whole of York, (with partners) and also work on Regional basis, with NYCC via 95 Alive and on a wider Yorkshire and Humber basis. We all have similar issues and similar vulnerable road user groups and pooling resources and funding in this way gives us more for our money. The current Road Safety Action plan includes a wide range of activities including: School Crossing Patrols, Cycle Training, iTravel road safety pledge, Road Safety Education, 95 Alive Campaign, Publicity and Campaigns focused on young drivers etc.

Regionally we have been working on a motorbike awareness campaign called “someone’s son” which as a spin off has given us access to a DVD aimed at motorcycle riders. We have also recently worked and produced regionally a DVD for commuting cyclists, called the “Urban Cycling Guide” which is partly filmed in York.”

(xix) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

“In congratulating the Minster authorities on the success of their ‘York Minster Revealed’ project, does the Cabinet Member share my concern about the conflict between some fast moving cyclists and pedestrians in the new “Minster Piazza” on Deangate and would he agree to sign the area as a pedestrian priority zone?”

Reply:

“The Piazza scheme is a bold scheme in a very active area. The space allows for access by pedestrians, cyclists and horse drawn carriages, as previously. All users are expected to use the space with due consideration and respect. The issue of potential user conflict was considered during the detailed design of the scheme, and it was not considered appropriate or necessary to seek to prohibit cycle access. Introducing a cyclist ban is likely to push some cyclists onto the very narrow and already congested Gillygate corridor, and discourage others from cycling, contrary to long standing Council policy. There is

recognition that there will be some initial teething issues. Officers have liaised with those involved in both New Road, Brighton and Exhibition Road, London, both of which experienced some initial problems. To seek to counter any early downsides to this project, officers (working with the Minster) are looking to assist people and monitor how people use the space and move through it. To that effect we will be placing some additional temporary signage on the approaches while users adapt to the new layout. These will seek to raise awareness of the presence of pedestrians, cyclists and horse drawn carriages and encourage sharing and consideration. This being a measure which has been successful elsewhere. The scheme will be subject to a stage 3 Safety Audit (as is standard practise) and a further audit could also be undertaken in 12 months time.

Officers are hopeful that through these actions such initial concerns will be allayed.”

(xx) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“How much has been raised by the organisers towards the cost of the “Arts Barge” project, when will a business plan for running the barge be published, when will the barge be open for business and what process is in place to recover the Council’s contribution - to the purchase price of the barge - should the project fail?”

Reply:

“The Arts Barge Project is currently looking at feasibility options around mooring sites on the river. They continue to raise funds and have placed a deposit on a boat. It is scheduled to be operating during 2014. Lawyers for the Council and Arts Barge Project have agreed that a ‘charge’, in effect a mortgage, be secured against the boat to protect the Council’s investment, should it be made.”

(xxi) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services from Cllr Reid:

“The yearly rubbish and recycling calendars came to an end on 31st March 2013 with the interim April-June calendars running out at the end of last month. Could the Cabinet Member outline when people will be given information on the new collection rounds and could he explain why there has been a delay in

getting this information to residents?”

Reply:

“All residents will get a new calendar in advance of changes to the collection rounds.

Making changes to a service like refuse and recycling collections whilst keeping disruption for residents to an absolute minimum, when there is an increasing demand but reducing resources due to massive Government cuts, is complicated and challenging.

New and different vehicles are required; consultations have to be undertaken with staff and the unions; support services such as the customer centre and the post code checker need to be updated and checked.

As part of the collection round changes we are adding recycling services to nearly 2,000 properties that do not currently have them, demonstrating our deep commitment to increasing recycling.”

(xxii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Aspden:

“Following the unsuccessful bid to secure government funding for the A19 update in Fulford, could the Cabinet Member confirm that the Council will work with and consult local residents on any future bids or schemes?”

Reply:

“Unfortunately the short timetable available for preparation of the A19 Pinch Point Fund bid disappointingly did not allow time for our usual consultation processes. The local community will be fully involved in any future funding bids provided a reasonable period of time is available for the bid and dependent on the level of detail required at the bidding stage. If funding is secured then we will work with and consult local residents to determine the extent and design the most appropriate scheme for the area.”

(xxiii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Ayre:

“In regards to the Local Plan consultation, can the Cabinet Member state how many deliveries by Local Link have had

significant failures, how much the contract is and whether any money has been recouped?”

Reply:

“Your Local Link delivered to 85,000 households in York (separate from the magazine) and were the most cost effective option for this service, at a total cost of £5,400– equating to 0.0.6p per household for delivery.

Overall 2.62% of total households may have been affected with either non-delivery or within Your Local Link. This is within the distributor’s customer guarantee of 95% delivery (and Royal Mail’s 92% delivery guarantee). Additional leaflets were redistributed to those affected areas that we were made aware of at no cost to the council.”

(xxiv) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services from Cllr Reid:

“Could the Cabinet Member outline what progress has been made in introducing charges for second green bins and for replacement black rubbish wheeled bins and for recycling boxes?”

Reply:

“Both of these are progressing well. It has been vital to involve the customer centre and ICT in this process and there are a number of issues that have had to be investigated and resolved, for example, as the charges for garden bins are classed as distance selling, legal have had to be consulted on the terms and conditions, which include a cooling off period and potential for refunds.”

(xxv) To the Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Customer Services from Cllr Ayre:

“How many temporary or interim staff who are on FTE salaries of £40k or more are working for City of York Council through ‘Work with York’ or other temporary/interim staffing agencies and which departments are they in?”

Reply:

“One - in Office of the Chief Executive.”

(xxvi) To the Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance & Customer Services from Cllr Ayre:

“This year citizens were allowed to pay their council tax in 12 parts, instead of 10. Could the Cabinet Member outline what the Council did to inform home owners/renters, social tenants and those in receipt of benefits of these rights, what promotion of the new arrangements took place, and how many home owners/renters, benefit recipients, social tenants elected to pay in 12 monthly instalments (overall and as a proportion by group)?”

Reply:

“The council as part of the Public Consultation exercise for Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) actively promoted this option to customers including:

- *13 Public Consultation Sessions;*
- *Individual letters to all affected customers;*
- *Outbound telephony (to those customers where we had numbers and where they were at home when we called);*
- *All staff made aware when contacted by customers.*

All CT customers were made aware as it was one of the options on the Council Tax Bill sent to all customers.

Where customers have got into difficulty with their account this is an option we have always provided to try and support customers.

The number of customers paying by 12 monthly instalments this year is 1,332 broken down as follows:

- *Direct Debit 1st Month LCTS 125*
- *Direct Debit 1st Month non-LCTS 359*
- *Direct Debit 15th Month LCTS 100*
- *Direct Debit 15th Month non LCTS 224*
- *Direct Debit 15th Month Councillors 2*
- *Cash Payers 1st Month LCTS 152*

- *Cash Payers 1st Month non-LCTS 141*
- *Cash Payers 15th Month LCTS 118*
- *Cash Payers 15th Months non-LCTS 111*

It is not possible to split this by tenure type as the system does not hold this information for CT payers.”

(xxvii) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“Will the Cabinet Member state which meetings of the ‘Community Stadium Project Group’ have been attended by key stakeholders e.g. the football club, rugby club, athletics club?”

Reply:

“Meetings of the Community Stadium Partnership Forum were held in September ’12, October ’12 and January ’13 and attended by the Football Club and the Rugby League Club, with the exception of the Rugby League Club in October. These meetings came to end with the beginning of the procurement process. As contact between each key stakeholder is now of a commercially sensitive nature regular meetings and discussions have continued on an individual basis with the Football Club, the Rugby League Club and the Athletics Club.”

(xxviii) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“Will the Cabinet Member confirm publically that the only reason for the delay in the stadium project is the ‘newt issue’?”

Reply:

“Yes.”

(xxix) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“On the 5th October 2009 the Cabinet Member proudly announced she would set up a leisure reserve to fund a city-centre pool. She repeated this promise again in November 2009 stating "we are the party that will do rather than offer empty promises". Can she therefore state how much is currently in the promised leisure reserve?”

Reply:

“A great deal has changed since October 2009, not least the election of the current Coalition Government which has slashed the Council’s funding.

What has also changed, however, is the level of supply and demand for swimming in York. Whereas Cllr Ayre’s administration presided over a shortfall in swimming provision we now have a more than adequate supply of facilities.

In planning the city’s requirement this administration works with Active York (the city’s sport & active leisure partnership).

The Built Sports Facilities Strategy produced by Active York is currently out to public consultation. This document compares supply and demand for sports facilities and shows that the city currently has a surplus of approximately 900m² of pool space.

The document also sets out areas of deficiencies in provision, particularly for indoor sports hall space, and some specialist outdoor facilities (for example cycling facilities).

We are prioritising our work with Active York to find ways of delivering the facilities that the community has actually identified a need for.

I am pleased to say that my work to deliver the community stadium, that had stalled miserably under Cllr Ayre’s administration, will drive forward a range of new facilities, such as the closed circuit cycle facility at York Sports Village.”

(xxx) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“Given Labour’s pledge to provide a city-centre swimming pool, yet its omission from their strategic plan to 2030, could the Cabinet Member define what she would say a “long term aspiration” is?”

Reply:

“I would refer the Member to the answer to the previous question. In addition, I would urge him not to belittle an administration having aspiration, vision and drive, however unfamiliar these things may be to him.

As an administration we move with the times, being realistic about the huge cuts we face from Government, and adapt accordingly. Here endeth the lesson.”

(xxx) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Ayre:

“Can the Cabinet Member state the 2012/13 budget for each of the council leisure facilities and the total actual spend?”

Reply:

- *“For Yearsley: The Budget was £387k and the actual spend £369k*
- *In the case of Energise: the budget for the grant to York High School was £274k, whilst the actual grant required was £271k - I am pleased to say that due to our investment in Energise the grant required in this financial year will be reduced to just £161k*
- *For Waterworld: The Budget was for £83k of income, whilst the actual received was £41k (the budget is higher than the income received due to an error made in the budget process by the previous administration).”*

(xxxii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

“What is the cost of establishing and maintaining the ‘i-travel’ web site and could he explain what the technical problem has been with the feed from the traffic cameras to the website?”

Reply:

“The iTravel York website is the cornerstone of the LSTF funded iTravel York programme, providing a dynamic ‘one stop shop’ to advise the communities we serve with sustainable travel options. The website also acts as a conduit for all new developments in all areas of travel affecting communities, schools, businesses and all travel modes.

The cost of establishing and maintaining the web site was included in the original bid document to the department of Environment, (DfT), for LSTF funding. This cost, over the life of

the LSTF funding 2011 -2015, (within the approved bid) was for £38.6k. This figure having been arrived at following a thorough test of the market place and formal procurement procedures. The overall award to York from the DfT LSTF funding was £4.6m.

The main body of the iTravel York web site is now a fully functioning site and a total of £35.4k has been spent. The remaining balance of the £38.6k will be spent on maintenance and upgrades and is on target to meet the projected financial profile to 2015.

The iTravel York web site enables us to link to other websites but iTravel York do not maintain those sites it links too.

The recent technical problem related to the upgrade of the communications between the CCTV cameras on street and the central control facility from analogue to the digital 'dark fibre' network. This resulted in the previous computer system used to 'grab' images off the live camera feeds no longer working (it was built to deal with analogue inputs only). The provider of our digital control equipment does not produce an equivalent system to grab images from digital feeds and so has had to develop one specifically to meet our needs. As with all bespoke computer systems, there has been a period of developing and testing for this bespoke system, and delays in completing this have lead to the loss of CCTV images from the website. Staff are now in the final stages of commissioning this new system and are finalising the list of which cameras will be presented on the website. This process should be completed within the next week and then live images will once again be available via YorkLIVE and i-travel."

(xxxiii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

"Regarding the Tour de France, how many new posts are being created or adapted to support the TDF – on which scale and at what cost to the Council?"

Reply:

"One post: 'Regional Director – Tour de France Legacy'.

It is proposed that this will be funded by a £5k contribution from each of the region's local authorities, so York's contribution would be £5k if agreed."

(xxxiv) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“Besides the £500,000 hosting fees already paid by the citizens of York to secure the Tour De France what other expenses are forecast to be incurred, (broken down by category where possible)?”

Reply:

“Anyone reading Coun. Ayre’s question would be forgiven for thinking he is opposed to York being part of Le Grand Départ and hosting the stage 2 start of next year’s Tour De France. He may indeed be happy to confirm this is the case.

The Government is still to be clear about the allocation and governance of its £10m contribution. I discussed this matter last week with district and county leaders and it is a matter we are eager to resolve, for my part to ensure the cost to the local taxpayer is minimised and that it represents excellent value for money when judged against the economic gain for York businesses.

The detailed specifications are being finalised with ASO and will be come forward in September in the form of a published report.”

(xxxv) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“In responding negatively to the government proposal to allow conversions of offices to housing, the Cabinet Leader said there is a shortage of office accommodation in York. Could he tell me how many square feet of office space is currently vacant in the City?”

Reply:

“I can provide some clarity for Coun. Ayre so he is entirely clear on my position. What I support is conversion in some cases where it is appropriate but not a one size fits all, carte blanche policy for converting offices into homes. Whilst we have some office stock available, we need to protect the availability of Grade A office stock which is more limited, particularly in the city centre, in order to attract more businesses to the city.

York must retain the ability to decide on preventing conversion of this type of stock if we are to ensure the future business

needs of the city are being met.

However, even with carte blanche to convert offices to homes, this would still not provide sufficient homes to address York's acute housing shortage. York needs more homes but office to homes conversions is not an alternative to a credible Local Plan.

There is currently a total of 562,096sq ft (17.95%) of York's office space being marketed as available (source CYC Economic Development commercial property database)

Of this:

27% is Grade A – 152,388sqft

58% is Grade B – 332,264sqft

11% is Grade C – 63,548sqft

4% are Listed Buildings – 22,676sqft

Of the total office stock % is being marketed as available:

City Centre – 7.73%

Clifton Moor – 2.71%

Clifton Park Business Park – 1.97%

Edge of City Centre – 0.68%

Elvington – 0.14%

Monks Cross – 1.93%

Northminster Business Park – 0.34%

Outside Ring Road – 0.34%

Station Business Park – 0.20%

Within Ring Road – 0.75%

York Business Park & Millfield Lane – 0.87%

York Science Park – 0.87%

This is made up of Grade A, B, C & Listed Buildings % within:

	<i>Grade A</i>	<i>Grade B</i>	<i>Grade C</i>	<i>Listed Buildings</i>
<i>City Centre</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>68%</i>	<i>21%</i>	<i>9%</i>
<i>Clifton Moor</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>99%</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Clifton Park Business Park</i>	<i>100%</i>			
<i>Edge of City Centre</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>8%</i>
<i>Elvington</i>		<i>100%</i>		
<i>Monks Cross</i>	<i>86%</i>	<i>14%</i>		
<i>Northminster</i>	<i>56%</i>	<i>44%</i>		

<i>Business Park</i>				
<i>Outside Ring Road</i>		81%	19%	
<i>Station Business Park</i>		100%		
<i>Within Ring Road</i>	12%	54%	34%	
<i>York Business Park & Millfield Lane</i>		100%		
<i>York Science Park</i>	100%			

Of the office space currently being marketed as available the following has been approved for change of use:

*City Centre – 9816sqft (Grade C – 8556sqft and Listed Buildings 1260sqft
Monks Cross – 8402sqft (Grade B))”*

(xxxvi) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“Does the Cabinet Leader think it is acceptable that opposition councillors were prevented from seeing key evidence for the Local Plan prior to the public consultation?”

Reply:

“All councillors should be entitled to see documentation when reports are complete. The council will follow what it is legally required to do to fulfil its obligations on the Local Plan.

Coun. Ayre should remember that the Local Plan evidence base is an extension of the LDF evidence base, which all political parties have discussed through the LDF Working Group.

The key thing is that opposition Members are able to see the entire evidence base, which they are.”

(xxxvii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“Given the Labour Leader’s public statement in 2010 that opposition councillors should not be prevented from seeing key Community Stadium documents because of commercial confidentiality, can he explain why his administration is now preventing councillors from seeing documents for this very reason?”

Reply:

“In 2010 the Community Stadium project was in crisis. York Knights were not on board and my predecessor made promises to people that could not be kept.

It was clear the project required political leadership and Labour provided it. Since then we seen a planning application passed, money from developers provided to pay for most of the Community Stadium and we are currently out to procurement, so good progress is being made. Making the business case of the project publicly available at this critically important stage would threaten the successfully delivery of the project, due to its commercial sensitivity.

The time for opposition councillors to influence the Community Stadium has gone as the focus is now on this administration delivering. This is a matter for officers and commercial confidentiality for York City FC and York City Knights is crucial.”

Cllr Julie Gunnell

LORD MAYOR OF YORK

[The meeting started at 6.30 pm and concluded at 10.00 pm]