



## Notice of meeting of

### **Tang Hall Area Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee**

**To:** Councillors Looker (Chair), Cuthbertson, Kind, Lancelott and Livesley

**Date:** Tuesday, 24 April 2007

**Time:** 5.00 pm

**Venue:** The Guildhall

## **AGENDA**

### **1. Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

- 2. Minutes** (Pages 1 - 4)  
To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2007.

### **3. Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Panel's remit can do so. Anyone who wishes to register or requires further information is requested to contact the Democracy Officer on the contact details listed at the foot of this agenda. The deadline for registering is Monday 23 April 2007 at 5.00pm.

- 4. Scrutiny Review of use of Council owned land at Tang Hall** (Pages 5 - 20)

This report asks Members to agree their final recommendations for presentation to Scrutiny Management Committee.

**5. Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972**

Democracy Officer:

Name: Tracy Johnson

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551031
- E-mail – [tracy.johnson@york.gov.uk](mailto:tracy.johnson@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting.

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

## **About City of York Council Meetings**

### **Would you like to speak at this meeting?**

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

**A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088**

### **Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting**

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

### **Access Arrangements**

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 613161 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন ভাষাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোভাষী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 613161.

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin tercümesini hazırlamak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel. (01904) 613161.

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話(01904) 613161。

کسی بھی دوسری زبان میں معلومات کی دستیابی ترجمہ شدہ معلومات، ترجمان کی شکل میں یقینی بنانے کے لئے ہر ممکن کوشش کی جائے گی، بشرطیکہ اس کے لئے پہلے سے سنا سب اطلاع کی جائے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 613161

### **Holding the Executive to Account**

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (38 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Advisory Panel (EMAP)) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

### **Scrutiny Committees**

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

### **Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?**

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

MEETING	TANG HALL AREA AD HOC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE	7 MARCH 2007
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS LOOKER (CHAIR), CUTHBERTSON, KIND, LANCELOTT AND LIVESLEY

---

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

Cllr Cuthbertson declared a personal non prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4 (Minute 7 refers) as a governor of Burnholme Community College.

#### **5. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 27 November 2006 be approved and signed as a correct record.

#### **6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation scheme.

#### **7. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF USE OF COUNCIL OWNED LAND AT TANG HALL**

Members considered a report, which updated members on progress in the scrutiny review of the Council-owned land in the Tang Hall area, particularly in relation to activities which have taken place since the last meeting.

Members of the Scrutiny Sub-Committee held consultations with residents at Heworth and Hull Road Ward Committees in January and February 2007. They also held a meeting with representatives of community groups at Tang Hall Community Centre on 13 February 2007. A summary of the comments raised by people attending these meetings could be found at Annex C. On 2 March 2007 officers from Property Services met with Ward Members and Service Representatives to discuss the structure of the Area Asset Management Plan.

In addition, at the last meeting, Members wished to find out what options would be available to consult with the public in the Heworth and Hull Road

ward areas. The supporting Scrutiny Officer had made enquiries and ascertained estimated costs of a postal survey, leaflet distribution, insert to or questions within a ward newsletter, online survey, leaflets in libraries or focus groups discussions. These costs could be found at Annex A.

Officers from Property Services updated Members on the meeting with Ward Members which took place on 2 March. It was reported that the feedback from the consultation meetings with Tang Hall residents (Annex C) and other issues were discussed. Officers felt that there was enough information available to put a draft Asset Management Plan together by end of March. It was proposed that the draft plan be circulated to the Scrutiny Ad Hoc Committee members at a meeting in April and then the agreed draft be taken to Ward Committees and Community Groups for their views during May 2007. Approval from the Executive would be sought in June/July 2007,

The following priorities were raised by officers:

- The use of Glen Gardens. It was proposed that the play area already there be replaced and the southern end be tidied up with a new entrance by the family centre.
- The use of the playing fields. It was suggested that ownership of the playing fields could be transferred to the council to be used as a public open space. The southern end could be fenced off to make a formal community facility and the northern end opened up for community use. It was proposed that Section 106 money in the area could be used to manage the site and provide revenue from leisure facilities.
- Affordable housing sites were needed. Four possible areas had been identified: -
  - Garage site on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. However there was a planning application submitted for this site already.
  - 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue allotment site. However, there was a sub station on it which restricts access. The Electricity Board was looking to remove it though.
  - The strip along the allotments on the corner of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  - South West corner of playing fields.
- The use of the library. The consultation revealed that the library was also used by residents of Osbaldwick and that the library was considered to be in the right place. There was an intention to make a bid for lottery funding which needed to be in by the end of March. However, the outcome of the bid would not be revealed until the end of the year.

Officers further reported that the definition of the Area Asset Management Plan had changed. A copy of the new definition was circulated at the meeting.

Cllr Potter attended the meeting to inform Members of the outcome of some consultation she had undertaken with school children in Year 5 at Tang Hall Primary School. She reported that the school was going to incorporate an Integrated Children's Centre, which was due to open in April

2008 and the back playground was going to become a multi use games area, which hopefully would be opened up for community use in the evenings. The children were asked what they would like to see in Tang Hall and what they thought about the feedback from consultation. Feedback from this consultation was circulated at the meeting. Suggestions included a BMX park, climbing frames for small and bigger children and improve St Nicks Park and Glen gardens. It was commented that some of the suggestions could be incorporated into plans for the playing fields or Glen gardens.

Cllr Kind requested that her disappointment with how long it had taken to get to this point be recorded. She highlighted her concerns that if this issue had been dealt with earlier, something more radical could have been done, especially in relation to the school.

Members discussed the following points: -

- Enhancing and developing a green corridor which linked Heworth Holme and St Nicholas Fields, through the playing fields, with Osbaldwick could be an option to investigate further.
- A mobile skating facility could be set up which alternated between Burnholme Community School and Tang Hall Primary School.
- It was agreed that there was a need to expand play provision for older children in the area through Leisure Services.
- Closing 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and putting bollards in to reduce traffic, improve school safety and change the character of the area was considered an option to have in the plan. People would still be able to access the school and allotments but the road would become closed off to through traffic.
- The four possible sites available for affordable housing. It was noted, however, that there was already a lot of affordable housing in the area and that there was a need and desire by residents for more open public space, in particular on the playing fields.
- It was agreed that the library would remain where it was but that the profile needed to be raised with improved signage.
- It was agreed that there was no need to do any further consultation before the draft plan was sent out.
- It was agreed that the consultation template should not be used as an absolute template, as there was a need for flexibility because the city was so varied. It was recognised that there was a need for significant involvement with ward councillors who would know where to consult and which groups to consult.

The following were agreed as options to include in the draft plan:

- Ways of expanding play provision for older children in the area through Leisure Services, such as the mobile skating facility.
- The need for affordable housing sites, which could be sited on one of the four sites listed above or on a little bit of the allotments.
- The need for more public open space in the area, in particular on the playing fields site.

- Closing 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue with a bollard to reduce traffic and improve school safety.

It was agreed that the draft plan would go back to ward committees and community groups for consultation in May 2007 and then to the Executive for agreement in June/July 2007. Members highlighted other interest groups who could be consulted on the draft plan. These included representatives from the allotment users, Glen Lodge, Alex Lyons house, and Friends of Heworth Holme. Furthermore, the library could be asked to make copies of the plan available to residents and to advertise and display it for comments.

RESOLVED: That the results of the consultations be used to inform the Area Asset Management Plan for Tang Hall.

REASON: In order to meet their responsibilities as an Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee and carry out the responsibilities agreed by SMC.

CLLR LOOKER  
Chair

[The meeting started at 5.05 pm and finished at 6.35 pm].





---

**Tang Hall Area Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Committee****24 April 2007****Final Draft Report of the Scrutiny review of use of Council owned land at Tang Hall****Background**

1. In December 2003 a scrutiny topic was registered by Cllrs Looker, Kind and Potter to look at Council owned land in Tang Hall. This topic was put on hold by Scrutiny Management Committee as the Executive had commissioned a feasibility study relating to development of this area and Members wished to avoid any duplication of work. In March 2004 the Assistant Director of Property Services presented a progress report to SMC to enable them to decide whether a scrutiny panel should be established to assist with the Tang Hall School Land Project.
2. It was suggested that scrutiny could be involved with this process, particularly in terms of consulting with the local community to identify their aspirations for the area and to ensure that these were real, robust, affordable and prioritised. Members also emphasised the need for any scrutiny to complement, rather than duplicate, work done elsewhere. The Head of Property Services informed the Committee of the intention to project manage the development and use Tang Hall as a pilot Area Asset Management Plan and a detailed report on how this might be achieved was submitted to the SMC on 28 June 2004.
3. In April 2005 SMC considered a report which provided an update on the potential development of Tang Hall and the piloting of an Area Asset Management Plan. Further updates were received throughout 2005 and in March 2006 SMC considered a report, which advised them of the progress being made to produce the pilot Area Asset Management Plan for Tang Hall and set out proposals for the next steps including the involvement of ward and other members.
4. The remit for this Scrutiny was agreed at Scrutiny Management Committee on 23 October 2006 and the sub-committee established. An interim report on the work of this sub-committee was considered at Scrutiny Management Committee on 26 March 2007 and the sub-committee was asked to consider if their work was completed and agree their final recommendations.

## **Corporate Priorities**

5. This could be considered to be relevant to corporate priority 3 – improve the actual and perceived condition and appearance of the city's streets, housing estates and publicly accessible spaces.

## **Options**

6. Members can support all, some or none of the recommendations proposed as a result of this review, for submission to Scrutiny Management Committee and then to Executive.

## **Remit**

7. In coming to a decision to review this topic, the Scrutiny Management Team agreed that the scope of the review would be to decide the boundary of the area to which this review refers and carry out an audit of council owned property within that boundary and as part of the remit set the following key objectives:
  - To carry out a local scrutiny review aimed at making better use of council owned land and buildings in the area in both community and resource terms.
  - To evaluate the options for resolving these issues
  - To make recommendations which will inform the pilot Area Asset Management Plan being prepared for this area.

## **To carry out a local scrutiny review aimed at making better use of council owned land and buildings in the area in both community and resource terms.**

## **Consultation**

8. Members held consultations with residents at the Heworth and Hull Road Ward Committees in January and February 2007. This was because the Tang Hall area covers parts of both these Wards (see 8 below). Representatives of this Sub-Committee, together with officers from Scrutiny Services and Property Services attended the meetings with a small display of maps of the Tang Hall area and discussed the possibilities with residents. These consultations were publicised in the preceding Ward Newsletter which informed residents that Scrutiny Sub-Committee members would be available at the Ward Committees to listen to their views.
9. A special meeting was held in Tang Hall Community Centre on 13 February 2007 to which representatives of all community groups which operate in the Tang Hall area were invited. Notices had been sent to all community groups who were known about by Sub-Committee and Ward members, posters placed in library, community centre etc and articles were published in the local press which informed people that the event was to take place.

### **Information Gathered**

10. A summary of the comments made by local residents at the consultation meetings is attached at Annex A. They highlight how the community would like council owned land and buildings in the area to be used and developed.
11. As a Ward Member, Cllr Ruth Potter discussed these comments with pupils at Tang Hall Primary School during a Citizenship lesson that she was contributing to. A summary of what they would like to see in the Tang Hall area is attached at Annex B.
12. It was recognised that the boundary of the Tang Hall area to which this review refers lies across two wards – Heworth and Hull Road. The core area that forms the focus of this review was shown on a map which also highlighted the Council-owned property in the area. This was the same area that was agreed as making up Tang Hall by ward members at a meeting with Property Services officers in June 2006.

### **Issues**

13. Members recognised that further and more extensive consultation could take place. This might include postal surveys of all or selected addresses within the wards, phone surveys, leaflet distribution, on-street or online surveys or focus group discussions. There would be considerable financial implications if these methods were employed – see Annex C.
14. Members discussed establishing a model or template for consultation processes in relation to future Area Asset Management Plans (AAMPs) that may be produced. Such a model might include a selection of the methods used as part of this review, wherever considered appropriate e.g. :
  - Area based consultation at appropriate location(s) within the community, involving residents and key stakeholders
  - Ward Committee consultation
  - A questionnaire delivered to every house within the ward (postal survey)
  - Questions asked via the Councils citywide consultation tool 'Talkabout' to ensure that local decisions affecting the City as whole are consulted on.
  - Phone surveys aimed at contacting 1 in 6 residents to get a representative view from ward based residents.
  - On street interviews conducted at geographic sites of possible change.
  - Leaflet distribution (see 3 alternative methods set out in Annex A)
  - On-Line Survey
  - Focus Group discussions
14. However the advice of Property Services was that the circumstances surrounding any future AAMPs could be widely different from that of Tang Hall with less Council owned buildings being affected. Members acknowledged their advice but agreed that some if not all of the above could be employed to consult in any area of the city and therefore a model could assist depending on the individual circumstances.

### **Recommendation**

15. That Members ask Officers to consider adopting any of the relevant research and consultation methodologies proposed in the model in paragraph 14 of the report, when developing future Area Asset Management Plans, taking into account cost and particular circumstances relating to the area being looked at.

REASON: In order to carry out their responsibilities as set by SMC.

### **Implications**

16. There are no known financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime & Disorder, IT, Property or other implications associated with these recommendations

### **To evaluate the options for resolving these issues**

#### **Consultation**

17. Information is given on the type of consultation carried out in paragraphs 8-11 above.

#### **Information Gathered**

18. Three main areas of concern were revealed by the consultation events and liaison with ward members. These were:
  - a. The provision and retention of open space with the area.
  - b. The provision of play and leisure facilities for older children and teenagers.
  - c. The identification of sites which could be used for affordable housing.

#### **Issues**

19. In considering these three areas Members recognised the following issues:
  - a. Members were keen that the playing fields site should continue to be predominantly open space, but recognised that part of the site may need to be sold to raise capital which could be used to enhance the remainder. It would be possible for this to be managed by the Community Centre if appropriate financial arrangements were made. Enhanced landscaping in this area could allow it to become part of the “green corridor” and cycle track which would link Heworth Holme and St Nicholas Fields with Osbaldwick.
  - b. Considerable investment is being made in the integrated children’s centre, however members were of the opinion that there was still a need

for leisure opportunities for older young people. It would be important to work with Leisure Services to source suitable facilities, however members suggested the use of a mobile skateboard park which could perhaps be located at Burnholme Community College, as well as Tang Hall Primary School for younger children. Also the possibility of play areas on the former Family Centre site or in the St Nicholas complex.

- c. Members discussed the possibility of using part of the allotment site as well as four other small sites which may meet housing needs.
20. Members acknowledged that the implementation of any of these options would be subject to the necessary consents and funding being available.

### **Recommendation**

21. The Executive be asked to consider the specific areas of need identified through this scrutiny review in paragraph 19 of the report, as part of any future Area Asset Management Plan for Tang Hall.

### **Implications**

22. Although there are no direct implications associated with this recommendation, Members recognised that there will be financial and property implications should these issues be addressed as part of a future Area Asset Management Plan for this area.

### **To make recommendations that will inform the process of creating the pilot Area Asset Management Plan which is being prepared for this area.**

### **Consultation**

23. Members consulted with officers from Property Services on the findings from the community meetings completed as part of this review, as set out in paragraphs 8&9 of this report.

### **Information Gathered**

24. Officers from Property Services found the input of the Scrutiny Sub-Committee to be useful. They also received input from Ward Members, the Executive Member and other relevant officers during their production of the suggested structure of the Area Asset Management Plan for Tang Hall. A draft of the plan was expected to be complete by the end of March 2007. This will be circulated to Ward Committees and community groups (hopefully by May 2007 with approval by the Executive in June or July 2007. The suggested structure for the Area Asset Management Plan is enclosed at Annex D.

### **Issues arising**

25. Members were concerned that the draft plan be circulated more widely, for example to allotment holders, Glen Lodge, Alex Lyon House, Tang Hall Library, Friends of Heworth Holme. They were also anxious that Ward

members be involved in the planning of consultation procedures for any future Area Asset Management Plans.

**Recommendation**

- 26. As a minimum, Ward Members should be included in the formulation of consultation plans early in the process for any future Area Asset Management Plans.

**Implications**

- 27. There are no known financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime & Disorder, IT, Property or other implications associated with these recommendations

**Contact Details**

**Author:**

Barbara Boyce  
Scrutiny Officer  
01904 551714  
barbara.boyce@york.gov.uk

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Suzan Hemingway  
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

**Final Draft Report  
Approved**



**Date** 13.04.07

**Wards Affected:**

All



**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers – None**

**Annexes**

- Annex A – Summary of comments from consultation meetings
- Annex B – Comments of pupils from Tang Hall Primary School
- Annex C – Research options and costs
- Annex D – Suggested structure of Area Asset Management Plan

**Feedback from Consultation Meetings with Tang Hall Residents**

The following were issues of concern to residents or changes to provision that they would like to see. They are printed in no particular order.

Improved youth facilities, e.g. a skate park

Improvements to the Library which is part of two communities, Tang Hall and Osbaldwick.

A greater profile for Glen Gardens.

A swimming pool on the family centre site.

There are currently few open spaces in Hull Road Ward.

A sports centre on Melrosegate playing fields with an all-weather football pitch on part of the site.

More plots needed on the allotment site.

Part of the playing fields could be used for houses.

The Heworth family centre site could be used for health or social services.

Improvements and refurbishment of Community Centre and development of field as a games area.

Children's play area on playing field.

Youth workers in the area.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Tang Hall Primary School Year 5

Things we would like to see in Tang Hall

- More things in the park
- More walks
- More plants more playgroups
- Mini motor raceway
- BMX park
- Play area
- More swings in Glen park
- Make Yearsley swimming pool bigger
- Trampoline area
- Swimming pool in tang hall school
- Trees next to playing field into houses
- Wardens at Alex Lyons house working weekends
- New road down Askwith Ave
- More fun grown up things to play on
- Cut grass more regularly
- More play equipment at school
- Climbing frames for small and bigger children
- Fix more roads
- Improve St Nicks park and Glen gardens
- More sweet and cookie shops
- More swings and slides
- Swimming pool on playing field
- Better meals in school
- No workmen who dig up roads because they have nothing to do

This page is intentionally left blank

## Area Asset Management Plan Research options and costs

### 1.0 Introduction

This document outlines the possible research methodologies and costings for a consultation in Hull Road and Heworth ward areas. The research would assess the use of council buildings and land. There are approximately 9,500 households in these two wards:

Ward Area	No. of Households
Heworth	5,484
Hull Road	4,017

All costs are approximate, a more detailed brief would be required to provide more accurate quotations. All costs are based on the assumption that a 4pg A5 booklet would be sufficient to ask all the questions required.

### 2.0 Postal survey

#### 2.1 Census

Each household in Heworth and Hull Road would be sent a postal questionnaire and a postage paid return envelope. All those who did not respond would be sent a reminder letter.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good response rate:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can send out reminder letters to those who do not respond</li> <li>○ Can send out return freepost envelopes</li> <li>○ Personalised letters</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reaches all households in Hull Rd and Heworth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expensive</li> <li>• Would need to know specific names addresses [May incur a cost from electoral roll].</li> <li>• Longer fieldwork period</li> </ul>

The table below illustrates the costs, I have assumed a 20% response rate would be achieved. [Sample size of 1,900]

Action	Cost (£)
Envelopes	600.00
Printing (4pg A5 booklet)	400.00
Postage - original mail out	2,185.00
Postage - return	456.00
Postage - reminder mail out	1,967.00
Envelope stuffing, printing of personalised letter, address labels, delivery to post office.	2,166.00
Data analysis & tabular report	1,045.00
<b>Total cost: [Ex VAT]</b>	<b>£8,819.00</b>

## 2.2 Sample

A random sample of households in Hull Road and Heworth would be selected. They would receive a personalised letter, questionnaire and postage page return envelope. Those who did not respond would receive a reminder letter.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good response rate:</li> <li>• Can send out reminder letters to those who do not respond</li> <li>• Can send out return freepost envelopes</li> <li>• Personalised letters</li> <li>• Less expensive than census</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not allow all residents to take part</li> <li>• Would need to know specific names addresses [May incur a cost from electoral roll].</li> <li>• Longer fieldwork period</li> </ul>

The costs assume that a 20% response rate would be achieved.

Action	Cost (£) Mail out 5,000	Cost (£) Mail out 4,000	Cost (£) Mail out 3,000
Envelopes	380.00	320.00	300.00
Printing (4pg A5 booklet)	300.00	270.00	250.00
Postage - original mail out	1150.00	920.00	690.00
Postage - return	240.00	192.00	144.00
Postage - reminder mail out	1035.00	828.00	621.00
Envelope stuffing, printing of personalised letter, address labels.	1140.00	912.00	684.00
Data analysis & tabular report	550.00	440.00	330.00
<b>Total cost: [Ex VAT]</b>	<b>£4,795.00</b>	<b>£3,882.00</b>	<b>£3,019.00</b>

## 3.0 Leaflet distribution

A consultation leaflet would be produced and delivered to all household in the Hull Road and Heworth ward areas. Residents would be asked to complete the questions then send back using their own envelope to a free post address.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Reaches all households in Hull Road and Heworth wards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower response rate than postal survey</li> <li>• Not personalised</li> <li>• No opportunity for a reminder letter</li> <li>• No return envelope</li> </ul>

The costs assume that a 15% response rate would be achieved [sample size of 1,425]

Action	Cost (£)
Leaflet printing and design [4pg A5 booklet, full colour]	400.00
Leaflet distribution	900.00
Return postage	342.00
Data analysis and tabular report	785.00
<b>Total cost: [Ex VAT]</b>	<b>£2,427.00</b>

#### 4.0 Leaflet as an insert in ward newsletter

A consultation leaflet would be added to the ward newsletters. The respondents would be asked to complete the questions and send back using their own envelope to a free post address.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Reaches all households in Hull Road and Heworth wards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower response rate than postal survey</li> <li>• Not personalised</li> <li>• No opportunity for a reminder letter</li> <li>• No return envelope</li> <li>• Lower impact as an insert</li> <li>• Next newsletter after the election</li> </ul>

The estimated costs, assuming a 10% response rate	Cost (£)
<b>Action</b> - Leaflet printing and design [4Pg A5 booklet, full colour]	400.00
<b>Action</b> - Leaflet distribution with ward news letter	315.00
<b>Action</b> - Return postage	342.00
<b>Action</b> - Data analysis and tabular report	785.00
<b>Total cost: [Ex VAT]</b>	<b>£1,842.00</b>

#### 5.0 Questions added to ward newsletter

Subject to member approval, questions could be added to the ward newsletter itself. The residents would be asked to cut out the questions, place in their own envelope and return using a free post address.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Reaches all households in Hull Road and Heworth wards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower response rate than postal survey</li> <li>• Not personalised</li> <li>• No opportunity for a reminder letter</li> <li>• No return envelope</li> <li>• Lower impact as it is an insert</li> <li>• Next newsletter is after the election</li> <li>• Limited space available</li> </ul>

The costs, assuming a 5% response rate [475 questionnaires]	Cost (£)
<b>Action</b> - Return postage	114.00
<b>Action</b> - Data analysis and tabular report	500.00
<b>Total cost: [EX VAT]</b>	<b>£614.00</b>

#### 6.0 Online survey

A questionnaire would be added to the council's Consultation Finder website. A cost would not be incurred. However, if detailed analysis of subgroups is required, a research agency would charge approximately £150.00.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Speed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low response rate (estimated sample 100)</li> <li>• Publicity needed</li> <li>• Excludes those without internet access</li> </ul>

## 7.0 Leaflets in libraries

Consultation leaflets would be made available in libraries for residents to complete and send back to a free post address.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low response rate</li> <li>• Publicity needed</li> <li>• Excludes those who do not use libraries</li> </ul>

Printing and return postage costs would be incurred.

## 8.0 Focus group discussions

Residents in the area would be invited to a focus group discussion lasting approximately 1.5 hours. There would be around ten respondents in each group.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can discuss issues in more detail with residents and understand the reasons for their views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small sample size</li> </ul>

For a research agency to conduct four focus group discussions the cost would be approximately £4600.00. However, if the groups were to be conducted in house by the Market Research Team the cost would be:

Action	Cost (£)
Recruitment (postage and telephone)	200.00
Venue hire and refreshments (Hopefully a community centre could be used at a lower cost.)	500.00
Incentive and respondent expenses.	600.00
<b>Total cost: [EX VAT]</b>	<b>£1,300.00</b>

ES 466/1

## Tang Hall Area Asset Management Plan

### Suggested Structure

- 1 Purpose of the Plan
  - See attached sheet
  - To only use property that sustains and supports service delivery
  - To deliver Corporate Priorities at a local level
- 2 Information about
  - Tang Hall area
  - Property/land CYC own/use
- 3 What does CYC provide currently?
  - How good is it?
    - i. Repairs
    - ii. Cost
    - iii. Underuse
    - iv. Alternative use
    - v. ....
  - Gap analysis
- 4 What are the property related needs in Tang Hall?
  - Service AMPs
  - Consultation
- 5 Proposals for improvements/changes
  - Criteria
  - Priorities
  - Look at partnerships for provision
- 6 Funding
  - Internal
  - External
- 7 Action plan/timetable

*Pdc/22207/tanghallampstructure*

This page is intentionally left blank