



Notice of meeting of

Tang Hall Area Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee

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

Date: Wednesday, 7 March 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 27 November 2006.

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 **Tuesday, 6 March, at 5.00pm.**

(Pages 5 - 16)

4. **Scrutiny Review of Use of Council Owned Land at Tang Hall**

This report updates members on progress in the scrutiny review of the Council-owned land in the Tang Hall area.

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

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting. Details are set out above.

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

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	27 NOVEMBER 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS LOOKER (CHAIR), CUTHBERTSON AND LIVESLEY
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS KIND AND LANCELOTT

1. **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 3 (Minute 3 refers) as a governor of Burnholme Community College.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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

3. **NEW SCRUTINY REVIEW OF USE OF COUNCIL OWNED LAND AT TANG HALL**

Members considered a report which summarised the issues around the new scrutiny review of the Council-owned land and buildings in the Tang Hall area and asked Members to agree their programme of work.

The topic registration form was submitted by Cllrs Kind, Looker and Potter in December 2003 (see Annex A). It had the objective of making the best use of council owned land around Tang Hall school including allotments, playing field, family centre site and the former garage on 5th Avenue. The intention of the review was to involve local people in a scrutiny review to enable them to influence decisions about their neighbourhood.

Officers from Property Services attended this meeting to update members on progress with the Area Asset Management Plan and inform the process of drawing up a programme of work for this review.

Officers reported that the purpose of this review was to get an idea of what the needs and priorities were for the people of Tang Hall and particularly to assist with the production of an Asset Management Plan for the area. It was highlighted that Tang Hall covered two wards – Heworth and Hull Road. There had been a meeting in June with the ward councillors to consider the core area of Tang Hall which was shown to Members on a map. Members discussed the following points at the meeting:

- That there would be a need to consult outside of this core area based on concentric circles as people might come in to use the facilities in Tang Hall
- That there were a number of holdings scattered across the area and whether any of these could be combined or reused for a different purpose
- That there was an opportunity to build a new library through the Big Lottery Fund
- That if this was going to be a model for future Area AMPs then it would be worth evaluating what economies of scale could be made.

Members discussed options for consultation and whether it could be linked to existing consultation. Officers reported that information was being collected across York through the Healthy City Board, which was focusing on Tang Hall as an area to consult on Healthy Living. It was highlighted that it could be useful to link up with other consultations so that people weren't being inundated with different consultations. Members initially suggested a three prong approach:-

1. Simple questionnaire in the area
2. Information posted in significant areas such as schools, libraries, community centres, and also take to ward committees
3. Drop in session for members of the public to come and talk to committee members

In addition it was agreed that talking to community groups, such as Ward Committee groups, Parish Councils, and ward forums, could be very useful. However it was noted that there was a need to get beyond these and market to those people that did not attend these groups. It was suggested that there were a number of issues coming up, including the integrated children's centre, the bid for the Big Lottery funding for the library, and the playing field and allotments, that could attract the public's interest.

The following initial timetable was then agreed by Members:-

1. Establish the boundary for the Tang Hall area through consultation with the ward councillors (to include the core area, southern part of Heworth, northern part of Hull Road and the catchment areas for the school and users of the community centres and libraries).
2. Establish the school catchment area to find out where the parents come from.
3. Combine these two pieces of information to obtain the concentric circles for consultation.
4. Officers to get in touch with ward councillors for a list of all the significant community groups in the area.
5. A user friendly briefing note be prepared to send out to groups and officers to contact Tang Hall Community Centre to check availability.
6. Invite the community groups to a meeting with the scrutiny committee Members and Ward Councillors in January 2007 at the community centre to talk about improving facilities in Tang Hall and ways to effectively communicate with other people living in the area.

It was proposed that this could be tied in with the healthy living consultation.

7. Officers to investigate when the ward committee meetings are and explore the possibility of holding a joint meeting.
8. Officers to discuss with Marketing & Communications what options are available to inform and consult the public on the review, such as the wards' newsletters, leaflets, exhibition stands and questionnaires, and the costs involved for each of these methods.

Members also discussed what options were available to get the information back from the public, including using the council's freepost for replies, online and through the library.

It was agreed that the committee would meet next at the meeting with representatives from the community groups in January. It was requested that information on the costs for the different options for public consultation be available for members at this meeting for consideration.

RESOLVED: (i) That the above timetable and tasks be agreed;
 (ii) That information on the costs of the different options for public consultation be made available to Members prior to the meeting at Tang Hall Community Centre in January.

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 6.10 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



Tang Hall Area Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Committee

7 March 2007

Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Scrutiny Review of use of Council owned land at Tang Hall

Summary

1. This report updates 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.

Background

2. At the meeting of 27 November 2006 members heard from officers from Property Services on progress with the production of an Area Asset Management Plan for the Tang Hall area.
3. Members agreed the area the review would cover for consultation purposes, subject to consultation with Ward Members, and officers provided maps with council owned land identified on them. These were used for consultation with local residents as detailed below.
4. On 2 March 2007 officers from Property Services are due to meet with Ward Members and Service Representatives to discuss the structure of the Area Asset Management Plan. The suggested structure as at the time of writing can be found at Annex B. An officer from Property Services will attend this meeting to update members on progress.

Consultation

5. 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 can be found at Annex C, to follow after publication of the agenda for the meeting.
6. 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 has 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 can be found at Annex A and an analysis of how these could be funded is given under paragraph 12 below.

Model for Consultation on Future Asset Management Plans

7. Members discussed establishing a template or model for consultation processes in relation to future Asset Management Plans, based on findings from the activities undertaken specifically with regard to Tang Hall.

Such a model might be developed, at this stage of the review, to include a selection of the following:

- *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

*Members have already undertaken these consultative methods so far and might wish to consider which of any of the above they would further recommend as a model of good practice fit for this purpose and which, if any, they would be interested in undertaking as part of this review. In doing this, Members will wish to have regard to the cost implications identified in Annex A and the available budget referred to in paragraph 12 below.

Options

8. Members may decide that their efforts to consult residents so far would provide a good basis for establishing a consultation model for future Area Asset Management Plans, together any of the other proposed consultative methods listed in paragraph 7 above.
9. Members may also wish to consider whether further consultation is necessary at this stage, along the lines set out in paragraph 7 and Annex A, bearing in mind the costs involved and responses from consultees to date.

Corporate Priorities

10. 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.

Implications

11. There are no known HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, IT or other implications at this stage, other than financial implications associated with undertaking any of the consultative methods referred to above or within Annex A.

Financial Implications

12. Members are reminded that there is now approximately £3,000 remaining within the scrutiny budget to support consultative and research activities associated with scrutiny reviews generally. This needs to be borne in mind when considering undertaking further consultation methods specifically in relation to this review.

Risk Management

13. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

Recommendations

14. Members are asked to agree that the results of their consultations are used to inform the Area Asset Management Plan for Tang Hall and which consultative methods in addition to those already undertaken locally, should be used as a model for the production of future plans.

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

Contact details:

Author:

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

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager
01904 551030

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Suzan Hemingway
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Report Approved**Date** 26/02/2007**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** None.**Wards Affected:****All**

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Research options and costs

Annex B – Suggested structure of Area Asset Management Plan

Annex C – Summary of comments from consultation meetings (to follow)

Background Papers None

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

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
Total cost: [Ex VAT]	£8,819.00

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 paid return envelope. Those who did not respond would receive a reminder letter.

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

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
Total cost: [Ex VAT]	£4,795.00	£3,882.00	£3,019.00

3.0 Leaflet distribution

A consultation leaflet would be produced and delivered to all households 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"> • Cost • Reaches all households in Hull Road and Heworth wards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower response rate than postal survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not personalised ○ No opportunity for a reminder letter ○ No return envelope

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
Total cost: [Ex VAT]	£2,427.00

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

The estimated costs, assuming a 10% response rate are as follows:

Action	Cost (£)
Leaflet printing and design [4Pg A5 booklet, full colour]	400.00
Leaflet distribution with ward news letter	315.00
Return postage	342.00
Data analysis and tabular report	785.00
Total cost: [Ex VAT]	£1,842.00

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

The costs, assuming a 5% response rate [475 questionnaires] would be as follows:

Action	Cost (£)
Return postage	114.00
Data analysis and tabular report	500.00
Total cost: [EX VAT]	£614.00

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

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

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

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
Total cost: [EX VAT]	£1,300.00

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
- 2 Information about
 - Tang Hall area
 - Property/land CYC own/use
- 3 What are the property related needs in Tang Hall?
 - Service AMPs
 - Consultation
- 4 What does CYC provide currently?
 - How good is it?
 - i. Repairs
 - ii. Cost
 - iii. Underuse
 - iv. Alternative use
 - v.
- 5 Proposals for improvements/changes
 - Criteria
 - Priorities
- 6 Funding
 - Internal
 - External
- 7 Action plan/timetable

Pdc/22207/tanghallampstructure

Area Asset Management Plans

An Area Asset Management Plan (AAMP) combines the strategic direction and priorities set by the Corporate Asset Management Plan, which are linked to the Council's corporate priorities, with the priorities and requirements identified in the individual Service Plans at a local, location specific level. In particular the AAMP

- Focuses on wards' community areas
- Looks at council and non-council community needs and service delivery
- Incorporates partnership working
- Promotes asset rationalisation and shared use of buildings with council and partner services thus reducing net running costs
- Objective is to simplify customer access to council and non-council services.

Areaampdefn/260107

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