

---

MEETING	Executive
DATE	30 May 2006
PRESENT	Councillors Steve Galloway (Chair), Sue Galloway, Jamieson-Ball, Macdonald, Orrell, Runciman, Sunderland and Waller
APOLOGIES	Councillor Reid

---

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

The Chair invited Members to declare at this point any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. Cllrs Macdonald and Jamieson-Ball each declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 7 (Relocation of Peaseholme Centre), as members of the Planning Committee which would deal with the subsequent planning application for the chosen site. Both left the room during consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion or decision thereon.

### **2. Exclusion of Press and Public**

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Annex 2 to agenda item 10 (5 Kings Square and 2-3 Kings Court), on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial affairs of particular persons, which is classed as exempt under paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as revised by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

### **3. Minutes**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 16 May 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### **4. Public Participation**

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

### **5. Executive Forward Plan**

Members received and noted an updated list of items currently scheduled on the Executive Forward Plan.

## 6. Police and Community Safety Reform

Members considered a report which provided an update on emerging issues in respect of police and community safety reform, sought policy guidance on these issues and discussed their implications for the Council and for the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP).

The report summarised the policy themes and recommendations arising from the recently published Police and Justice Bill, which included recommendations from the review of the Crime and Disorder Act. The Bill covered a wide range of proposals in respect of police reform, crime and anti-social behaviour, and a single inspectorate for Justice, Community Safety and Custody. The review acknowledged the significant changes that had occurred since the creation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and sought to provide guidance on how they should be modelled and run in future. In particular, it recommended that CDRPs be subject to scrutiny by local authority scrutiny committees and that CDRPs and Police Basic Command Units (BCPs) should share coterminous boundaries. In respect of previous Home Office proposals to create a Strategic Police Force / Authority for the region, it was reported that orders had now been laid before the House of Commons, and the Council had until 11 August to lodge any objections.

Members commented that, due to changes in management at the Home Office a more acceptable “federated” option to the merger of police forces might now be open for consideration. They expressed concern that the governance proposals for CDRPs would reduce the accountability of the Safer York Partnership (SYP) to local residents and that introducing coterminous boundaries would result in a loss of focus on York issues.

Having considered the advice of the Shadow Executive, it was

- RESOLVED: (i) That the recommendations of the Police and Justice Bill and the Crime and Disorder Act review, and their implications for York, be noted.
- (ii) That the Executive maintains its view that the creation of a Strategic Police Authority could have adverse implications for the residents of York and that Officers be asked to continue to press the case for guarantees relating to the quality of service that might be expected in the City following any such change.
- (iii) That the views of the Council be communicated to central government in writing.
- (iv) That details of the Council’s position be communicated via the media and on its web site.
- (v) That the Executive records its concern about the appropriateness of the LSP as a vehicle to manage the local

CDRP any instructs Officers to consider and report on ways in which accountability can be maintained.

(vi) That the CDRP boundaries should remain as they currently are.

(vii) That Officers consider and report on how the Neighbourhood Pride team might make, within the existing budget limitations, a greater contribution to community safety and the new neighbourhood policing initiative.

(viii) That the enhanced role for scrutiny committees in holding the CDRP's contributing agencies to account be noted.

(ix) That the formal broadening of the Section 17 definition (the Council's legal obligation to consider promoting safety and reducing crime) be noted, and that Officers be asked to consider how a Safe City unit might be established within the Council as one of the responses to this legislation.

REASONS: To ensure that the Council makes a clear and appropriate response to the government's recommendations on police and community safety reform, which aims to safeguard the interests of the City of York and the accountability of the SYP to local residents.

## **7. Relocation of Peaseholme Centre - Site Shortlist**

Members considered a report which presented a shortlist of potential sites for relocation of the Peaseholme Centre and sought approval to carry out consultation with local residents, businesses and community groups around the shortlisted sites.

The Peaseholme Centre, a 22-bedded accommodation centre offering support to homeless people, was currently located within the Hungate redevelopment area, in a location scheduled for development of a new office complex. A core group of Officers had been established to oversee its relocation and they had now met and analysed all available sites against a set of agreed criteria. Details of this analysis were set out in Annex 1 to the report and in the revised Annex 1 circulated after publication of the agenda. Only two sites had met the criteria, namely 4 Fishergate and Monk Bar Garage. It was reported that a further site at 14 Jewberry had since been put forward in response to a Press statement inviting suggestions from the public as to possible alternative sites. This site, which adjoined Foss Bank Car Park, was not in Council ownership. Its potential use was therefore dependent on any plans which the current owner might have for the site.

Members were asked to consider three options:

**Option 1** – agree the shortlist of sites and approve a detailed consultation

**Option 2** – amend the shortlist of sites and approve a detailed consultation

**Option 3** – not agree the shortlist and ask Officers to bring back alternatives.

Members noted that the current site was needed not only for Council offices but also for retail and housing use, as a key site for the Hungate redevelopment. The Peaseholme Centre had a good record of operating within the City centre and the new building would be designed to a high standard to ensure that it enhanced the surrounding area, whichever site was chosen.

Having considered the advice of the Shadow Executive, it was

RESOLVED: (i) That Officers be asked to investigate the feasibility of using the suggested site at 14 Jewberry and be given delegated authority to include this site in the shortlist for further consultation, if they consider it appropriate.

REASON: To ensure that all potential sites have been properly considered.

(ii) That, following that further investigation, consultation be carried out on all the shortlisted sites and a further report be brought back to the Executive meeting on 25 July 2006 giving details of the outcome of the consultation process and a detailed site analysis.

REASONS: In order to progress the necessary relocation of the Peaseholme Centre as quickly as possible, subject to appropriate consultation with the local community.

## **8. York Museums Trust Funding**

Members considered a report which asked them to agree core funding for the York Museums Trust (YMT for the period 2008-2013 and to release £50k of capital funding to the YMT for a scheme to refurbish Kirkgate at the Castle Museum.

The legal agreement between the Council and the YMT required that the level of 5-year core funding for 2008-2013 must be agreed now. The report explained the YMT's current financial position, its business and capital plans, and set out the business case for continued revenue funding from the Council. The proposal was that the Council should continue to provide funding at the current level, with annual inflationary increases. The budget plan forecast that the YMT would start to generate surpluses in the last three years of the new funding period. These would provide a number of benefits, including removing the need for further "dowry" payments from the Council. In respect of capital funding, the Council was committed to providing £1.813m, to match fund the YMT's bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). In view of the fact that the Council had been unable to allocate the agreed "dowry" funding in the 2005/06 budget, YMT had asked that £50k of the capital be made available immediately, to use as match funding in the refurbishment of Kirkgate.

Details of YMT's performance indicators for 2005/06 and expected performance by 2010/11 had been circulated to Members before the meeting. Members commented with approval on the proposal to increase residents' satisfaction with museums and galleries to 78% and on the inclusion of informal learning opportunities in the proposed targets.

Having considered the advice of the Shadow Executive, it was

RESOLVED: (i) That core funding for the York Museums Trust for the period 2008/9-2013/14 be continued at the current level, with inflationary increases guaranteed as set out in paragraph 43 of the report.

(ii) That £50k of the £1.813 capital funding be provided immediately, as a contribution to the refurbishment of Kirkgate.

(iii) That authority be delegated to Officers to enter into a deed with the Heritage Lottery Fund, if the Trust is successful in its HLF bid, as set out in paragraph 52 of the report.

REASON: In order to secure the future of the YMT and the successful refurbishment of the Council's museums.

## **9. York Racecourse Traffic Management**

Members considered a report which presented the results of consultation on a Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) aimed at tackling traffic management issues arising during race meetings, together with a traffic management plan put forward by the York Race Committee YRC).

Advertisement of the TRO had been approved by the Executive on 7 February 2006. Two responses had been received, both of which objected to the duration of the proposed restrictions and their disruptive effect on local residents. Copies were attached as Annex B to the report. The YRC's alternative traffic management proposals were attached as Annexes C and D. These outlined one set of restrictions for major race days such as Ebor Day (Annex D) and another for ordinary or "Other" race days (Annex C).

Members considered the following options:

### **In respect of the YRC's proposals:**

**Option 1** – implement the same traffic management plan for all race meetings, as originally proposed, and approved by the Executive;

**Option 2** – implement two different plans, depending on the size of the race meeting, as proposed by the YRC.

It was noted that the costs of Option 1 would be around £40k per year. The Council had no funds set aside for management of traffic to events and no power to insist that the YRC fund traffic management measures for race days.

### **In respect of the TROs:**

**Option 1** – Approve the proposed TRO as advertised.

**Option 2** – Approve a reduced selection of the proposals.

**Option 3 – Abandon the proposals.**

It was noted that the TRO encompassed a range of measures, but their use would depend upon the individual circumstances of each event and it was not intended that all restrictions would be put in place for every meeting. The needs of residents, students and businesses would be taken into account before each element of the proposed measures was introduced. The TRO as advertised would allow for the management of both of the traffic management plans put forward by the YRC. Hence Option 1 was recommended.

Having considered the advice of the Shadow Executive, it was

RESOLVED: (i) That Option 2 in paragraph 6 of the report (implementing two different traffic management plans, in accordance with the YRC's proposals) be supported in principle.

REASON: The YRC have developed their plan for the benefit of their customers and would not support, nor wish to pursue, the plan initially put forward.

(ii) That Officers be asked to continue negotiations with the YRC to secure funding for the necessary traffic management measures.

REASON: Whilst recognising that race meetings do bring significant revenue to the City, they are commercial events and the costs should not fall to the residents of York.

(iii) That Option 1 in paragraph 12 of the report (the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order as advertised and shown in Annex A) be approved.

REASON: It is considered that this option allows sufficient flexibility to manage the traffic on the road network during race meetings.

**10. 5 Kings Square and 2-3 Kings Court**

Members considered a report which sought approval to sell the Council's freehold interest in 5 Kings Square and 2-3 Kings Court to the current lessees, who wished to carry out a refurbishment of the building.

The site was leased on a fixed rent and the the existing buildings would not revert to the Council until 2061. It was therefore recommended that the sale be approved, on the terms set out in Annex 2 to the report.

Having considered the advice of the Shadow Executive, it was

RESOLVED: That the site of 2-3 Kings Court and 5 Kings Square be sold to the Oakgate Group Plc, as existing lessees, on the terms and conditions outlined in the report and its annexes.

REASON: To secure a capital receipt for the Council, and in view of the fact that retaining the site would lead to erosion of the value of the fixed ground rent and might result in a deterioration of the existing buildings.

S F Galloway, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 2.50 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank