
MEETING	CABINET
DATE	3 APRIL 2012
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS ALEXANDER (CHAIR), CRISP, FRASER, GUNNELL, MERRETT, SIMPSON-LAING (VICE-CHAIR) AND WILLIAMS
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS BARNES, CUTHBERTSON, D'AGORNE, FITZPATRICK, GALVIN, REID, SCOTT AND WARTERS
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR LOOKER

119. 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.

The following Members declared personal, non-prejudicial interests in respect of agenda items in so far as they related to staffing matters:

- Cllr Crisp, as a member of the retired section of Unison
- Cllr Williams, as a member of Unison and Unite
- Cllr Gunnell, as a member of Unison
- Cllr Alexander, as a member of GMB
- Cllr Simpson-Laing, as a member of Unison
- Cllr Fraser as a member of the retired sections of Unison and Unite (TGWU/ACTS).

Councillor Merrett declared a personal non prejudicial interest in respect of Agenda item 6 (Water End/Clifton Green Junction) as a member of the York Cycle Campaign and Honorary Member of the CTC.

Councillor Williams also declared a personal non prejudicial interest in relation to Agenda item 8 (Review of Admission Arrangements and School Travel Policies) as a member of the National Secular Society who campaigned against provision of free transport on a denominational basis.

Councillor Simpson-Laing also declared a personal non prejudicial interest in relation to Agenda item 11 (Low Emission Strategy Update) as she lived adjacent to roads included in the new Air Quality Management areas in Leeman Road.

120. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Annex 1 to Agenda item 15 (York Central Project Update) on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons. This information 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).

121. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Cabinet meeting held on 6 March 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

122. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/OTHER SPEAKERS

It was reported that there had been thirteen registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme and that seven Members of Council had also requested to speak.

The following spoke in respect of Agenda item 6 – Water End/Clifton Green Junction: Options for Reinstating a Separate Left Turn Lane on the Water End Approach:

Virginia Shaw spoke as a pedal cyclist who regularly used this route pointing out that, prior to the alterations, this junction had been identified as a priority for work to ensure the safety of cyclists . She expressed concern that the consultation options had not included 'leave in present form' and she made a plea for members to let commonsense prevail and leave the junction alone.

Matt Wilson-Boddy, representing York Youth Council, expressed surprise at proposed changes at the junction, as he felt these would undermine the Council's credibility. Responses to the consultation were they felt insufficient to allow further changes, particularly as maintaining the present layout had not been offered as an option. Reference was made to the council's cycle campaign to further changes being inconsistent with the authority's hierarchy of road users.

Bernie Cullen, representing Bike Rescue, pointed out that one of the key council priorities was to protect vulnerable people and that any change to the road layout would not support this. Cycling was supported especially if it took residents out of cars and improved congestion giving cyclists the right to safe passage.

Peter Fay spoke as a user of the Water End route, both as a cyclist and a motorist. He confirmed that the new arrangements had encouraged him to cycle but the proposed changes in both Options 1 and 2 would be a retrograde step removing protection for cyclists. He therefore requested members to leave the present arrangements as any change would encourage him to revert to car use once again.

Paul Hepworth spoke as a representative of the CTC referring to the increased risk to cyclists if changes were made at Water End. He referred to a safety audit carried out at a redesigned junction in London which had been disregarded and which was now under investigation by the Police following an accident. He questioned the short term gains and costs involved to revise a government funded scheme and requested members to defer a decision pending receipt of legal advice.

June Tranmer spoke in relation to safety issues as a cyclist and the victim of two accidents as she felt there were now increased risks on York's roads. She pointed out that, as a resident of Clifton and regular user of the Water End junction, since the redesign she felt much safer and requested the Cabinet to leave the junction alone.

Jim Begley, spoke on behalf of residents of Westminster Road and The Avenue pointing out that neither of the proposed options put forward in the officers report would assist local residents with the issue of traffic using their roads as a rat run to avoid the junction. He referred to a recent traffic survey

undertaken by residents which had shown 1600 vehicles using the roads over a 12 hour period. This was no longer a peak flow problem and he urged members to put measures in place to overcome residents concerns with a point closure of the roads.

Andrew Pringle spoke as a resident of Westminster Road of 13 years and the impact changes at this junction had made to local residents. Although the works had been of value to cyclists he questioned the percentage of non cyclists who had been encouraged to cycle in comparison with the money invested. Failures of the scheme included congestion, pollution, noise, speed of vehicles and the increased use of residential roads and he reiterated the request for point closure.

Cllr D'Agorne spoke as the former cycle champion and a member of the cross party Councillor Call for Action in respect of this issue. He referred to the work undertaken to form this crucial section of the orbital cycle route to encourage cycling and to the proposed options which would break this link. A further request was made to leave the junction unchanged and to note the results of the consultation.

Cllr Reid reiterated the Lib/Dem comments in relation to this report, particularly that the consultation had not offered the option of No Change to the existing layout however the majority of responses, almost 60%, had favoured this. The Safety Audit findings had clearly shown that to alter the junction would be wrong and increase risks to pedestrians and cyclists. The emergency services had also agreed with these findings and in view of this the decision should be taken to leave the junction as it is.

Cllr Warters referred to this issue as an important point of principal, particularly as the present administration had as a manifesto pledge supported the reinstatement of the left turn lane at this junction. Members should therefore support Option 1 in the report.

Cllr Scott spoke of the history of this junction and work undertaken. He pointed out that it was incorrect to state that the financial implications were low as works had already been over budget and issues of reputational damage had not been mentioned. He confirmed his support for reinstatement of the left hand lane

Cllr Warters also spoke in relation to Agenda item 10 (Economic Infrastructure Fund – Governance and Initial Funding Decisions). He pointed out that on a number of occasions he had made requests for funding to be made available for the complete re-construction of the highway on Tranby Avenue, Osbaldwick, without success. He then submitted a request in writing for the release of £500k from the economic infrastructure fund to carry out these works which would support the York Economic Strategy Ambition 4, Get York Moving.

The following spoke in respect of Agenda item 14 – Controlling the Concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Planning Outcomes:

Harry Telfer spoke on behalf of the Badger Hill Residents Community Group, circulating a plan which gave example calculations to demonstrate the unintentional consequential effects of the clustering of HMO's. It was suggested, that lowering the threshold to 10% rather than 20% was justified as the majority of consultees felt that 20% was too high.

Cllr Warters confirmed his comments and that of Osbaldwick Parish Council as set out on pages 294 to 297 of the report. He went on to reiterate his opposition to the threshold approach at either street or neighbourhood level, particularly as York had chosen an extremely high threshold of 20%. Reference was made to the high number of students in comparison to the accommodation provided on campus and to the proposals which would lead to the 'filling up' adjacent residential areas with student HMO's.

Cllr Barnes spoke as the Councillor of a ward on which these proposals would have most impact. He expressed support for a combination of the thresholds which he felt would provide a better approach, providing balance in neighbouring streets. Although HMO's were an important part of the housing stock, he supported mixed communities rather than establishing ghettos. The proposals should however be clearly communicated to residents to ensure they had a clear understanding of the issues.

The following spoke in respect of the urgent business at Agenda item 17 – Beckfield Lane Household Recycling Site:

Professor Downes spoke in support of the retention of the recycling site which had been well used for over 30 years. He referred to safety issues raised as a reason for closure when the site already had an excellent safety record. Closure of this facility which result in less recycling and additional vehicle journey's to other sites. He requested members to note residents views and support its retention.

Trevor Scott reiterated his support for the earlier speakers comments. He referred to the increased distance skip lorries would have to travel from Hazel Court rather than Beckfield Lane to Harewood Whin increasing pollution and recycling costs. The Beckfield Lane facility was well used and should remain open.

Rueben Mayne spoke in respect of the recently published officer report, which set out further information regarding the decision made for the closure of Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling centre as part of the budget proposals. He pointed out that the savings figures were gross rather than net and that increased fly tipping and landfill tax would also require inclusion in costings. Local residents took pride in their community and this would be undermined with the closure of this facility. He therefore asked members to note residents support for the centre's retention provided by the number of signatories of the petition.

Peter Ashton spoke as a Beckfield Lane resident and signatory of the petition. He referred to the popular facility which local residents were able to visit without a vehicle using wheelbarrows and wheelie bins. Mention was made of the assistance provided by the excellent staff on site, the support of immediate neighbours and to the detrimental effect closure of the site would have on residents in the west of the city.

Cllr Reid spoke in support of the motion and petition presented to council, and the e-petition for retention of the facility. She referred residents strength of feeling for the sites retention when the alternative meant a drive across the city. Reference was made to the lack of detail in the report, particularly financial, and to the comparatively small saving closure of the site would provide. Additional points included the increase in transport costs from Hazel Court and skips at the Towthorpe site were no more accessible for residents than at this site. A request was

made to defer further consideration of this report pending consideration at Council.

Cllr Warters expressed support for reference of this motion and petition to a special council meeting to enable further consideration of the matter. He requested members to reconsider the closure of this site and acknowledge the views of local residents.

Cllr Galvin also asked members to listen to local residents and support the retention of a well used community facility on the west side of York. He pointed out that there had been no personal injury accident reported at the site since its opening and that fly tipping in the area would increase leading to future costs for the authority.

Cllr Cuthbertson expressed concern at the late publication of the officer report dealing with this site. Concern was also expressed at the length of the Cabinet agenda which included a number of important issues for the city which he felt could not be seriously considered in the time available.

123. FORWARD PLAN

Members received and noted details of those items listed on the Forward Plan for the next two Cabinet meetings at the time the agenda was published.

It was noted that an update report on the Police and Crime Commissioners together with details regarding consultation on the closure of Burnholme Community College would also be considered at the Cabinet meeting in May.

124. WATER END/CLIFTON GREEN JUNCTION: OPTIONS FOR REINSTATING A SEPARATE LEFT TURN TRAFFIC LANE ON THE WATER END APPROACH

Consideration was give to a report which presented the findings of the consultation exercise undertaken with local residents and interest groups on two of the reinstatement options in respect of the Water End/Clifton Green junction.

The plan at Annex A of the report set out the current layout at the junction implemented in 2009 to assist in the completion of the Orbital Cycle Route around the city. Since implementation

however there had been complaints about increased traffic congestion at Water End following which, numerous layouts had been investigated with only two being approved for public consultation. Plans for these two options were set out at Annexes B and C and described at Annexes D and E of the report.

Details on feedback from the consultation was set out at paragraphs 9 to 15 and an analysis of the options at paragraphs 18 to 23 of the report. Public consultation had shown a clear preference for option 1, which the Cabinet Member had been recommended to consider when balanced against other consultation responses and the safety audit findings.

The Cabinet Member referred to the various issues raised, including the number of conflicting uses which required accommodating at the junction. However, in line with his Group's election pledge and as the majority of residents supported Option 1 he felt that this would provide a better balance for all road users. He confirmed that, following reinstatement works this would however be kept under review.

In answer to points raised by earlier speakers and consultation responses the Council's Monitoring Officer explained the authority's statutory duties in respect of gross breach of care and corporate manslaughter in relation to any works at the junction.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet approve reinstatement Option 1, as set out at Annex B of the report, subject to future review of the junctions safety record and any changes in cycle take up. ¹.

REASON: To address the issue around traffic congestion caused by the external layout at the Water End junction.

Action Required

1. Implement reinstatement and undertake future review of safety record and cycle take up.

MD, JP

125. MINUTES OF WORKING GROUPS

Members received a report which presented the minutes of meetings of the Equality Advisory Group (EAG) held on 20

February 2012 and the Local Development Framework Working Group (LDFWG) held on 5 March 2012, attached as Annexes A and B to the report, respectively.

Members were invited to consider the advice offered by the working groups in their capacity as advisory bodies to the Cabinet, and in particular the recommendations of the LDFWG in respect of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment at Annex B (minute 26) and the York Central and Former British Sugar Sites – Update on Transport and Access Approach also at Annex B (minute 27).

The relevant Cabinet Members presented the minutes of their meetings and confirmed that issues raised would be noted and if applicable addressed at their next meeting.

RESOLVED: (i) That the minutes at Annexes A and B to the report be noted.

(ii) That the specific recommendations of the LDF Working Group made at their meeting on 5 March 2012, as set out in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report, be approved.

REASON: To fulfil the requirements of the council's Constitution in relation to the role of Working Groups.

126. REVIEW OF ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS & SCHOOL TRAVEL POLICIES

Consideration was given to a report which presented information gathered in support of the review of admission arrangements and school travel plan policies by the Learning and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Details of the background to the review and information received to inform the Committee's work was set out at paragraphs 2 to 9, and the conclusions at paragraphs 13 to 16 of the report.

Councillor Reid, as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, presented the report, outlining their findings, explaining the reasons for the review and their recommendations.

The Committee's final report was set out at Annex A including the following recommendations:

- That no changes be made to the Local Authority's oversubscription criteria and that
- A phased withdrawal of free denominational transport should take place from 1 September 2013 together with the introduction of concessionary fares on transport provided by the Local Authority.

Councillor Reid expressed her thanks to officers and the scrutiny committee for their work in producing the final report and following further discussion it was

- RESOLVED:
- i) That the contents of the final report on the Review of Admission Arrangements and School Travel Policies be noted.
 - ii) That the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee, at paragraph 16 of the cover report, be approved.¹

REASON: To fully inform the Cabinet of the outcome of the review.

Action Required

1. Implement phased withdrawal of transport and introduction of concessionary fares from September 2013.

ME

127. DELIVERING THE COUNCIL PLAN - THE WORKFORCE STRATEGY AND THE PROCUREMENT AND COMMISSIONING STRATEGY

Consideration was given to a report which presented strategies for the workforce, procurement and commissioning. It was reported that these strategies were central to support the delivery of the Council Plan.

The Workforce Strategy 2012-2015 replaced the council's first Workforce Plan 2010-12 which had focussed on the future size and shape of the authority's staffing resource. It was confirmed that the council's approach to procurement had developed significantly however the strategy had not been refreshed for a number of years. Details of the background work and

consultation undertaken in relation to both of these documents was set out in the report.

It was confirmed that a full strategy delivery plan was being developed which would be electronically available in April.

The Cabinet Member referred to the work undertaken in relation to each of the strategies, in particular procurement which was crucial to the achievement of savings and to delivery of services.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree:

- i) The Workforce Strategy for 2012-2015 as set out at Annex 1 of the report and
- ii) The Procurement and Commissioning Strategy 2012-2014, as set out at Annex 4 of the report.

REASON:

- i) To ensure the delivery of the core capabilities that support the Council Plan and continue to develop the workforce so that they can meet the needs of the organisation now and in the future.
- ii) To ensure the delivery of the core capabilities that support the Council Plan and improve the social economic and environmental outcomes and the level of savings derived from all council procurement and commissioning activity.

128. ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE FUND - GOVERNANCE AND INITIAL FUNDING DECISIONS

Cabinet considered proposals for the investment and governance of the economic infrastructure fund (EIF) for the City of York Council.

This strategic investment fund of £28.5m over 5 years would be used to unlock progress towards the council priority of creating jobs, and growing the economy and would be administered in coordination with the Delivery and Innovation Fund. It was intended to use the Fund strategically to gain both public and

private investment with the final decision on funding resting with the Cabinet.

Further information on the Funds principles, objectives, ambitions and criteria were set out at paragraphs 14 to 18 with details of future officer support, composition of the Fund and sources of funding, options on governance and consultation undertaken at paragraphs 32 to 53.

The Leader outlined details of the fund which would facilitate economic growth and explained how bids would be received. Following concerns raised in respect of officer support for the fund, referenced in paragraph 34, he requested an amendment to the recommendation to commit funding to this post for an initial 18 month period.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet

- i) Approve the proposed objectives, priorities and governance for the Economic Infrastructure Fund.
- ii) Note progress to develop business cases for projects to support the Reinvigorate York theme and the scoping of the opportunity to open the Economic Inclusion theme to external parties.
- iii) Approve £430k as recommended for officer capacity to deliver the Fund over 5 years, with commitment of funding for 18 months in the first instance subject to review of the external funding generated, prior to continuation.¹

REASON: To support the Council Plan priorities of creating jobs and growing the economy and investing in the city's economic future.

Action Required

1. Proceed with development of Fund as outlined. IF, KS

129. **LOW EMISSION STRATEGY UPDATE**

Consideration was given to the draft Low Emission Strategy (LES) consultation document set out at Annex A of the report. The document incorporated a package of measures aimed at improving vehicle efficiency and accelerating the take up of low emission fuels and technologies.

This provided an overview of all the actions the authority were currently and intended to take to reduce emissions of local air pollutants and carbon dioxide in the city. The report highlighted the link between nitrogen dioxide, mainly a traffic pollutant, and respiratory illnesses which resulted in a high number premature deaths in the city. Further information on the proposed consultation and how the strategy would contribute to the council's priorities were outlined in the report.

The Cabinet Member outlined the background to the strategy and to the importance of reversing the trend, particularly in view of the related health issues.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

(a) To approve the content of the draft consultation LES as summarised in Annex A (executive summary), Annex B (summary of LES measures) of this report, and provided in detail within the full version of the draft LES circulated electronically with this report. To allow officers to proceed directly to the public consultation as detailed in paragraphs 20 to 25 of this report.

(b) To request revisions to the draft consultation LES as summarised in Annex A (executive summary), Annex B (summary of LES measures) of the report, and provided in detail within the full version of the draft LES circulated electronically with this report. To request officers to bring the revised LES to the Cabinet, prior to public consultation.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree

- i) Option (a) to approve the content of the draft consultation Low Emission Strategy as summarised in Annex A (executive summary) and Annex B (summary of LES measures) of the

report, and provided in detail within the full version of the draft LES circulated electronically with the report.

- ii) To allow officers to proceed directly to public consultation as detailed in paragraphs 20 to 25 of the report. ¹.

REASON: To allow public consultation on the draft consultation LES to be completed by the end of May 2012 allowing a final version of the LES to be brought to the Cabinet for approval in September 2012. This will allow the drawing up of a revised low emission based AQAP3 to commence as soon as possible maximising the chances of York attracting low emission vehicles, technologies and jobs to the city and achieving targets for both local air quality and CO₂.

Action Required

- 1. Proceed with public consultation on LES. EB

**130. FORMER BRITISH SUGAR/MANOR SCHOOL
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Consideration was given to a report which outlined the work carried out on the preparation of a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the former British Sugar/Manor School site.

Information on the background to the preparation of the document and consultations undertaken and responses received were detailed. Consideration had been given to all comments received and details of the main changes proposed to the SPD were outlined at paragraphs 8 to 21 of the report. It was confirmed that it was important that a planning framework for the area was in place, as soon as possible, in order to provide up to date specific planning guidance with clear direction given on planning issues and considerations relevant to this site, prior to the submission of any planning application.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that the document reflected the consultation responses and incorporated new access routes,

however it was noted that there would be a need to ensure that impacts on adjoining residential areas were minimised.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option 1: To note the consultation findings and agree the revised draft SPD for use of the document for development management purposes.

Option 2: To request further changes are made to the draft SPD.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree

- i) Option 1 to note the consultation findings and agree the revised draft Supplementary Planning Document at Annex 2 of the report to be used for development management purposes.¹
- ii) To delegate to the Director of City Strategy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Strategy the making of any incidental changes to the draft document that are necessary as a result of the recommendations of the report.²

- REASON:
- i) To provide robust planning guidance to assess the acceptability of emerging development proposals and future planning applications for the area.
 - ii) To enable any recommended changes to be incorporated within the draft SPD.

Action Required

- 1. Proceed with use of document for development management purposes. SH, AW
- 2. Amend document as outlined and delegated. SH, AW

131. CASTLE PICCADILLY -CONDITIONAL CONCESSION AGREEMENT

The Cabinet considered a report which updated them on the progress of the Castle Piccadilly project since July 2009. It was confirmed that the procurement competition had now concluded,

Heads of Terms had been negotiated and that the council would shortly proceed with a contract award notice and settlement of a development agreement.

Taking the project forward would involve consultation with stakeholders to develop the master plan for the area and any subsequent planning applications.

Following discussion the options then considered were:

- i) To conclude the procurement concession competition and proceed to issuing an award notice. To conclude the Condition Concession Agreement and report back to Members for approval.
- ii) To discontinue the award process.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree to

- i) Approve the issuing of the Award Notice.^{1.}
- ii) Delegate to the Director of Customer and Business Support Services the conclusion of the negotiations of the Conditional Concession Agreement with a further report being brought back to members following approval of the Agreement.^{2.}

REASON: To enable the Council to meet its aims and objectives including the successful delivery of this scheme.

Action Required

- 1. Issue Notice. DG
- 2. Conclude negotiations and add item to Forward Plan for report back. IF

132. CONTROLLING THE CONCENTRATION OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

Consideration was given to a report which updated members on the outcomes of recent consultation on the draft Supplementary

Planning Document to Control the Concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation.

Further information in respect of consultation undertaken and comments received on the draft document were set out at paragraphs 5 to 18 and at Annex 1. Details of the proposals for a combined approach of both a neighbourhood and street level analysis of HMO's to determine HMO planning applications was presented in paragraphs 19 to 26 of the report and incorporated in the draft document at Annex 2.

The Cabinet Member referred to lengthy consultation and research undertaken during the preparation of this SPD. This had now resulted in a document which would provide a planning basis for consideration of any planning applications for HMO's. Reference was also made to support given to this document at a recent meeting of the Local Development Framework Working Group. Suggestions made at the meeting had included keeping the scheme under review and consideration given to super output areas however these would be examined in more detail during any future review.

Consideration was given to the following:

Option 1: To approve the SPD at Annex 2 for Development Management purposes as a material consideration when determining of HMO planning applications.

Option 2: To approve a revised SPD with an alternative approach to assessing concentrations of HMOs

RESOLVED: That Cabinet

- i) Approve the draft Supplementary Planning Document at Annex 2 of the report, to be used for Development Management purposes in accordance with Option 1, subject to review of the schemes operation in 12 months and ¹.
- ii) Delegate to the Director of City Strategy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Strategy the making of any changes to the SPD that are necessary as a result of the LDF Working Group. ².

REASON: So that the SPD can be approved for use for Development Management purposes to support the emerging LDF Core Strategy and the Article 4 Direction coming into force on 20 April 2012.

Action Required

1. Proceed to use document for development management purposes and review operation in 12 months. MG
2. As delegated arrange for amendment of document. DG

133. YORK CENTRAL PROJECT UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report which set out details of recent and ongoing progress on the York Central development site and outlined a proposed way forward.

Further information and background on this 35 hectare brown field site were detailed at paragraphs 2 to 4, with details of the current position and programme of proposed works set out in paragraphs 5 to 18 and Annex 2 of the report. Information on the potential for a Tax Increment Finance scheme to be developed had been explored by consultants, with further details set out in paragraphs 11 and 12 and in confidential Annex 1.

The proposed options were

- Option 1: To endorse the proposed approach and the work-streams identified
- Option 2: To recommend an alternative approach is pursued.
- Option 3: To discontinue the pursuit of the delivery of the York Central development in light of the issues raised.

The Leader expressed his appreciation for the cross party support received from the working group members on a site which was important to the city's future.

RESOLVED: That the current and proposed work streams outlined in the report annex together with the overall programme to date be received and noted.

REASON: To continue to facilitate and deliver the development of the strategically important York Central site.

134. RECRUITMENT TO THE ROLES OF DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELLBEING AND DIRECTOR OF CITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Cabinet received a report which outlined the requirements of the Health and Social Care Bill in relation to the appointment of a Director of Public Health and Wellbeing for York. Details of the structural options available for the permanent appointment together with the transition arrangements for public health personnel were also set out.

It was confirmed that a member of the Council's Management Team who had been due to take over the new role of Director of City and Environmental Services on 1 April 2012, had tendered his resignation, and was due to leave the Council in June 2012.

From 1 April 2013 the Authority would be required to appoint a Director of Public Health and take on critical new functions in Public Health, draft guidance on the process had been issued by the Department of Health.

Consideration was given to the following three options available to the council to fulfil the new statutory duties:

- i) Appoint a joint Director of Public Health with North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC).
- ii) Appoint a Director of Public Health for the City of York Council (CYC).
- iii) Appoint a Director of Public Health jointly with the Vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group (VYCCG).

Following discussion it was

RESOLVED: That Cabinet agree to:

- i) The joint appointment of the Director of Public Health and Wellbeing with the Vale of York Clinical Commissioning Group as outlined in paragraph 10 at option iii) of the report.

- ii) The structural position of the Director of Public Health & Wellbeing under an existing Director at Assistant Director level as outlined at option (ii), paragraph 13 of the report.
- iii) Note the secondment of the Director of Public Health & Wellbeing upon appointment to 31 March 2013;
- iv) Commencement of the recruitment of Director of Public Health and Wellbeing in line with the plan at Annex C and panel as outlined in paragraph 15 of the report. ¹.
- v) Note the proposed management of the transition of the Public Health Team.
- vi) Approve the recruitment to the position of the Director of City & Environmental Services using an external organisation to complete the search and select processes on behalf of the council. ².

REASON: To ensure that arrangements are in place in respect of appointments to these posts.

Action Required

1/2. Commence recruitment for both posts.

PS

135. URGENT BUSINESS: BECKFIELD LANE HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING SITE

Consideration was given to report prepared in response to a motion, presented to Council on 29 March 2012, regarding the budget decision made regarding the closure of the Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre (the report had been included in the republished agenda on 3 April and hard copies were circulated at the meeting).

The following motion had been presented to Council by Councillor Reid:

“Council notes the significant improvement in the proportion of waste that has been recycled under the previous Liberal Democrat administration, from 12% in 2003 to 45% in 2011.

Council supports the principle that waste collection and recycling should be convenient and fair to residents across the city.

In light of the fact that the Budget 2012/13 has deleted the provision of a Recycling and Reuse Centre in the west of the city, Council requests that the Cabinet halts the closure plan for Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre.

Council also supports the principle of the provision of a free receptacle for the collection of waste to all residents across the city requests that the provision of free black bin bags should continue to all areas of the city where wheeled bins are not in use.”

It was reported that a petition calling for the tip to remain open had also been received at the same Council meeting and, as it was believed to have more than 1000 signatories, the petition would trigger a debate at a future Council meeting.

The Leader referred to lengthy Cabinet budget discussions undertaken prior to these decisions being taken and to the lack of financial information put forward in support of any change in decision. He confirmed that an extraordinary council meeting would be called to enable further consideration of the matter to be undertaken.

It was confirmed that the options available to members at the meeting were:

Option 1 – consider the evidence from the motion and petition and confirm the decision made through the budget process for the closure of Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre; or

Option 2 – consider the evidence from the motion and petition and recommend a change in the budget decision and seek alternative funding cuts to offset it.

However it was recommended that Option 1 was approved as the motion presented no additional evidence to amend the decision made at Budget Council.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet note the motion and petition to Council, which provided no further information with regard to the decision made at budget Council, and agree Option 1 set out in the

report, confirming the decision to close the Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre.

REASON: To enable the implementation of the Budget Council decision.

CLLR J ALEXANDER, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.50 pm].