

---

MEETING	Executive
DATE	25 July 2006
PRESENT	Councillors Waller (in the Chair), Jamieson-Ball, Macdonald, Orrell, Reid, Runciman, Sunderland and Waller (Chair)
APOLOGIES	Councillors Steve Galloway and Sue Galloway

---

#### **41. 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 Jamieson-Ball and Reid each declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda items 6 (Relocation of Peasholme Centre – Site Analysis) and 7 (Proposed Development of Manor School), as members of the Planning Committee that would deal with the subsequent planning applications for the respective development sites. Cllr Macdonald also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 7, for the same reason. These Members all left the room during consideration of the items in which they had declared an interest, and took no part in the discussion or decisions thereon.

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

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following, on the grounds that they contain information relating to the financial and business 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 amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation ) Order 2006:

- Annex 7 to agenda item 6 (Relocation of Peasholme Centre)
- Annex 2 to agenda item 10 (Lendal Bridge Sub-Station)
- Annex 2 to agenda item 11 (Clifton Family Centre).

#### **43. Public Participation and Ward Member Comments**

It was reported that there had been three registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Each was invited to speak for three minutes, in accordance with the scheme.

Gary Miller spoke in relation to agenda item 6 (Relocation of Peasholme Centre – Site Analysis), as the landlord of the Masons Arms next door to the potential relocation site at 4 Fishergate. He raised questions about the space required for Council office accommodation on the Hungate site and the Council's ability to afford this development and indicated that he had

contacted Hugh Bayley and the Ombudsman with a view to preventing the Centre being relocated to 4 Fishergate.

Allan Hymer also spoke in relation to item 6, on behalf of residents living near to the 4 Fishergate site. He expressed strong opposition to the Peasholme Centre being relocated to this site, stating that it would attract an undesirable element and have an adverse effect on house values in the area. He criticised the organisation and recording of the public meeting held on 14 July and requested that a further meeting be arranged to which residents be invited by post. He expressed the view that 4 Fishergate had been "earmarked" from the start as the preferred site as the Council did not want the Peasholme Centre on the same site as their new offices.

With the consent of the Chair, Cllr D'Agorne addressed the meeting in respect of item 6, as Ward Member for Fishergate ward. He expressed support for the work carried out by the Peasholme Centre but was concerned that the reasons for the proposed relocation had not been made clear to local residents. In particular, the minutes of the Executive meeting on 22 November 2005, when options for the new Council accommodation were discussed, had not been made available at the public meeting. A more suitable relocation site on Piccadilly had already been ruled out for financial reasons during previous discussions on the Arc Light relocation. It was important to the long term success of the Centre to involve local residents in the decision and ensure that community needs were met.

Christopher Hartley spoke regarding agenda item 10 (Lendal Bridge Sub-Station, Wellington Row), as the lessee of a nearby building on Lendal Bridge. He expressed support for the idea of converting the premises for use as a cycle store and suggested that this would also enable the roof space to be let as a separate area.

Note: Cllrs Reid and Jamieson-Ball left the room for the duration of the comments on agenda item 6, returning to hear the comments on agenda item 10..

#### **44. Executive Forward Plan**

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

#### **45. Minutes**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 11 July 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

#### **46. Relocation of Peasholme Centre - Site Analysis**

Members considered a report which advised of the outcome of consultation on and appraisal of the two possible sites for the relocation of the Peasholme Centre and sought their views on which site should be selected for the relocation.

At their meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> May, the Executive had agreed that consultation be carried out on the shortlisted sites at 4 Fishergate and Monk Bar Garage and had asked Officers to investigate the possibility of including 14 Jewberry on the shortlist. The owners of 14 Jewberry had now confirmed that they were unable to accommodate the Centre, so that site had not been included. Consultation on the other two sites had included distributing 2,000 information leaflets in the Fishergate and Guildhall wards, an open day at the Peasholme Centre and a public meeting, attended by about 40 people. An information link on the Peasholme Centre had also been set up on the Council's website and residents invited to submit their comments by 25 June.

The main issues raised at the public meeting were summarised in Annex 2 to the report and an analysis of the 28 written responses received was provided in Annex 4. Concerns raised in respect of both sites related mainly to security, personal safety and the archaeological importance of the areas. It was noted that both sites were within the central Area for Archaeological Importance and therefore subject to Policy HE10 in the Local Plan. Results of a professional and technical analysis carried out on both sites by staff from Property Services, Planning, Highways, Finance, Conservation, Housing, Adult Social Services and the Peasholme Charity were set out in paragraphs 22-30 of the report and in Annexes 5 and 6.

In response to the issues raised under Public Participation on this item, Officers confirmed that Annex 2 reflected the key issues raised at the public meeting. It had not been intended to produce minutes or a verbatim record of the meeting. Issues relating to the Hungate development had been reported to Executive on 22 November 2005 and the report and minutes of that meeting were publicly available. There had been no predetermination of the relocation site and 33 sites had been considered before drawing up a shortlist. Local residents would be consulted on the design of the new building, to ensure that it met security and other requirements.

The Chair read out a statement expressing support for the work of the Peasholme Centre and explaining the process that had led to the decision to relocate the Centre, the reasons why it could not practicably be accommodated on the Hungate site and the selection of the two alternative relocation sites. It was noted that the new building would provide purpose-built accommodation that was DDA compliant. The current Centre was considered to be very well run and there had been no complaints associated with it during the past two years.

**RESOLVED:** That the Executive agrees to release the site at 4 Fishergate for use by the Peasholme Centre, subject to the granting of planning permission, and on terms to be agreed with the Peasholme Charity, which are to be consistent with the arrangements made for the release of land for social housing purposes by the Council in the past.

**REASON:** 4 Fishergate is considered to be the more suitable of the two sites, given the proximity of Monk Bar Garage to the Bar walls and to the relocated Arc Light Centre.

#### **47. Proposed Development of Manor School**

Members considered a report which set out proposals from the Governing Body of Manor School to relocate the school to a new building off Millfield Lane and to increase its capacity from 630 to 900 places. The report summarised the outcome of consultation on these proposals and outlined further proposals for a land transfer and associated capital contribution to allow the relocation to proceed.

The relocation and expansion would support the Council's planned restructuring of education provision on the west side of the City, replace the current unsuitable school building and address the issue of oversubscription at Manor School. Statutory consultation had been carried out on the proposals and no objections had been received. Consultation had also taken place via ward committee meetings in Acomb and Poppleton wards and a public meeting hosted by the school. Again, no objections had been received and responses at the meetings had been supportive of the proposals.

A representative of the York Diocese attended the meeting to show Members plans and artists' impressions of the new school and answer questions on the design process. It was confirmed that the impact of the building on Green Belt land would be minimal and that the school's playing fields and sports hall would be made available for wider community use outside school hours. The report asked Members to agree. The Council's Head of Finance drew attention to the risks associated with the proposal to agree a capital contribution to meet the Governors' statutory liability under the grant funding arrangements, as the planning complexities were not yet known and the availability of the capital was dependent upon sales that were not yet completed. However, agreeing the contribution was the only way in which funding could be secured for provision of the new school.

With regard to the Shadow Executive's request that the British Sugar site be examined as a possible alternative site for the school, it was noted that this site had not yet been released and that the Council did not have the capital to purchase it. Members expressed surprise that this suggestion had been made, given the Council's support for saving jobs at British Sugar.

RESOLVED: (i) That the outcome of the consultation on proposals to expand and relocate Manor School be noted and that it be noted that no objections were received during the four week statutory "representation" period following publication of statutory notices.

(ii) That it be noted that the statutory School Organisation Committee has supported the proposal to increase the size of Manor School to a 900 place school, by increasing its admission number by 56 children – from 124 in 2006 to 180 in September 2009.

(iii) That it be noted that the Governing Body of Manor School intends to submit a planning application seeking permission to relocate the school to the new site off Millfield Lane.

(iv) That the land transfer proposals set out in paragraph 19 of the report be approved, subject to planning permission being secured for the new school.

(v) That £3.5m be committed to support the development of the new Manor School, from capital receipts generated by the disposal of Council assets at the existing Manor and Lowfield sites.

REASON: To enable this project, which provides a vital opportunity to improve educational facilities for young people on the west side of the City by building an up to date, DDA compliant school building with 21<sup>st</sup> century facilities, to proceed without delay.

#### **48. Organisational Effectiveness Programme**

Members considered a report which sought approval for a proposed three year Organisation Effectiveness Programme (OEP), and views on how the Executive might support delivery of the OEP.

The OEP would be key to delivering the four “enabling” priorities contained in the Corporate Strategy recently approved by the Executive, along with other organisational development actions. Taken together, there would deliver tangible improvements to the Council’s organisational effectiveness and culture over the next three years. The full range of benefits and implications of the OEP would be defined by the Chief Executive in conjunction with the four Chief Officers appointed as Organisational Champions and reported to the Executive as part of the first progress update, likely to be in October 2006.

Members agreed that it was essential to continue the cultural change within the Council to ensure best value for money and build on a “can do” ethos which would drive up quality and improve the experience of residents and customers in the City.

RESOLVED: (i) That the contents of the proposed Organisational Effectiveness Programme, attached as Annex A to the report, be noted and approved.

(ii) That the intention of the Chief Executive to lead the programme and provide regular progress reports to the Executive, be noted.

(iii) That all Executive Members discuss with their Directors how they form part of the process to implement the OEP and that this issue be an agenda item for the next

Performance Review with the Corporate Management Team and the Executive in the autumn.

REASON: So that the OEP can be delivered successfully and can bring about improvements to the Council's organisational effectiveness and organisational culture.

**49. Final Report of the Sustainable Street Lighting Scrutiny Sub-Committee**

Members considered a report which presented the final report of the Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Board and the Sustainable Street Lighting Sub-Committee on the topic "Street Lighting – Strategic Management & Procurement to Reduce Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Waste".

The final report had been agreed by the Scrutiny Board at their meeting on 21 July and subsequently approved by the Scrutiny Management Committee, on 26 July, for referral to the Executive. Members were asked to consider whether to approve the findings and recommendations set out in the report, which was attached as Annex A.

Members welcomed the report, which accorded with the Council's commitment to improving the efficient use of energy and reducing the City's ecological footprint. However, it did not include an Officer appraisal of the budgetary and resourcing issues relating to the recommendations. It was therefore proposed that the Executive reserve its comments until that information was available. It was suggested that potential EU funding sources for street lighting improvements also be investigated in the meantime.

RESOLVED: (i) That the report be noted.

(ii) That an Officer report be requested from City Strategy and Resources on the implications of the recommendations and that this report be presented to the Executive meeting on 26 September for Members to comment upon each of the outcomes deriving from the recommendations.

REASON: To ensure that Executive Members are fully aware of the implications of the recommendations before making their comments.

**50. Lendal Bridge Sub-Station, Wellington Row**

Members considered a report which outlined options for the future use of a former sub-station at Wellington Row, adjoining Lendal Bridge.

This Grade II listed building had recently been decommissioned by Northern Electric Distribution Ltd. and had reverted back to the Council. Though in reasonable condition externally, it would require substantial investment to adapt it to a beneficial use. As part of the city's flood

defences, the basic structure must be maintained. Members were asked to consider the following options:

**Option A** – sell the freehold, in accordance with the budget decisions agreed by Council in March.

**Option B** – retain the building and invest capital to convert it for commercial use, with a view to letting it on the open market.

**Option C** – carry out a feasibility study on converting the building to a secure cycle park, in accordance with the recently re-written Cycling Strategy.

Members noted the comments made under Public Participation on this item and supported the suggestion that the option to rent the roof space be investigated.

RESOLVED: (i) That, subject to Resolution (ii) below, the property be sold for the best sum available on the open market.

REASON: In order to obtain a capital receipt to contribute towards the 2006-09 capital programme.

(ii) That the sale of the property be delayed for approximately three months to allow a study to take place of options for the provision of secure cycle parking in the city centre and that a report back on the options, including this property and complete with a business case, be made jointly with the Director of City Strategy within three months of this decision.

REASON: To determine whether a viable case can be made for retaining the building for this use.

## **51. Clifton Family Centre, Burton Stone Lane**

Members considered a report which recommended demolition of the existing Family Centre on Burton Stone Lane, and subsequent sale of the site, on completion of the new children's centre at Clifton Green Primary School.

The new centre was part of a project to relocate the City's family centres to primary school sites, in order to achieve a more integrated service provision. Alternatives to the recommended option of demolition and site sale were to:

- Retain the property - not recommended, as no alternative use had been identified;
- Sell the property as it stood – not recommended, since re-use of the purpose-built centre was unlikely.

Early demolition and redevelopment would improve site security. Indicative schemes prepared by consultants suggested that the site could accommodate 8 to 12 units.

In response to issues raised by the Shadow Executive on this item, Officers confirmed that the Council's protocol on disposal of assets had been properly followed and that ward members had been contacted on 20

June with details of the proposals and given the opportunity to comment. The Head Teacher of Burton Green Primary School had also been consulted. Any issues raised regarding future development of the site would be dealt with as part of the planning process.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommended option be approved and that the existing property be demolished on vacation and the site sold at the earliest possible date for redevelopment and a capital receipt.

**REASONS:** To improve public amenity and safety, attract a new beneficial use for the existing site on relocation of the Family Centre service and raise a capital receipt to support the capital programme, which has included the new Family Centre.

## **52. LTP Delivery Report**

Members received a report which informed them that the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Delivery Report had been prepared and would be issued to the Department of Transport at the end of July.

The Delivery Report identified key achievements against the objectives of the first LTP over the five years from April 2001 to March 2006 and was one of the criteria used to determine government funding for future years. York's key achievements in the main strategy areas had included:

- Launch of the ftr as a new concept in public transport
- Park and Ride spaces increased by 30%
- A shift to more sustainable modes of transport, indicated by reduced numbers in council car parks and increases in bus and rail passengers
- A 75% reduction in car park related crimes
- Reduced traffic volumes in peak periods
- Development of the Traffic Congestion Management System
- A general improvement in air quality across the City
- Significant reductions in the number of people killed and seriously injured on the roads
- Percentage of children cycling to school increased to 11%
- Compliance with all the DfT benchmark standards for good condition of roads
- Percentage of footways needing repair reduced from 35% to 11%.

Members expressed thanks to all the Officers involved for their hard work and dedication in achieving sustained results over the five year plan period.

**RESOLVED:** That the preparation of the Delivery Report, to be submitted to the Department for Transport at the end of July 2006, be noted.

**REASON:** For information.



A Waller, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 3.50 pm].