

Meeting	Executive
Date	14 July 2016
Present	Councillors Carr (Chair), Aspden (Vice-Chair), Ayre, Gillies (items 1-6), Rawlings, Runciman, Steward and Waller
Other Members participating in the meeting	Councillors Looker and Craghill
In attendance	Councillors Crisp and Cuthbertson

---

## **Part A - Matters dealt with under Delegated Powers**

### **18. Declarations of Interest**

Members were asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of business on the agenda. No interests were formally declared.

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

Resolved: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Annex 2 (ii) to agenda item 8 (The Guildhall – Detailed Designs and Business Case) and Annex 2 to agenda item 9 (Demonstrating Progress on the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme) on the grounds that they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). 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).

## 20. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been eight registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme, and that one Member of Council had also requested to speak. The registrations were in respect of the following items:

### York Central

Mr Chris Barrett expressed concerns regarding the impact of the York Central proposals on St Paul's Terrace and its neighbourhood. He stated that he was particularly concerned at the impact on the community garden and play area which would be destroyed to make way for an access road. He stated that the garden had been created by volunteers and was well used by the community for a variety of activities.

Mr Andy Richardson expressed concern that the proposed access point from Chancery Rise would increase traffic congestion, noise, light and air pollution. He stated that there was already significant traffic and pollution in Holgate and the proposals would make the situation worse. He urged Members not to permit another road to go through the community and commented on the loss of the community garden. Mr Richardson stressed the importance of a full assessment of the environmental impact.

Mr David Barrett spoke on the impact of the proposed Chancery Rise access road on the natural environment (in particular the Holgate Community Garden and Play Park) and the threat to the local heritage. He drew attention to the wildlife that was present in the area. He stated that the area was an area of special character because of its Victorian terrace streetscape and associated amenities and it should be protected from unsympathetic development. Local opinion was unequivocally against the proposed access road because of the adverse impact that it would have on the community. Whilst there was support for the development of a brownfield site, access to the site had to be reconsidered.

Mr Simon Graysmark spoke on issues in respect of crime, safety and anti-social behaviour arising from the proposed access to the site. He stated that advice had not been sought from crime prevention experts on this matter and expressed concern about this. He also urged Members to consider the

impact on the Holgate Community Garden and its importance to the community.

Mr Jef Morris expressed his concern regarding the consultation that had taken place on the proposals. He stated that the information that had been provided to residents had been limited and had not mentioned the adverse impact on neighbourhoods. He stated that the consultation meetings had not been well publicised and he expressed concern regarding the questionnaire and the consultation process.

Mr Paul Kirkman, Director of National Railway Museum, stated that the museum was working in partnership to take the development forward and stressed the importance of the development to the museum and to the city. The heritage of the site would be honoured and the project would be a catalyst to upgrade facilities. Although there were issues to be addressed, in general the development would be a great thing for York. Mr Kirkman urged the Executive to move the development forward.

Councillor Crisp stated that she was speaking on behalf of the three Holgate Ward Councillors and on behalf of many residents of Holgate. She expressed concerns regarding the unaffordability and type of housing that was planned. She stated that expensive high rise apartments would not address the city's housing needs and that there was a need to ensure that the housing was suitable for families, for example terraced housing with gardens. It was important that social and affordable housing was included in the development. Councillor Crisp also drew attention to the environmental impact of the proposed development and the additional congestion and pollution that would arise.

### The Guildhall – Detailed Designs and Business Case

Mr David Horton, twice former Lord Mayor and a member of the former civics group that was raising funds for the restoration of the Mansion House, drew Members' attention to paragraph 41 of the report on the Guildhall project which stated that the Mansion House garages were no longer part of the Mansion House listing. He queried when the listing had been removed and expressed concern at the proposal to demolish the garages to open up the Guildhall Yard. Mr Horton expressed concern as to how the civic party would be able to operate effectively without the mayoral car being accessible. He urged Members

to remove the demolition of the garages from the design proposals.

Mr Brian Watson, former Lord Mayor, stated that the Guildhall had the potential to be a world class venue and was a city icon. He stated that he did not see the need for design changes such as the proposed removal of the dais to enable a link corridor to be put in place. Mr Watson also commented that he did not believe that it would be sufficient for the Council to be able to use the building for only 12 civic events a year and he suggested that the agreement should specify the required usage in days rather than in number of events. Mr Watson expressed concern at the removal of the listing of the garages, which he stated would impact detrimentally on the functionality of the Lord Mayor. He commented that there were already many cafes and restaurants in the city and he urged Members to think again before going ahead with the proposals.

The speakers were thanked for their contributions.

The following written representations had also been received and had been circulated to Executive Members:

- Ms Claire McMahon – on the provision of school places in Holgate (agenda item 7 refers)
- Mr Steve Galloway – on the future of the Lowfields site, including a summary of the preliminary results of a public opinion survey in relation to the Lowfields site from local residents (agenda item 9 refers)

## **21. Forward Plan**

Members received and noted details of the items that were on the Forward Plan for the next two Executive meetings, at the time the agenda had been published.

## **22. Thinking & Acting Differently – A Response to the Peer Review 2016**

Members gave consideration to a report which offered a specific response to the findings from the recent Local Government Association Peers report and which presented the People Plan strategic aims for approval. The report also provided an update on all actions contained in the Peer Review Action Plan along with suggestions for ongoing monitoring arrangements by Members.

Members commented that it was pleasing to note that the LGA Peer review had recognised that relationships between Members had improved. The Executive would be working with the new Chief Executive to move the plan forward and consideration would be given as to how best involve all Members in its implementation.

Members noted the arrangements that would be in place to monitor implementation of the action plan, including the proposed role of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee in this process.

- Resolved:
- (i) That the progress in achieving the Peer Review 2016 Action plan (Annex B of the report) published on 2 June 2016 be noted.
  - (ii) That future monitoring arrangements for the Peer Review Action Plan 2016 be through the Council's quarterly performance reporting process that is already in place.
  - (iii) That, in light of (ii), Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee be invited to review any matters they feel appropriate given the committee's portfolio.<sup>1</sup>
  - (iv) That the People Plan 2016-20 (Annex C of the report) be approved.

Reason: To provide assurance regarding clear action planning and decision taking around the Peer Review 2016 recommendations, together with progress and monitoring arrangements in place.

Action Required

1. Bring to the attention of Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee

JC

**23. The City Vision and Council Plan – A Framework for Delivery**

Members considered a report which outlined the refresh undertaken of the Council's Performance Framework in order to provide a clear line of sight between the high level vision for the

city and the work carried out by every Council employee. This followed the Finance and Performance Monitor taken by the Executive in June, and in order to reinforce the centrality of the Council Plan in determining priority activities and their resourcing both for services and individual members of staff.

Attention was drawn to paragraph 5 of the report which summarised the key elements of the vision and to the service delivery planning that was taking place to support the delivery of the plan.

Members commented on the need to ensure that the Council could evidence that it was a listening Council and that its consultation with residents was meaningful. Members agreed on the importance of ensuring that feedback was given to residents explaining why particular options had been taken.

Resolved: (i) That the City Vision 2030 be approved.

(ii) That City of York Council Performance Framework 2016-19 be approved.

Reasons: (i) To clearly communicate direction of travel of the Council alongside the Council Plan.

(ii) To provide a performance framework for assuring action planning and decision making.

## **24. York Central**

Members gave consideration to a report that fed back on the outcome of the informal consultation undertaken for the redevelopment of York Central. The report outlined the proposed approach to the Planning Framework; set out the proposed composition of the York Central Community Forum; provided an update on progress with the project and sought agreement to enter into a Local Growth Fund deal from Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership in order to proceed with site assembly and preparation.

Officers responded to issues that had been raised during the public participation item on the agenda. They stated that no decisions had yet been made regarding access to the site and that further work was still to be carried out before more detailed plans for the site, including alternative access routes, would be

presented. Attention was drawn to the ecological survey that was being undertaken.

Members stated that they were pleased to note that the project was moving forward as this had been a long term aspiration for the city. The development of this brownfield site would be significant for the city and for the wider region.

Referring to housing density and mix on the site, Members acknowledged that this would be influenced by viability and the decisions of the owners of the land.

Members stated the importance of ensuring that conversations with the community were ongoing and they welcomed the establishing of York Central Community Forum. They requested that, because of the specific impacts, officers ensured that its membership included representatives from the wider area and not just the site itself.

Members noted that it was intended that a further report would be presented to the Executive in September 2016.

- Resolved<sup>1</sup>:
- (i) That the responses to the informal consultation on “Seeking your views to guide development” be noted.
  - (ii) That the approach to establish a York Central Community Forum as an integral part of the consultation process for the site be noted.
  - (iii) That the progress over the past six months to inform the emerging York Central Planning Policy and deliver the York Central site be noted.
  - (iv) That a loan of £2.55m from Leeds City Region (LCR) Local Growth Fund as an element of the funding proposals for York Central be agreed in principle.
  - (v) That the Director of Customer and Business Support Services, in liaison with the Leader, be delegated to agree the terms for a Funding Agreement with Leeds City Region (LCR) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

- (vi) That a further draw down from the £10m allocation of £0.55m be agreed in order to fund the immediate site preparation works outlined in the report.

- Reasons:
- (i) To ensure issues raised from the consultation are taken account of in developing the Planning Framework SPD.
  - (ii) To ensure the views of the local community are represented as the site progresses.
  - (iii) To ensure that a development scheme for the York Central site can be delivered.
  - (iv) – (vi) To enable timely progress on the York Central project.

Action Required

1. Progress with scheme as agreed

TC

**25. The Guildhall - Detailed Designs & Business Case**

Members considered a report that presented the latest designs and business case for the development of the Guildhall complex, highlighting the potential for a world class venue for business, alongside retained council use in one of York's most significant historic buildings. Members were recommended to proceed with detailed design and planning/listed building consent applications for the scheme, which proposed to create a business club/serviced office venue with supporting commercial development on the riverside.

A presentation was given which showed the planned developments as well as illustrating work that had been identified as needing to be carried out to address structural issues.

Officers gave details of the planned designs and proposed usage and management of the buildings. Members' attention was drawn to the increased costs which had arisen because of structural issues that had been identified and because the proposed design now included more new build.



At the request of Members, details were given of the ways in which the use of renewable energy had been embedded in the design.

Referring to the concerns that had been raised under the public participation item on the agenda regarding the proposed demolition of the garages, officers explained that this work was intended to provide a more open and attractive space within the Guildhall Yard. Historic England had undertaken a re-listing exercise for the Guildhall complex in March 2016 and the garages had ceased to be listed from that date.

Members stated that, whilst they acknowledged that the demolition of the garages would cause some inconvenience to the Lord Mayor and civic party, the opening up of the Guildhall Yard was crucial to the project and would impact on its commercial viability. It was therefore important that consideration was given as to arrangements that could be put in place to mitigate the impact of the loss of the garages.

Members expressed their support for the proposed developing and its innovative design.

Resolved<sup>1</sup>: That Executive:

- (i) Note the business case and cost estimates for the scheme indicating a capital budget requirement of £10.19m to be prudentially borrowed, and a potential increase to the net revenue budget of £180k.
- (ii) Agree that the detailed business case be presented to Executive in February, setting out the actual budget requirement for delivery. Executive and Full Council will be asked to take a final decision and make the relevant budget provision, following further work to confirm the budget requirement.
- (iii) Agree to the marketing of the restaurant unit and securing a pre-let agreement for a 25 year commercial lease.

- (iv) Agree the commencement of the procurement of a service contract for the operation of the business club, office venue and cafe.
- (v) Agree the submission of Planning and Listed Building Consent applications.
- (vi) Agree that the RIBA stage 4 detail design (construction information/specification), including for value engineering to potentially reduce project costs, proceed.
- (vii) Agree that the opportunities for securing Local Growth Fund monies with both the regional LEP teams continue to be explored.
- (viii) Agree that the procurement of a construction contractor, through an EU compliant process, commence.
- (ix) Agree the draw down of a further £350k from the capital budget already allocated to the project to fund the planning application and the RIBA stage 4 design work.

Reason: To ensure the future viability and effective re-use of the Guildhall as one of the city's most significant historic buildings, through the creation of a vibrant business and civic venue, with supporting commercial development on the riverside.

Action Required

1. Progress with scheme as agreed.

DW

**26. Demonstrating Progress on the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme**

*[See also Part B minutes]*

Members considered a report that provided an update on the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme and which demonstrated the changing supply and demand for older persons' accommodation with care up to 2020. The report also sought consent to:

- Move forward with plans for the re-development of the Lowfield school site, beginning with public engagement regarding use and design.
- Open negotiations to purchase land adjacent to Haxby Hall in order to facilitate the examination of options for its future.
- Consult on the closure of a further Older Persons' Home in the autumn of 2016 and another one in the first half of 2017, in accordance with the Moving Homes Safely Protocol.

Officers stated that good progress had been made and that they were seeking approval to move forward to the next stage of the project. They detailed the proposals, as outlined in the written report.

Referring to the Lowfields site, the Executive Member stated that the plan was affordable and she hoped that it would be acceptable to local residents. Consultation would take place on the plan. The Executive Member stated that she also welcomed the plans for Haxby Hall as this was very much part of the community. Referring to the consultation on the closure of older persons' homes, the Executive Member stated this action was necessary as some of the accommodation was not for purpose.

Councillor Waller commented on the proposals in respect of the Lowfield site, in particular his support for the care home, and elderly housing but residents concerns about the loss of open space and the length of time of building works. He stated that he would like to see options to increase open space on the site. It was also important to ensure that the impact of the building work on the local community was minimised. Councillor Waller stated that he welcomed the discussions that had taken place with the local football team regarding future arrangements. He also commented on possibilities in respect of a community hub on the land behind Acomb Explore.

Members stated that they were pleased to note the progress that had been made and they welcomed the proposals for the next stage of the project. They commented on the need to balance provision of the accommodation across and the city and to ensure that the impact of the proposed work on the community was effectively managed.

Resolved<sup>1</sup>: (i) That the progress made towards delivering the

Older Persons' Accommodation Programme agreed by Executive in July 2015 and the changing supply and demand for older persons' accommodation with care up to 2020 be noted.

### Lowfield

- (ii) That it be agreed to move forward with the development of the Lowfield School site in order to deliver:
  - i. Approximately 3 acres for the potential development of health and wellbeing facilities, including a care home;
  - ii. Approximately 9 acres for housing, including "starter homes" and homes for the over 60s;
  - iii. Approximately 1 acre as play and open space; and
  - iv. A capital receipt of at least £3.8m from sale of land on the site.
- (iii) That the examination of the opportunity to create football facilities on land off Tadcaster Road be authorised.
- (iv) That a further report be received in Q4 2016 providing feedback on the public engagement and proposals for the future of the Lowfield site

### Haxby Hall

- (v) That the Director of Customer and Business Support Services be authorised to commence negotiations for and agree the purchase of land adjacent to Haxby Hall, in order to facilitate the examination of options for the future of Haxby Hall Older Persons' Home as part of the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme.
- (vi) That a further report be received in Q4 2016 on the examination of options for the long term future of Haxby Hall, including seeking a

partner to operate and redevelop as an alternative to consultation on closure.

#### Consultation on Closure

- (vii) That, this autumn, a six week period of consultation be undertaken with the residents, family, carers and staff of one of the Council's Older Persons' Homes to explore the option to close the home with current residents moving to alternative accommodation and that a further report on the outcome of this consultation be received by the Executive before a final decision to close is made and that this process be repeated in the first half of 2017 in respect of a further Council run Older Persons' Home.

#### Further reports

- (viii) That the Executive receive regular written updates on the progress of the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme.

- Reasons:
- (i) To ensure that the Executive is kept updated on progress made in delivering the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme.
  - (ii) to (iv) So that the consideration of the redevelopment of Lowfield can progress.
  - (v) to (vi) So that the Executive can decide the best future for Haxby Hall.
  - (vii) So that the Executive may decide which homes may close having been fully informed of the views of and options available to existing residents.
  - (viii) So that the Executive can be assured that the Programme is progressing according to plan and will be delivered.

#### Action Required

1. Progress with scheme as agreed

RW

**27. Prevention and Early Intervention Services - a proposal for a new way of working**

Members gave consideration to a report that followed the Executive decisions on 17 March 2016 which outlined the plans to create new Local Area Teams to work across the city to bring together a range of existing services to form a new set of preventative arrangements for families from pregnancy through to adulthood. The report also detailed work underway to establish the new structures, processes and the new ways of working that were required.

Officers detailed the proposals, as outlined in the report, and stated that the arrangements would enable the centres to be used more flexibly. It was noted that Hob Moor, Clifton and Tang Hall would be the designated “children’s centres”.

Officers were questioned about the proposed arrangements in respect of Sycamore House. Members commented that this must not be at the expense of the adult mental health offer. Officers gave details of the engagement that was taking place with young people regarding this issue, including plans to establish a working group to ensure that their voice was heard.

Discussion took place regarding the defining of outcomes, as outlined in Annex A of the report. Members noted there would be a set of measurable indicators within the outcomes framework, some of which would be mandatory and others which would be more locally responsive.

Officers were questioned about the risks involved in the new operating model and the action that was being taken to mitigate the risks.

The Executive Member stated that he had visited many of the children’s centres and Sycamore House and, whilst some individual concerns had been raised, he had been pleased to note that there had been a great deal of understanding and commitment to the process.

- Resolved<sup>1</sup>: (i) That the following be agreed regarding children’s centre services:
- a. All nine sites to be re-named and re-launched as a range of children and family

centres that enable more flexible and responsive provision which aligns with local community activity and use.

- b. Three children and family centre resources to be maintained as designated “children’s centres” with the statutory responsibility for ensuring the delivery of integrated early childhood services across the city. These centres will be the main bases for the Local Area Teams.

(ii) That the following be agreed regarding the approach to the city Youth Order:

- a. A revised offer including information and advice services being drawn from the Local Area Teams to deliver city centre services alongside Adult Services and Community and Voluntary Sector partners, as outlined in paragraphs 54 and 61 of the report.
- b. To relocate the city centre offer from 29 Castlegate to Sycamore House to achieve this.
- c. To release 29 Castlegate for disposal as a surplus asset and to bring back a further report setting out the required funding for any works to Sycamore House and any other re-designated sites; this will in principle be funded from the capital receipt from Castlegate.
- d. Begin a process of engagement and commissioning of community partners to deliver the youth counselling offer.

Reason: This will finalise the plans for the Local Area Teams, allow the council to take forward agreed work to remodel early help arrangements and achieve the associated savings targets.

Action Required

1. Progress with project as agreed

NM

## **Part B - Matters Referred to Council**

### **28. Children and Young People in Care: York's New Strategy 2016-2020**

Members considered a report which presented the new Children in Care Strategy 2016-20 and sought Council endorsement of the strategy which had been developed on the basis of consultation and input from children and young people in care, council colleagues and multi-agency partners. The report also detailed the new partnership arrangements which would provide strategic leadership across agencies responsible for commissioning and providing services for children in care in York.

Officers drew Members' attention to the "Aspire to More" project that had been carried out by Show Me That I Matter.

Members noted that a young persons' version of the strategy was also to be produced. It was agreed that all Members of Council should receive a copy of the strategy.

Members expressed their support for the Children in Care Strategy and stressed the importance of ensuring that there was a collective commitment to the strategy. The Council's responsibility to Looked After Children was of the highest priority.

Members paid tribute to the work carried out by foster parents and wished to place on record their thanks to them.

- Recommended:
- (i) That Council endorse the Children in Care Strategy 2016-2020 (Annex 1 of the report).
  - (ii) That Council note the introduction of new strategic partnership arrangements and strengthened leadership to ensure the progress and delivery of the strategy be noted.

Reason: To endorse the new children in care strategy.



**29. Demonstrating Progress on the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme**

*[See also Part A minutes]*

Members considered a report that provided an update on the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme and which demonstrated the changing supply and demand for older persons' accommodation with care up to 2020. The report also sought consent to:

- Move forward with plans for the re-development of the Lowfield school site, beginning with public engagement regarding use and design.
- Open negotiations to purchase land adjacent to Haxby Hall in order to facilitate the examination of options for its future.
- Consult on the closure of a further Older Persons' Home in the autumn of 2016 and another one in the first half of 2017, in accordance with the Moving Homes Safely Protocol.

**Recommended:** That, in respect of Haxby Hall, provision of up to £600,000 be made within the Capital Programme to meet the acquisition and legal costs as well as to fund demolition, enabling and related works, drawing upon capital held for the use of the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme.

**Reason:** To allow the development of options for the future of Haxby Hall as part of the Older Persons' Accommodation Programme.

Cllr Carr, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 8.40 pm].