



Notice of meeting of

Scrutiny Management Committee

To: Councillors Galvin (Chair), Aspden, Blanchard (Vice-Chair), Scott, Simpson-Laing, Taylor, R Watson and I Waudby

Date: Monday, 15 September 2008

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: The Guildhall

AGENDA

1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members will be invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

2. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 8)

To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2008.

3. **Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit can do so. Anyone who wishes to register or requires further information is requested to contact the Democracy Officer on the contact details listed at the foot of this agenda. The deadline for registering is Friday 12 September 2008 at 5 pm.

4. Final Report of the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee – Sale of the Barbican (Pages 9 - 18)

This report presents the final report from the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee detailing their review of the sale of the Barbican.

5. Final Report of the Education Scrutiny Committee - School Governors (Pages 19 - 52)

This report presents a final report from the Education Scrutiny Committee detailing their review of School Governors.

6. Update on Implementation of Recommendations of Previous Scrutiny Reviews (Pages 53 - 58)

This report provides Members with update information on the implementation of recommendations made as a result of the previously completed review on Guidance For Sustainable Development.

7. Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee – Co-option (Pages 59 - 60)

This report asks Members to consider formally co-opting Sir Ron Cooke onto the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee.

8. Proposed Development of New Council Headquarters at Hungate - Feasibility Report (Pages 61 - 74)

This report asks Members to consider a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor Jenny Brooks to scrutinise the proposed development of the new Council headquarters at Hungate.

9. Any other business which the Chair decides is urgent under the Local Government Act 1972

Democracy Officer:

Name: Simon Copley

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551078
- E-mail – simon.copley@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

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

Contact details are set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোঅবী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Executive to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (38 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Advisory Panel (EMAP)) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

MEETING	SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
DATE	28 JULY 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS GALVIN (CHAIR), ASPDEN, FUNNELL (AS SUBSTITUTE FOR BLANCHARD), MOORE (AS SUBSTITUTE FOR WAUDBY), SIMPSON-LAING, TAYLOR AND R WATSON
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS BLANCHARD, SCOTT AND WAUDBY
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLOR WISEMAN

7. 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.

Councillor Aspden declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (Update on Implementation of Recommendations of Previous Scrutiny Reviews), in relation to the Home to School Transport review, as an employee of North Yorkshire County Council at Tadcaster Grammar School.

8. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 16 June 2008 be approved as correct record and signed by the Chair.

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

10. UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS SCRUTINY REVIEWS

Members received a report which provided them with update information on the implementation of recommendations made as a result of the reviews completed since 2004.

The reviews related to Highways Maintenance Procurement Process and PFI, Home to School Transport, and Reducing Carbon Emissions. A further update relating to the Reducing Carbon Emissions review was circulated at the meeting (attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes).

- RESOLVED: (i) That all of the recommendations from the Highways Maintenance Procurement Process and PFI review be signed off;
- (ii) That all of the recommendations from the Home to School Transport review be signed off;
- (iii) That recommendations 1, 4 and 8 from the Reducing Carbon Emissions review be reviewed again and the remaining recommendations be signed off.¹

REASON: To raise awareness of those recommendations which still have to be implemented.

Action Required

1 - To further review the outstanding recommendations. GR

11. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - FEASIBILITY REPORT

Members received a report which asked them to consider a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor Wiseman to scrutinise the resources available to the Planning Enforcement Team and to look at the timescales for completion of enforcement cases.

- RESOLVED: (i) That it be agreed to proceed with the review, commencing in autumn 2008;
- (ii) That the remit at Annex G of the report be agreed with the following amendments:
- a) To add the words, "including Section 106 Agreements," to the end of key objective i.;
- b) To reword key objective iv. to read, "To review the Council's processes and procedures to improve the handling of planning enforcement cases";
- (iii) That examining the impact of the Powers of Enforcement – Takeaways Scrutiny Review be included in the review;
- (iv) That the offer of attending a training course, as set out in paragraph 17 of the report, be accepted;¹
- (v) That an ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee be established on a 2:2:1 basis, with a Liberal Democrat chair, and nominations be sought from Group Secretaries;²

- (vi) That the timeframe for the review be agreed as 3-6 months.

REASON: To progress with a review of the topic.

Action Required

- 1 - To hold the training course;
2 - To seek nominations from Group Secretaries.

JB
GR

Councillor J Galvin, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 5.35 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendation as approved by the Executive on 7 November 2006	Update on Recommendations as of July 2008
Reducing Carbon Emissions Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Review Completed Sept 2006) Contact Steve Waddington, & Mike Slater (rec 9 & 10) Jacqueline Warren (all other recs), Mark Grandfield (rec 7) and Dilys Jones (rec 8)	1	That Climate Change Strategies and Action Plans are developed by the Council's Sustainability Officer as a matter of urgency. This to be done with a view to best practice approaches used by other Local Authorities. It is acknowledged that the Council is already well advanced in developing its strategies for dealing with climate change, in so far as it has powers to do so, and anticipates that a consultants report will be submitted to Executive shortly. At that time the SMC may, of course if they wish, choose to review the contents of the report".	Sustainability Officer is leading a core group from the LSP - Environment Partnership - to create a Climate Change Strategy for York. The strategy will target mitigation and adaptation to future climate change and the group is currently drafting and writing the evidence base for this strategy (including best practice from other local authorities). By Spring 2009.
	2	<p>That the Local Development Framework and our present planning policy framework include a Calderdale/Merton Style Target. This target will require developers to ensure that:</p> <p>i. at least 10% of all energy required is provided from renewable sources in all new and significantly refurbished developments from this point and up to 2010, including domestic development.</p> <p>ii. After 2010 the target rises for onsite embedded renewable to be greater than or equal to 15% between 2010 and 2015</p> <p>iii. Then rises again to be greater than or equal to 20% between 2015 and 2021 etc.</p> <p>This proposal to be referred to the LDF Working Group for their consideration</p>	<p>Regional Spatial Strategy and Regional Assembly provide strategic policy framework</p> <p>This is currently implemented through Development Control teams and the Council's Interim Planning Statement on Sustainable Design and Construction and with assistance from the Sustainability Officer and City Development Teams.</p> <p>This is will be investigated and implemented based on current guidance and best practices and will implemented through the Council's emerging LDF process.</p> <p>This is will be investigated and implemented based on current guidance and best practices and will implemented through the Council's emerging LDF process.</p>
	3	That the City of York Council researches planning policies adopted by other local authorities with a view to applying them in York, if appropriate, in order to specifically ensure energy efficiency by design. That all plans submitted to the Local authority be tested on these criteria. The proposal to be referred to the LDF Working Group for their consideration.	The provisions of the "Interim Planning Statement on Sustainable Design and Construction" are implemented through Development Control teams, the Sustainability Officer and City Development Teams.
	4	That the authority enforce Parts L and F of the Building Regulations as a matter of urgency, resolving any training and resourcing issues that may need addressing, whilst recognising that the deployment of resources will be influenced by the Councils annual budget build process	Building Control continue to enforce Parts F&L of the Building Regulations. The necessary training has taken place for the current legislation, however it is proposed to amend Part L (Energy Conservation) within the next year so retraining may be required. It is also proposed to create further links between the Building Regulations and the Code for Sustainable Homes, however no time frame has been set for this.
	5	That the Council, through officers in consultation with its Elected Member Energy Champion request that the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly and/or Yorkshire Forward facilitate region wide BREEAM assessor training for the region's Development Control (and other appropriate) Officers with the aim of reducing costs to individual Local Authorities, with the aim of reducing future expenditure.	BREEAM training has been provided in 2007 to Development Control Officers and Planning Committee Members through the BRE and in assistance with the Sustainability Officer. Refresher presentations are also to be implemented in 2008 by the Sustainability Officer.
	6	That information, including any response to regional questionnaires, on the Councils position be reported to the City Strategy EMAP at an appropriate time	Agreed.
	7	That the authority adopt clearer lines of communication to ensure that information already collated by Housing Officers regarding thermal efficiencies improvements and other Carbon reduction measures, is shared with the Sustainability Officer. This should be done to ensure housing data relevant to the developing Environmental Management System (EMAS) is integrated. Officers in Housing should work with the Authority's Sustainability Officer to agree the best format for such data sharing and, ensure advice regarding targeted improvements in housing and the reporting of these outcomes are delivered under EMAS	All data recorded on the Housing Stock in terms of energy efficiency is held within the housing stock condition database and administered by the Asset management data Analyst. The sustainability officer is invited to work closely with the data analyst as and when required to resolve any information requests that are required as part of this process.
	8	That the Housing Strategy & Enabling Group - Housing Standards & Adaptations Officer and other officers in housing where relevant work with York EEAC officers consult upon, devise and adopt a 'Energy Efficiency and Thermal Comfort Strategy and Action Plan' for the authority commencing this year. The Officers are recommended to use the Regional Action Plan (Annex C) NEA guidance (Annex F) and activities outlined at paragraph 50 of this report as a primary steer in shaping the process	Have just completed a PSSCS the results of which are currently being analysed to provide the base line evidence for a Private Sector Renewal Strategy which will include energy efficiency and thermal comfort measures, linked to fuel poverty. This work will be completed by December 2008.
	9	That the Local Authority ensures that CYC Officer and Member Positions on the Energy Partnership Board are always filled.	Mark Grandfield Asset Manager is the officer rep

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendation as approved by the Executive on 7 November 2006	
Reducing Carbon Emissions Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Review Completed Sept 2006)	10	That Annual and inter-year joint working be conducted between EEAC's Local Authority Support Programme Co-ordinator and CYC Housing Officers to ensure that opportunities for the use of renewable are considered as part of the HRA and Housing Capital Business plan. Where such opportunities are cost neutral or affordable within the life of the business plan, micro-renewable should be installed as part of the development of the business plan. Consultation between housing officers and EEAC should cover improvements scheduled to buildings fabric, such as photovoltaic roof tiles when roofs need replacement and/or heating, water systems replacements (i.e. can carbon minimising heat pumps be applied) etc; Consultation should also explore opportunities to bring in external grants revenue.	The opportunities for the use of renewable are considered as part of the HRA and Housing Capital Business plan as part of the current refresh
Scrutiny Comment as of 26 February 2007: Executive have only recently considered and approved these recommendations therefore to soon to report on their implementation. Suggest update in September 2007			



Scrutiny Management Committee

15 September 2008

Report of the Democratic Services Manager

Final Report of the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee – Sale of the Barbican

Summary

1. This report presents the final report from the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee detailing their review of the sale of the Barbican.

Background

2. In coming to a decision to carry out a review of this topic, the Scrutiny Management Team recognised certain key objectives and the following remit was agreed:

Remit

‘To investigate the arrangements surrounding the sale of the Barbican site, with the purpose of learning some key lessons for the future, in the event of developments of a similar nature or scope being proposed.

- To understand why the contract in relation to the sale of the Barbican site was not signed, sealed and delivered until after May 2003.
- To understand the public consultation process which took place and the resulting decisions.
- To assess whether decisions taken in relation to the sale resulted in a loss of capital to the Council.

To understand the changes in land values with a view to establishing whether best value was actually achieved in this case.

Consultation

3. As part of their review, the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee carried out a number of consultation sessions, as detailed in their final report attached at Annex A.

Options

4. Having considered the findings contained within the final report attached, Members may choose to support all, some or none of the recommendations shown in paragraph 7 below, and provide their comments, prior to the report being considered by the Executive.

Analysis

5. In regard to the aims and objectives of the review, the final report attached, analyses all of the information gathered and the arising issues.

Summary of Recommendations Arising From the Review

6. The final report of the Barbican Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee recommends that the Executive should:
 - Commission an officer report which sets out a corporate approach for the Council when dealing with pressure groups
 - Ensure all future projects have a robust system of risk management which is regularly reviewed and updated throughout the period of each project.

Reason: To ensure that any future projects are managed effectively and take into account lessons learnt from this review.

Corporate Direction & Priorities

7. It was recognised that this review would support the following direction statements as set out in the Council's Corporate Strategy:
 - We will listen to communities and ensure that people have a greater say in deciding local priorities
 - Our ambition is to be clear about what we will do to meet the needs of our communities, and then deliver the best quality services that we can afford
8. The review also provided an opportunity for the Council to consider the procedures followed and the decisions taken at the time of the sale of the Barbican, in order to identify ways of improving what we do, in line with our Corporate Values.

Implications

9. There are no known legal, Financial, Equalities, HR, or other implications associated with the recommendation below or the recommendations within the final report at Annex A.

Risk Management

10. There are no known risks associated with the recommendation within this cover report. The risks associated with the recommendations within the final report are detailed therein.

Recommendations

11. Members are asked to note the contents of the attached final report and provide comments on the findings and recommendations as shown in paragraph 7 above.

Reason: To inform the Executive's consideration of the final report.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel No.01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager

Report Approved **Date** 1 August 2008

Wards Affected: **All**

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes

Annex A – Sale of the Barbican Scrutiny Review - Final Report dated 16 July 2008

This page is intentionally left blank



Barbican Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Committee

16 July 2008

Final Report

Background

1. In July 2007, Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC) considered a scrutiny topic proposed by Cllr Joe Watt relating to the sale of the Barbican. SMC agreed that the scale of the topic as proposed was too wide ranging for review and requested Cllr Watt's attendance at their next meeting to discuss the possibility of a review tailored to learn key lessons and achieve improvements in handling future developments of a similar scale and nature.
2. Cllr Watt attended the meeting of SMC in September 2007 and agreed to revise his topic submission in order that it did not duplicate the work that was ongoing at the time as part of the review commissioned by the Executive on swimming provision in York.
3. In coming to a decision to review this topic, the Scrutiny Management Team recognised certain key objectives and the following remit was agreed:

'To investigate the arrangements surrounding the sale of the Barbican site, with the purpose of learning some key lessons for the future, in the event of developments of a similar nature or scope being proposed.

- To understand why the contract in relation to the sale of the Barbican site was not signed, sealed and delivered until after May 2003.
- To understand the public consultation process which took place and the resulting decisions.
- To assess whether decisions taken in relation to the sale resulted in a loss of capital to the Council.
- To understand the changes in land values with a view to establishing whether best value was actually achieved in this case.

Consultation

4. This review has been carried out in consultation with the Assistant Director of Lifelong Learning & Leisure, the Head of Property Services, Political Group Leaders i.e. those involved in the decision making process relating to the Barbican, and representatives of the Save Our Barbican Group and the Barbican Action Group.

Information Gathered

5. In order to understand the full sequence of events leading to the Barbican sale, the Committee were given copies of all the reports previously presented at formal decision making meetings together with the minutes of those meetings. They then held a number of informal meetings where they met separately with officers, Members and representatives of the local action groups, to discuss their understanding of the events and to ask a number of questions.

6. From this process the Committee were able to clarify the following information:

To understand why the contract in relation to the sale of the Barbican site was not signed, sealed and delivered until after May 2003

7. In 2001 sales particulars for the site were issued, and 11 bids were received. Five of these were long listed and invited to make further bids based on a number of objectives. Four schemes were submitted as a result of this process from which two were short listed. In November 2002, Barbican Venture Ltd (BV) was selected as the preferred developer. This was a company formed for this particular project with the intention of building a serviced residential home and two hotels on the site, and refurbishing and selling the Kent Street car park. The deal also included a county standard pool at no cost to the Authority (to be operated by Cannon Leisure) and for the refurbishment of the Barbican Centre (to be operated by Absolute Leisure), plus a capital receipt of £3m.

Issues Arising

8. While the council was trying to assemble a workable scheme only a limited amount of consultation was done with a small number of representatives. As there was strong disagreement within the Council about the BV scheme and bid, and the council's plans for the other two pools in the city, a decision was taken in February 2003 to launch a city-wide public consultation prior to the signing of any contractual agreement, to ensure the proposals were broadly publicly acceptable.
9. A consultation leaflet was issued in March 2003 which pointed out that there would be no fitness or crèche facilities with the county standard pool. The results of the consultation were not fully available until after the election period, which in turn, delayed any final decision by the Council as to the way forward.
10. The Barbican Action Group which had formed to protect the swimming facilities on the Barbican site were broadly satisfied with the resulting proposed scheme and therefore disbanded.

To understand the public consultation process which took place and the resulting decisions

11. There was a mixed response to the consultation leaflet. Although the results broadly supported the refurbishment and renewal of the Barbican, there was

some criticism of the lack of community and play facilities and the level of fitness equipment.

12. The incoming administration in 2003 wanted to revisit the amount of the capital receipt to allow it to fund the refurbishment of the other two pools in the city, and decided to continue running the Barbican pool as a Council service whilst they renegotiated the agreement with BV. They also chose to re-run the consultation process in order to gauge public opinion on their alternative package which would address the capital receipt issue. This further delayed the final decision.

Issues Arising

13. During the period of renegotiation, the Council received external legal advice that it would be illegal to allow BV to build the pool as part of the development bid. It was advised that even though BV's intention was to gift the pool to the City, the contract to construct the pool would have to be tendered by the Council, in accordance with European procurement rules.
14. A further public consultation was carried out in July 2003 on a revised package which asked whether residents preferred a community pool with considerable investment in other city pools, or a county standard pool with fewer resources available for the other pools. The result was marginally in favour of the community pool, and this was selected by the Executive in September 2003.

To assess whether decisions taken in relation to the sale resulted in a loss of capital to the Council & To understand the changes in land values with a view to establishing whether best value was actually achieved in this case

15. In October 2003 an archaeological survey showed that parking for the apartments and hotel could be put in an undercroft under the buildings. BV became Barbican Venture (York) Ltd and submitted a new scheme and offer. A decision was taken not to consult on the new scheme as it reflected the Executive's view of the outcome of the second consultation process, and would be subject to the planning process.
16. As part of the new scheme, Barbican Venture increased the number of apartments and included a new 4 star hotel. They also moved the council's community pool on to the Kent Street coach park site, requiring a third of the car park to be demolished. The revised scheme which included a capital receipt of £4.4m was accepted by the Council's Executive in December 2003.
17. In February 2004 the Executive agreed to split the sale of the site into two contracts. The residential and hotel sites and the Kent Street car park to be sold to Barbican Venture and a lease of the auditorium to Absolute Leisure Ltd.

Issues Arising

18. The Save our Barbican Group (SOB) started in spring 2003 when the consultation document was issued. Its purpose was to report local resident's concerns over the amount of residential development and the impact on the neighbourhood of the proposed casino and nightclub. For some, the involvement of Absolute Leisure also caused concern, and things intensified following the enlargement of the residential development. SOB's aim was to stop the development, to enable a rethink and consideration of other alternatives, with proper consultation. This aim was not achieved and ceased to be possible at the granting of planning permission.
19. In 2004, SOB took legal action due to the Council not having carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which council officers had been advised was not legally required as part of the planning process. This eventually led to judicial review by which time, it was too late for the Council to get an EIA as this was needed prior to planning approval. The advice given to the Council at that time, was that the judicial review would take approximately three months. But, in fact it took much longer because when SOB lost the judicial review, they chose to appeal as they felt it would be of national importance to other environmental groups. They then had to fight a decision not to grant them legal aid which they won. Having got financial aid, their original appeal was heard but it was unsuccessful. This series of events could not have been predicted in advance.
20. It is recognised that the scheme could have been built had the delays not occurred, as it was a good time to sell property and the best possible offer had been made. But, by the time the judicial review was rejected in late 2005, a downturn in the property market had begun. As a result, Barbican Venture submitted a revised lower offer which excluded any build of a pool, and as a consequence of the downturn, the Council had little option but to accept.
21. At the same time, the University as part of their Heslington expansion, had put forward a proposal for a new pool to be built on their site. This contributed to concerns as to whether the pool at the Barbican would continue to be viable.
22. Subsequently, there was a review as to whether CYC should have re-tendered the whole scheme in light of the revised Barbican Venture proposals. It found that as the market was dropping and not many companies were interested in this mix of development, the Authority would have been worse off.

Analysis

23. Having considered all of the information gathered, the Committee discussed the problems that had led to the initial delays in selling the site. They expressed the view that it was realistic to take two years to formulate a proposal and that it was not unreasonable for a new administration to exercise its democratic right and change the proposal. The committee recognised however, that there was no evidence that any risk assessment had been carried out in regard to reopening the process. They also concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that use of an external project manager would have been beneficial.

24. The Committee agreed that the decisions taken in relation to the sale had resulted in a significant reduction of capital receipt to the Council. They concluded that this had been due to the complicated nature of the transaction, the changes to the brief by both the Council and the developer, the issues and the subsequent legal actions around an Environmental Impact Assessment, and the lack of periodic reviews of the project, including updates to the risk assessment, especially given the speculative nature of land values. Taking the project as a whole, the Committee acknowledged that best value had not been achieved, but recognised that each decision had been taken in good faith.
25. Finally, the Committee expressed the view that there might have been a more effective way of dealing with the protest movement and agreed to recommend that the Council should review the way it handles objections to schemes.

Options

26. Having regard to the remit for this review and the information contained within this report, Members may agree to make the recommendations below in full or in part, or agree some alternative recommendations.

Corporate Direction & Priorities

27. It is recognised that this review supports the following direction statements as set out in the Council's Corporate Strategy:
 - We will listen to communities and ensure that people have a greater say in deciding local priorities
 - Our ambition is to be clear about what we will do to meet the needs of our communities, and then deliver the best quality services that we can afford
28. The review also provides an opportunity for the Council to consider the procedures followed and the decisions taken at the time of the sale of the Barbican, in order to identify ways of improving what we do, in line with our Corporate Values.

Implications

29. There are no Financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, ITT or other implications associated with the recommendation within this report.

Risk Management

30. There are no known risks associated with Recommendation (a). Recommendation (b) recognises that there is a risk to the Council if risk assessments are not regularly reviewed and updated during the period of a project. If a decision is taken not to approve Recommendation (b), then the levels of risk associated with projects will remain unknown.

Recommendations

31. In light of the above options, Members are asked to agree that:
- i. it was realistic to take two years to formulate a proposal
 - ii. it was not unreasonable for a new administration to exercise its democratic right and change the proposal, taking into account the associated risks
 - iii. although each decision taken in relation to the sale had been taken in good faith, the delays in making those decisions, the longevity of unforeseen legal action and the shift in land values, had resulted in a significant reduction in capital receipt to the Council
 - iv. best value was not achieved taking the project as a whole, even with recognising the reasons outlined in paragraph 24.
 - v. there might have been a more effective way of dealing with the pressure groups
32. Therefore, the Committee are asked to recommend that:
- a) The Executive should commission an officer report which sets out a corporate approach for the Council when dealing with pressure groups
 - b) All future projects have a robust system of risk management which is regularly reviewed and updated throughout the period of each project.

Reason: To ensure that any future projects are managed effectively and take into account lessons learnt from this review.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel No.01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager

Interim Report Approved **Date** 28 July 2008

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report



Scrutiny Management Committee

15 September 2008

Report of the Democratic Services Manager

Final Report of the Education Scrutiny Committee - School Governors**Summary**

1. This report presents a final report from the Education Scrutiny Committee detailing their review of School Governors.

Background

1. In coming to a decision to review this topic, certain key objectives were recognised. Due to the work involved in examining these objectives, the Committee chose to split the review into two parts, and the following revised remit was agreed:

Remit

2. In regard to Governing Bodies, to encourage an improved level of community involvement and maximise their diversity and skills.

Part A - Key Objectives

- i. Investigate the current composition of governing bodies with an effort to find ways of improving the diversity of governing bodies to better reflect the community
- ii. Identify ways of increasing the number of community Governors
- iii. Identify ways of increasing community involvement with Governing Bodies
- iv. Investigate ways of maximizing the skills that individual members of governing bodies bring to their role

Part B – Key Objective

- v. Investigate the role of Governors and current clerking arrangements in extended schools

3. At a meeting in February 2008, the Committee received a briefing paper from the Head of Early Years & Extended Schools on the Government's 'Extended Services in Schools' agenda, and in May 2008 they considered a scoping report for Part B of the review. As a result, Members recognised that there was no issue around the current clerking arrangements in extended schools and therefore agreed not to proceed with Part B of the review. Instead they agreed that the broader issue of governance of extended school provision should be considered as a possible separate topic in the future.

Consultation

4. As part of their review, the Committee carried out a number of consultation events, as detailed in their final report attached at Annex A.

Options

5. Having considered the findings contained within the final report and its annexes attached, Members may choose to support all, some or none of the recommendations shown in paragraph 7 below, and provide their comments, prior to the report being considered by the Executive.

Analysis

6. In regard to the aims and objectives of the review, the final report attached, analyses all of the information gathered and the arising issues.

Summary of Recommendations Arising From the Review

7. The recommendations arising from the review of School Governors are that:
 - i) the significant voluntary contribution of school governors to the successful running of York schools, be acknowledged;
 - ii) the work of the Governor Support & Development Service Team be noted, in particular in supporting this scrutiny review and the resulting benefits gained to their service area as referenced in Annex F to the final report .
 - iii) the Governor Support & Development Service Team be instructed to:
 - (a) Continue to develop improved methods for advertising governor vacancies i.e. by targeting specific organisations, in order to attract a more diverse mix of individuals to the role of governor and ensure it captures the information necessary to reflect changing circumstances and monitor diversity. (*objective (ii)*)
 - e) Create an information guide which identifies the most effective methods for finding and recruiting potential community governors and distribute it to all York schools (*objective (ii)*)
 - f) Continue use of the 'Exit Questionnaire' in order to investigate governors motivation for leaving their post (*all objectives*)

- g) regularly maintain, update and develop their database to ensure it remains an effective tool (*objective (i)*);
- h) share information on best practice with all York schools (*objective (iii)*)
- i) be encouraged to consider the most applicable form of training for maximizing skills, whether that be whole governing body or online training. (*objective (iv)*)

Corporate Direction & Priorities

- 8. Although the remit for the School Governors review did not fit directly with any of the Corporate Priorities, it was recognised that it could indirectly have a positive effect in relation to Corporate Priority No.7 – ‘Improve the life chances of the most disadvantaged and disaffected children, young people and families in the city’.

Implications

- 9. There are no known legal, Financial, Equalities, HR, or other implications associated with the recommendation below or the recommendations within the final report at Annex A.

Risk Management

- 10. There are no known risks associated with the recommendation within this cover report. The risks associated with the recommendations within the final report are detailed therein.

Recommendations

- 11. Members are asked to note the contents of the attached final report and its annexes and provide comments on the findings and recommendations as shown in paragraph 7 above.

Reason: To inform the Executive’s consideration of the final report.

Contact Details

Author:
Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel No.01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager

Report Approved **Date** 1 August 2008

Wards Affected: **All**

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes

Annex A – School Governors Review - Final Report dated 30 July 2008

Annex AA – Ethnicity Information

Annex AB – Information From Completed Exit Questionnaires

Annex AC – Information Relating To Community Governors

Annex AD – Information On Community Involvement With Governing Bodies

Annex AE – Information On Training Requirements

Annex AF – Update From governor Support & Development Service



Education Scrutiny Committee

30 July 2008

Final Report For School Governors Review

Background

1. In coming to a decision to review this topic, certain key objectives were recognised. Due to the work involved in examining these objectives, the Committee chose to split the review into two parts, and the following revised remit was agreed:

Remit

2. In regard to Governing Bodies, to encourage an improved level of community involvement and maximise their diversity and skills.

Part A - Key Objectives

- i. Investigate the current composition of governing bodies with an effort to find ways of improving the diversity of governing bodies to better reflect the community
- ii. Identify ways of increasing the number of community Governors
- iii. Identify ways of increasing community involvement with Governing Bodies
- iv. Investigate ways of maximizing the skills that individual members of governing bodies bring to their role

Part B – Key Objective

- v. Investigate the role of Governors and current clerking arrangements in extended schools
3. At a meeting on 30 October 2007, Members considered a scoping report for Part A of the review which identified the current composition of governing bodies and gave a snap shot of the number of vacant seats at the time of providing the information.
4. In December 2007, Members were provided with information which identified York as having one of the fastest growing 'Black, Minority & Ethnic (BME) communities in the country, and the following statistics from the most recent Pupil Levels Annual School Census (PLASC) :

- b) There are at least 49 languages spoken by children in York schools
 - There are 1340 minority ethnic pupils in York schools
 - All York schools have minority ethnic pupils
 - Until recently the largest ethnic group were Travellers, but this is an overarching term that includes several distinct groups
 - There are significant Bangladeshi, Chinese and Turkish/Kurdish communities in York
 - Only 27 out of 1578 teachers in York schools are from minority ethnic backgrounds (1.7%)
- 5. At a meeting in May 2008, the Committee considered a scoping report for Part B of this review, having received an update from the Head of Early Years & Extended Schools. Members acknowledged that that was no issue around the current clerking arrangements in extended schools and therefore agreed not to proceed with part B of the review. Instead they agreed that the broader issue of governance of extended school provision should be considered as a possible separate topic in the future. Members agreed to consider this along with other topic suggestions at their next meeting in June 2008.

Consultation

- 6. As part of this review the Committee carried out a number of consultation exercises:
 - The Committee issued an individual survey to all 1090 governors at the beginning of January 2008, to identify the age, gender, ethnicity, skills, and economic background of all current school governors. The survey was aimed at understanding the correlation between the governing bodies of the schools within each ward and each ward's local community. 354 responses were received and fed into the Governor Support & Development Service database to generate a number of reports for the Committee's consideration.
 - Members created an exit questionnaire for use by the Governor Support & Development Service, in order to identify the reasons why governors stood down and why some schools have a bigger turnover than others. This was issued to all governors who had resigned since the start of the academic year 2006-07, to information on any unresolved issues within their governing bodies, or with the training / level of support they had received.
 - In February 2008, an informal consultation session was held for all Governors. Attendance was good and the Committee explained the reasons for carrying out this review and gathered insight into some of the different methods used for recruiting new members and how governing bodies were coping with their ever increasing workloads.
 - In April 2008, the Committee sent a copy of their latest interim report together with a questionnaire to each school's governing body requesting further information to support the review. Much thought was given to the

content of the questionnaire in an effort to the information already gathered as a result of the individual governor survey.

Information Gathered

7. In cases where individuals had been governors for many years, the information originally gathered when they first became a governor had never been recorded electronically. For more recently appointed governors, only some of the personal information they originally provided had been entered into the Governor Support & Development Service database, due to the restrictions of the electronic system. At the beginning of this review, the Committee were informed of the planned work of the Governor Support & Development Service to upgrade their database and check the validity of the information currently held on each Governor. The Committee recognised the opportunity to support this work and at the same time gather information pertinent to the objectives of this review and therefore agreed to finance a number of additional improvements to the database.
8. Throughout the review the Committee gave much consideration to how the information gathered would be presented to them, as any personal information provided by individual governors was covered by the Data Protection Act. The Committee was careful not to receive information in such a way that it would identify individuals. Instead, the Committee sought information on a ward by ward basis and by school type i.e. primary or secondary.

Objective (i) - To investigate the current composition of governing bodies with an effort to find ways of improving the diversity of governing bodies to better reflect the community

9. A recent report from the ODPM identified York as having one of the fastest growing Black, Minority & Ethnic communities in the country. All York schools have minority ethnic pupils, and although it was thought that the Governing Bodies of York schools reflected their local community, there was no evidence to support this. Historically in York, the role of governor has attracted white middle class, middle aged applicants. To encourage a more diverse mix that better represented the school's local community, the Committee wanted to identify the barriers e.g. language, work commitments, childcare issues and look at ways of addressing those issues.
10. In an effort to identify ways of improving the diversity of governing bodies, to better reflect the population of their school and their community, Members recognised it would first be necessary to clarify their current level of diversity and therefore a number of questions were included in both the survey and the Governing Body questionnaire.
11. The ethnicity information provided by governors was grouped on a ward basis and by school type, and then compared to the ethnic balance of school pupils within each ward – see Annex A.

Analysis

12. As a high number of governors did not identify their ethnicity in their completed surveys etc, it was not clear from results whether the ethnic diversity within the schools in each ward was equally reflected in their governing bodies. The committee concluded that irrespective of the completeness of information provided by governors, if governing bodies were truly to reflect their local community and attract a more diverse mix of individuals to the role, improved methods for advertising all types of governor vacancies would need to be identified to ensure they were accessible by everyone within the local community particularly hard to reach groups.

Recommendation

13. That the Governor Support & Development Service (GSDS):
 - (a) continue to develop improved methods for advertising governor vacancies, e.g. by targeting specific organizations, in order to attract a more diverse mix of individuals to the role of governor; and
 - (b) regularly maintain, update and develop its database to ensure it captures the information necessary to reflect changing circumstances and monitor diversity.

Objective (ii) - To identify ways of increasing the number of Community Governors

14. Through the various consultation exercises it became clear that some governing bodies were more successful than others at finding community (and parent) governors and providing support to new governing body members, and that this was directly affecting whether individuals were attracted to the role and retained in post.
15. The Committee were informed that at any given time there would generally be a higher percentage of vacancies within the community governor category than any other category. The responses to the exit questionnaire showed that governors left their post for a number of reasons and that the number of community governors leaving their post was no higher than the number from other categories of governor. In fact a high number of governors took up the role of Community governor having previously been a governor from a different category - see Annex B.

Analysis

16. The information gathered suggested therefore that there was not a problem with retaining community governors but that the difficulty lay initially in recruiting into the post. The Committee therefore recognised the need to identify the most effective methods for finding and recruiting potential community governors and a number of questions were included in the governing body questionnaire to identify the methods currently in use – see Annex C.
17. The information provided showed that the method yielding the most results was through existing governing body members approaching their personal contacts.

The committee recognised that this approach was not ideal as it relied heavily on the good will of existing members (and their knowledge of the skills of those they approached) it ran the risk of duplicating the existing profile

Recommendation

18. That the Governor Support & Development Service (GSDS):
 - (a) continue to develop improved methods for advertising governor vacancies, e.g. by targeting specific organizations, in order to attract a more diverse mix of individuals to the role of governor; and
 - (b) create an information guide to identify the most effective methods for finding and recruiting potential community governors and distribute it to all York schools.

Objective (iii) - To identify ways of increasing community involvement with Governing Bodies

19. In order to identify ways of increasing community involvement with Governing Bodies, Members agreed it would be necessary to understand the methods used and the level of involvement attained currently. Questions were therefore included in the Governing Body questionnaire to gather the relevant information. The responses are shown at Annex D.

Analysis

20. Many schools take advantage of their local parish council's newsletters and ward committee meetings to circulate information about what is happening in their school. Others are more adventurous, using local press and radio to advertise events etc. The Committee recognised that other schools could benefit from trying alternative methods and that sharing information and raising awareness, could be facilitated by the Governor Support and Development Service. Information on best practice could then be shared with all York schools.

Recommendation

That the Governor Support & Development Service (GSDS) ensure information on best practice be shared with all York schools.

Objective (iv) - Investigate ways of maximizing the skills that individual members of governing bodies bring to their role

21. In order to identify each governor's current skills and highlight any additional training they might require to support them in their role, a number of questions were included in the individual school governor survey. The responses are shown at Annex E. The information gathered was then used to populate the upgraded Governor Support and Development Service database.

Analysis

22. The committee recognised that a fully populated database would be a really useful tool for identifying training needs. The Governor Support & Development Service Manager subsequently provided an update on the training requirements identified as a result of the improvements to the database – see Annex F.
23. The Committee recognised that in order for the database to continue to be a useful tool, the information contained therein would need to be regularly revised to include up-to-date information. This could then be used to:
 - look specifically at individual governors to identify gaps in their skills and identify any future training requirements.
 - highlight the skills that were available within each governing body that were not currently being utilised and those that they were collectively lacking
24. It is recognised that the improvements made to the Governor Support & Development Service database and the information gathered as a result of this review will also allow the Governor Support & Development Service team to:
 - provide information from the database to Governing Bodies to assist them with their skills audit and to inform their discussions about their training needs,
 - Support the governing body self-review exercise that many carry out on a regular basis.
 - Inform the Governor Support & Development Service Manager decision-making process, when placing new governors into Local Authority governor vacancies or when suggesting possible candidates for community governor vacancies to ensure the new appointee brings the relevant skills required to the governing body .
 - Identify all of the relevant training required for new governors to enable them to fulfil their role.

Recommendation

That the Governor Support & Development Service (GSDS) be encouraged to consider the most applicable form of training for maximizing skills, whether that be whole governing body or online training.

Options

25. Having considered the information contained within this report and associated annexes, Members may decide to amend and/or agree the recommendations within the report

Implications

26. There are no known legal, Financial, Equalities, HR, or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

Corporate Priorities

27. Although the remit for this review does not fit directly with any of the Corporate Priorities, it could indirectly have a positive effect in relation to Corporate Priority No.7 – 'improve the life chances of the most disadvantaged and disaffected children, young people and families in the city'.

Risk Management

28. Without the thorough engagement of current governors the findings from this review could be limited which in turn, could have a negative effect on the number of new applicants. It is recognised that some schools have difficulties in attracting community governors and therefore it is important that governing bodies are supported in attracting applicants for vacant seats, and retaining governing body members.

Recommendation

29. In light of the above options, Members are asked to note the contents of the draft final report, agree any amendments and recommend to the Executive that:
- i) the significant voluntary contribution of school governors to the successful running of York schools, be acknowledged;
 - ii) the work of the Governor Support & Development Service Team be noted, in particular in supporting this scrutiny review and the resulting benefits gained to their service area as referenced in Annex F.
 - iii) the Governor Support & Development Service Team be instructed to:
 - a) Continue to develop improved methods for advertising governor vacancies i.e. by targeting specific organisations, in order to attract a more diverse mix of individuals to the role of governor and ensure it captures the information necessary to reflect changing circumstances and monitor diversity. (*objective (ii)*)
 - b) Create an information guide which identifies the most effective methods for finding and recruiting potential community governors and distribute it to all York schools (*objective (ii)*)
 - c) Continue use of the 'Exit Questionnaire' in order to investigate governors motivation for leaving their post (*all objectives*)
 - d) regularly maintain, update and develop their database to ensure it remains an effective tool (*objective (i)*);
 - e) share information on best practice with all York schools (*objective (iii)*)

- f) be encouraged to consider the most applicable form of training for maximizing skills, whether that be whole governing body or online training. (*objective (iv)*)

Reason: To ensure this review complies with scrutiny procedures, protocols and workplans.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel No.01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services & Scrutiny Manager

Interim Report Approved

Date

6 June 2008

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: Interim Reports dated 26 February 2008, 3 April 2008 & 27 May 2008

Annex A – Ethnicity Information

Annex B – Information From Completed Exit Questionnaires

Annex C – Information Relating To Community Governors

Annex D – Information On Community Involvement With Governing Bodies

Annex E – Information On Training Requirements

Annex F – Update From governor Support & Development Service

Ethnicity Information Provided by Governors Via the Individual Governors Survey
& The Governing Body Questionnaire

Do you feel the economic balance on your governing body reflects the economic balance within the community local to your school?

YES	NO
213	106

Do you feel the ethnic balance on your governing body reflects the ethnic balance...

- a) amongst pupils at your school
b) within the community local to your school

YES	NO
275	64
264	66

Ethnic Group	Ethnicity	Ethnicity Notes	No.Of Governors
White	British	My children are	1
White	Irish		2
White	Other Please Specify		1
White	Other Please Specify	American	2
White	Other Please Specify	Anglo-American	1
White	Other Please Specify	English	2
White	Other Please Specify	Finnish	1
White	Other Please Specify	German	1
White	Other Please Specify	Scottish	1
NO DATA	Other Please Specify		1
NO DATA	NO DATA		711
Total Number of Responses Received			724

School Type	Ethnic Group	Ethnicity	Ethnicity Notes	No. of Governors
Primary	Asian or Asian British	Indian		1
	NO DATA	Other		1
	NO DATA	NO DATA		565
	White	British		247
	White	British	My children	1
	White	Other	No Data	1
	White	Other	American	1
	White	Other	English	1
	White	Other	Finnish	1
	White	Other	Scottish	1
Secondary	Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi		1
	NO DATA	NO DATA		146
	White	British		77
	White	Irish		2
	White	Other	American	1
	White	Other	Anglo-	1
	White	Other	English	1
	White	Other	German	1

For the purposes of this exercise Applefields School is classed as secondary and Hob Moor Oaks as primary.

Ethnicity By Ward

Ward/Parish	Ethnic Group	Ethnicity	Ethnicity Notes	No.of Governors
Acomb	NO DATA	NO DATA		29
	White	British		19
	Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi		1
Bishopthorpe	NO DATA	NO DATA		19
	White	British		9
	Asian or Asian British	Indian		1
Clifton	NO DATA	NO DATA		32
	White	British		15
Derwent	NO DATA	NO DATA		9
	White	British		7
Dringhouses & Woodthorpe	NO DATA	NO DATA		21
	White	British		12
Fishergate	NO DATA	NO DATA		31
	White	British		17
	White	British	Chinese adopted.	1
Fulford	NO DATA	NO DATA		20
	White	British		15
	White	Other	German	1
Guildhall	NO DATA	NO DATA		19
	White	British		8
Haxby & Wigginton	NO DATA	NO DATA		31
	White	British		15
Heslington	NO DATA	NO DATA		13
	White	British		4
Heworth	NO DATA	NO DATA		53
	White	British		23
Heworth Without	NO DATA	NO DATA		14
	White	British		4
Holgate	NO DATA	NO DATA		63
	White	British		30
	White	Other	Finnish	1
Hull Road	NO DATA	NO DATA		38
	White	British		12
	White	Other	American	1
	White	Other	Anglo-American	1
	White	Other	Scottish	1
Huntington and New Earswick	NO DATA	NO DATA		63
	White	British		25
	White	Other	Irish	1
Micklegate	NO DATA	No DATA		59
	White	British		25
	White	Other	American	1
	White	Other	English	1
	White	Other	Irish	1
Osbaldwick	NO DATA	NO DATA		11
	White	British		3

Ward/Parish	Ethnic Group	Ethnicity	Ethnicity	No. of
Rural West	NO DATA	NO DATA		1
	White	British		32
	White	Other		1
	White	Other	Scottish	1
Skelton, Rawcliffe & Clifton Without	NO DATA	NO DATA		44
	White	British		19
Strensall	NO DATA	NO DATA		24
	White	British		9
Westfield	NO DATA	NO DATA		60
	White	British		33
	White	Other	Finnish	1
Wheldrake	NO DATA	NO DATA		31
	White	British		8

Ethnicity Figures For York's School Population By Ward (5-16 year olds)

Ward	Ethnicity								
	Any other ethnic background	Asian / Asian British	Black / Black British	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	Refused	White - British	White - Other
Acomb	0.09%	-	-	-	1.03%	1.03%	1.03%	95.99%	0.84%
Bishopthorpe	-	-	-	-	-	1.93%	0.39%	94.98%	2.70%
Clifton	0.25%	3.30%	0.68%	0.25%	0.17%	1.44%	0.76%	90.01%	3.13%
Derwent	-	0.50%	-	-	-	0.25%	1.50%	93.50%	4.25%
Dringhouses & Woodthorpe	0.16%	0.90%	0.41%	0.33%	1.31%	1.06%	2.45%	87.75%	5.64%
Fishergate	0.77%	6.91%	0.77%	0.92%	0.15%	5.07%	0.77%	78.34%	6.30%
Fulford	0.40%	2.02%	-	-	-	2.02%	-	93.95%	1.61%
Guildhall	0.32%	2.92%	0.32%	0.65%	0.32%	4.22%	0.97%	80.52%	9.74%
Haxby & Wigginton	0.32%	0.57%	0.32%	0.49%	-	0.49%	0.16%	96.51%	1.14%
Heslington	5.98%	9.40%	5.13%	1.71%	-	2.56%	0.85%	62.39%	11.97%
Heworth	0.20%	1.56%	0.34%	0.07%	0.14%	1.22%	0.61%	92.80%	3.05%
Heworth Without	0.55%	0.82%	-	0.55%	0.27%	-	0.27%	94.51%	3.02%
Holgate	0.09%	0.78%	0.52%	0.17%	0.52%	1.57%	1.13%	92.77%	2.44%
Hull Road	0.94%	1.88%	0.31%	0.10%	0.42%	1.36%	0.73%	91.62%	2.62%
Huntington & New Earswick	0.07%	0.94%	0.07%	0.07%	0.61%	0.67%	0.34%	96.23%	1.01%
Micklegate	0.13%	0.90%	-	0.51%	0.26%	3.60%	0.90%	85.59%	8.11%
Osbaldwick	0.29%	1.16%	0.29%	0.87%	-	1.16%	2.02%	90.17%	4.05%
Rural West	-	0.42%	-	0.63%	0.10%	0.52%	0.31%	95.92%	2.09%
Skelton, Rawcliffe & Clifton Without	0.18%	0.49%	0.18%	0.31%	-	1.60%	1.05%	94.58%	1.60%
Strensall	-	0.89%	0.09%	0.18%	0.27%	1.25%	0.18%	96.17%	0.98%
Westfield	0.05%	0.60%	0.55%	0.16%	2.13%	0.98%	0.71%	93.44%	1.37%
Wheldrake	0.19%	0.19%	-	-	-	1.51%	-	96.79%	1.32%

Produced by : Management Information Service, LCCS (February 2008)

Responses From School Governor Exit Questionnaire

School	Length of		Category	Office Held
	Years	Month		
Millthorpe School	3	6	Community	
Oaklands School	2	6	Community	
York High School/Oaklands Schools	2		Community	Vice Chair
Scarcroft CPS, St Paul's CofE PS, Millthorpe	10		Community	Scarcroft-Special Needs, Millthorpe-Link Gov for Music & Drama
Burholme	4		Community	Technology, Pupil Discipline Committee
Haxby Road Primary School	Many!		Community	Chair of Governors
Oaklands / York High School	11		Community	Chair of Governors
Fulford School	5		Co-opted	Chair of Finance, Chair of Pupil Discipline
Haxby Road Primary School	12		Co-opted then Community	Chair - Governor with responsibility for special needs
Oaken Grove/Wigginton Primary	8/9?		Co-opted then Community	
St Lawrences	7		Foundation	
Dunnington Primary School	7		Foundation	Chair Jan to Sept 2007; Chair of Personnel 2002 - 2007
Archbishop Holgate's School	3		Foundation	
Elvington CE School	8?		Foundation	On Performance Management Team
Wheldrake with Thorganby CE Primary	4		Foundation	
Heworth Primary School	5	5	Foundation	Child Protection
Wheldrake with Thorganby Ce Aided	2	6	Foundation	
Naburn Primary School	3		LA	Chairman for two years
Lowfield School	7		LA	Chairman - Pupil Welfare
Scarcroft Primary	3	4	LA	
Hob Moor Primary School		18	LA	
St Wilfrid's Primary School	3		LA	Chair, Staff and Finance Committee
Lowfield School after 10 yrs on joint Carr GB	17+10		LA then Parent	Chaired Curriculum
Hob Moor Oaks Special School	10		LA/Voluntary	Chair of Governors
Dringhouses Primary School	4		Parent then Community	Chair Performance Management; Chair Curriculum
Oaklands and Queen Anne Schools	20		Parent then Community	Chair - Queen Anne; Chair Finance - Oaklands
Hob Moor Primary, Oaks and Millthorpe	10		Parent then Community	Chair of Governors
Lowfield School	8		Parent then Community	Chair
Lowfield School	6?		Parent, then Community	
Lowfield School	13		Parent then Co-opted	Chair Curriculum (2 years)
All Saints School	6	2	Parent, then Foundation	
Lowfield School	2		Support Staff Governor	
Lowfield School	12		Teacher	
Carr Junior, Acomb	5			Subject: Literacy; Responsibility: Nutrition/school meals

Reason(s) for Leaving

End of term of office
 Workload too great
 Work commitments
 Family commitments
 Ill health
 Children left the school
 Other

Number
5
3
7
5
3
2

See comments on next sheet

Support you received as a Governor

Did you attend Governor training?
 Did you find the termly mailout for the Local Authority useful
 did you ever contact the Governor Support & Development Service?
 Did the call resolve your query
 As a new Governor, did you have a mentor?
 As a new Governor, did your Governing Body offer any induction?
 Would you consider being a Governor again in the future?

	YES	NO
Did you attend Governor training?	31	2
Did you find the termly mailout for the Local Authority useful	30	1
did you ever contact the Governor Support & Development Service?	14	18
Did the call resolve your query	13	1
As a new Governor, did you have a mentor?	8	24
As a new Governor, did your Governing Body offer any induction?	10	21
Would you consider being a Governor again in the future?	18	12

Number of Leavers per Governor Category

Community = 7
 Co-opted = 3
 Foundation = 7
 LA = 7
 Parent = 7
 Support Staff = 1
 Teacher = 1

No. of Governors who became a 'Community' Governor having previously been a governor within a different category = 7

Reason for Leaving - Other

Left the area and associated employment

Relocation to SE England owing to my husband's promotion

Headteacher retired. Decided time for me to go

I began working away from home for an extended period and couldn't attend meetings

Lowfield School merged with Oaklands to create York High School - I served on the temporary Gov to YHS until its start September 2007

School closed as part of reorganisation of West of York secondary provision

I didn't know I had been sacked - no reason to leave at all

Other commitments

Disagreement over the management and suspension of teacher

Lowfield School merged with Oaklands to create York High School

Moved to Oaklands School to promoted post

House move

I have given 20 years service as a Governor. Creation of York High School provides opportunity to withdraw

Wanted to support Lowfield School, first as a parent then to support school and local community. Did not agree with decision to close the school

End of Lowfield School - felt that I was too old to do two terms which I thought desirable to establish continuity with new school. Left Carr Governors after term ran out and my children left junior school

School closed

Having served for 10 years as a Governor I decided that I would like a change to alternative community work to community archaeology at Hungate. I still occasionally go into Millthorpe to helping History

I had no respect for current Chair and didn't like the direction she was taking the board

Oaklands School closed summer 2007

Moved away from york

Additional Information Regarding Support Received As A Governor

If you didn't attend training, please tell us why:

Never offered - not necessary

As a newly retired village school head, I felt I could offer support without (Church and school links)

This Gov did attend training and commented "I'd rather state the positives - that I always found the School Governor Support and Development Service, and the staff and others very helpful, during some difficult times at Haxby Road

If you didn't find the termly mailout useful, please tell us why:

A lot of non-relevant information

Can't remember enough to pass comment

If the call did not resolve your query, please tell us why:

If you would not consider being a Governor again, please tell us why:

I have done it twice (primary school in Devon before). I work as a volunteer counsellor at Relate so there is a limit as to how many hours I volunteer

Time for others to have an input

Grandparent duties and occasional ill health

Little chance to have an impact

This is a voluntary unpaid activity and being a school Governor is very time consuming particularly if your retired when there is a constant demand for involvement with pupil discipline cases

I am moved away from that part of York - and have retired

From a personal development point of view and as a teacher, I learnt a lot but I don't really think Governors add any value

Would need a reason to want to support a particular school

Too old

Could not make the time commitment to a school where I would have no connection
Long term illness. Also I'm more hands on and prefer to help in class with the children

What did you enjoy about being a Governor?

Making a contribution

Working together

Friendship of colleagues and staff

Having an inside knowledge of how a truly innovative school worked

Contributing to the life of the school

Satisfaction at "putting something back into the community"

I felt I represented the staff and was called on many times to express their feelings and explain things to other Governors

The people, the role, the school

Sitting on the appeal panels - pupil exclusion, etc. Meeting and dealing with the headmaster and staff

What did you enjoy about being a Governor? (Cont...)

Promoting links during the church's year. Christmas stories by candlelight (infants - KS1). Helping during new head appointment

Contribution to development of school and pupils with particular emphasis on the Christian values

The involvement in whole school process

Trying to do one's best for the school

Being involved in a school (secondary) - getting to know the procedures

Getting to know the school and seeing the children thrive and develop

Seeing that I was welcomed by teachers and staff and that the input and support appreciated. Learning about trends in education

Contact and team effort with other school Governors, Head Teacher and Teaching Staff

Being involved in the decisions affecting school/staff and pupils

Contact with school staff and children - helping to "make a difference"

Being involved in the creation of a new school

Contributing to and acting as a critical friend in the school

Training, experience running committees

Cared about the school (staff and pupils) therefore wanted to support in any way I could

Being involved in trying to improve quality of local schools

The Governing Body were a very special group of people - the school was well run by a dynamic head and an interesting and committed team, and was doing excellent work

Being involved in the inner workings of a school

Great for learning more about the strategic management of schools and feeling contribution welcomed and useful

The community spirit, being part of an establishment that had challenges and success's

Seeing how schools work; making a contribution to the community; working as a team with Governors, teachers and other parents; occasional teaching; support from yourselves - especially Annual Ed Lectures

Being part of a team which worked together for the benefit of the pupils

Taking an active part in the direction the school was going and working with the Head and staff to improve the school and provision for the children

What did you not enjoy about being a Governor?

The long delay before the papers went through after I was asked to be a Governor. It felt a bit like an old body's club when I started and fellow Governors were not welcoming. It think it improved over the year.

Not being able to commit enough time to the school and my departmental links

Too much unnecessary paperwork

The amount of time taken up with sub Committees then going over it again at full Gov

Some of the decisions that had to be made

Nothing

Paperwork

What did you not enjoy about being a Governor? (Cont...)

Selective inclusion by the Headteacher in the decision making process

The workload/legal duties/responsibilities. To-ing and fro-ing of decision making

Little effect you can have

Working through financial details

Feeling that as a Governing Body we did not always have the required expertise/skills for some of the decisions required

Excessive demands on time available. I already have an ongoing 26 year voluntary service commitment with York Lions Club (with additional activities in Yorkshire and UK)

As Chair of Governors, the responsibility and knowledge required was increasingly suggestive of a part-time appointment

Translating "professional language" used in too many reports

Feeling that you're not sure there's any real point to what you're doing. Takes up too much time

Far too much paperwork to read from Government and York Council - a lot of it worded in jargon difficult to understand, unnecessary bureaucratic documentation - overwhelming

Lowfields: Struggling with a deficit budget;

The painful end to it all

Long meetings!

Nothing

The paperwork!

Occasionally feeling that I was not being shown the whole picture - I would have liked more (and varied) opportunities to be involved in the work of schools

I thoroughly enjoyed my years as a Governor until the appointment of the current Chair - as my term was coming to an end I reluctantly decided to call it a day

Anything else about being a Governor?

Workload is what you make it

Overrated in my view

Best thing I did in the last seven years

I thoroughly enjoyed my time as a Governor, I felt I played an important role representing staff but also in my own right as part of appointment panels including for headships (though this occasioned a lot of pressure).

One of the most worthwhile experiences I have undertaken. Totally different to my working life, made to feel useful

I always wanted to be involved with school and Church services, but am dubious about Governors moving "jobs" like a cabinet, when some of us have experience and expertise in the slot we were chosen for

Arising out of being a school Governor, I trained to be a Pupil Mentor, a commitment

I enjoyed greatly and I have been invited to return to York High School to resume this activity now that CRB check has been cleared

Anything else about being a Governor? (Cont...)

Format of finance reporting - top down driven - most conform with centralist dictat, rather than respond to cost centres appropriate to a devolved school

Over my years as a governor, paperwork increased in amount and complexity - experience did not help in dealing with this

Lowfields: I was only able to really pull my weight after my retirement as a member of Pupil Welfare Committee. We had great help from LA Link Advisor

It was very pleasant and probably thus unrepresentative!

Would consider doing secondary school - All Saints

On occasion, it would have been useful to provide childcare for some daytime meetings eg like the Surestart Local Action group meeting. Thanks

I asked to move from Scarcroft to St Paul's because I wanted to see how smaller denominational schools differed from larger community schools.

I really loved being a Governor most of the time but the task became more and more onerous and time consuming - at times almost like a full-time job, But extremely rewarding

I would have welcomed more support when Oaklands was having inspection difficulties

At one stage the school was very disorganised about advanced papers - the LA clerking service made a major positive benefit in resolving this.

The work put in by the Governance Service in supporting the establishment of York High School was very good - professional and helpful

Very Requiring! Gave me experience that enhanced my CV that I would not have gained at work

Being a Governor was another chore in a busy life. I didn't feel I contributed anything significant and I missed meetings I didn't have time to attend.

This page is intentionally left blank

Responses From the Governing Body Questionnaire Relating to Community Governors

Responses to Qu.6 - Difficulties recruiting and/or retaining Community Governors - give details.....	
School	Response
Archbishop of York's Junior	No
Burton Green Primary	Yes - We have had people who say they are interested then they never make it to a meeting
Carr Junior	N/A
Clifton Green Primary	No - considerable effort goes into finding the appropriate people to ensure a balance of competencies across the Governing Body
Lord Deramore's?	No
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	No
Scarcroft Primary	Yes - a small community means limited people available
Woodthorpe Primary	Yes - The LA try to help but without any success. We have one vacancy and the one remaining leaves this

	Responses to Qu.7 - From what sources do you seek Community Governors?	Responses to Qu.8 - Which sources have been most successful?
School	Response	Response
Archbishop of York's Junior	Governing Body member's contacts on needs/skills analysis	Personal Contacts
Burton Green Primary	Mainly approach people personally	People who already have a connection with the school
Carr Junior	Living or working in the school area or immediate surrounds.	No one source better than another
Clifton Green Primary	Personal contacts with York St John, Local Business and community groups e.g. churches	All equally
Copmanthorpe Primary	Pre-school group / parish council / advert in village newsletter / contacts or current governors	All successful at different times - 4 responses from village newsletter
Dringhouses Primary	word of mouth, community networks, schools newsletter and wider community newsletters	word of mouth
Huntington Primary	Various	
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	Parish Councils, people known to the school/governors	Parish Councils

Cont/d....	Responses to Qu.7 - From what sources to you seek Community Governors?	Responses to Qu.8 - Which sources have been most successful?
School	Response	Response
Rufforth Primary	People in the community either express an interest in being a governor or welcome an approach to be one	looking for people with the appropriate skills and the time
Scarcroft Primary	Recommendations from existing governors	
Skelton Primary	Personal approaches / contacts, advert in parish magazine,	All
Westfield Primary Comm	Business contacts, associates of other governors, former parent governors, bank manager, local medical services	Local business, personal/governor contacts and former parents
Woodthorpe Primary	Headteacher / Chair - but real sources to tap into	None

Responses to Qu.9 - What reasons do people give for not taking on the role of community governors?	
School	Response
Archbishop of York's Junior	Time Commitments
Burton Green Primary	Do not have the time
Carr Junior	Time, commitment, availability during school hours
Clifton Green Primary	Time demands
Copmanthorpe Primary	Lack of time - prior commitments
Dringhouses Primary	Not enough time, misunderstanding or role
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	Luckily no one has refused yet
Scarcroft Primary	work commitments and commitment required to role of governor
Skelton Primary	Time commitment, not addressing the issues they are interested in
Westfield Primary Community	Too busy, work commitments, lack of knowledge of education, time commitment required, some don't even respond to letter, medical reasons
Woodthorpe Primary	When we have known of someone we have been successful. The LA says that being a primary school is not attractive and our geography has been cited (i.e. location)

Responses From the Governing Body Questionnaire Relating to Ways of Increasing Community Involvement with Governing Bodies

Responses to Qu.11 - What involvement does the local community have in the life of your school and vice versa?	
School	Response
Burton Green Primary	We have 2 volunteers (RSVP) who help in classes, students (YSIS) give voluntary help. The school is a hub for information and help for parents, summer and christmas fairs open to all, school used as a site for community liaison - CYC Neighbour fairs/events
Carr Junior	Children's centre, use of school facilities (swimming pool, hall hire) visits from police, fire & religious bodies. Presence at open days, school fairs and events
Clifton Green Primary	Although there is much involvement with families of pupils, 50% of local population are students, elderly and high turnover of young professionals. However, the school encourages activities throughout the year to work in partnership with local businesses and local churches. Senior citizens are involved in Citizenship work to enable the children to have an experience of working with senior citizens in local residential care homes. This work with the pupils is to nurture a respect and care for all members of the local community.
Copmanthorpe Primary	Pre-school partnership, use of school pool, rooms in schools for lettings, field used by local junior teams. Also guides/brownies.
Dringhouses Primary	Strong support from local business, faith groups, sports and social groups and local residents
Lord Deramore's	Local Secondary Schools, Community Police, Universite, Church and Science Park Companies
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	A number of local people and groups come into school to take specialist clubs/groups
Rufforth Primary	PTA, Community hall for hire, after school club, attend school events, as Governors
Scarcroft Primary	Partnerships/visits with local businesses, nurseries, St Clements Church, local secondary schools, using school as polling station, location for weaving classes, occasional visits to residential care homes, visits from Police, Fire Brigade & School Nurse
Skelton Primary	Visits into community/church/Doctors surgery. Events open to all e.g. 50yr anniversary. Carol singing at Tesco, gardening at shop & other activities
Westfield Primary Community	Through the extended schools and Children's Centre services e.g. 'The Westfield Wiggle', Toy Bus, 'Tea & Tunes', Food Festival, Harvest Festival, Music Concerts - as featured in the Press
Woodthorpe Primary	Soccer Team, Girl Guides, Parents Group and our family room is well used; Playgroup is sited within school

School	Response	
Burton Green Primary	Regular letters to parents, articles in the local press	Yes - we get excellent attendance at events - parents, grandparents, former pupils etc
Carr Junior	Friends of Carr (a wider ? PTA organisation) via Children's Centre	No - the social economic make-up of the community includes a significant lack of interest
Clifton Green Primary	Through local church magazine (delivered to 2000 homes), Press coverage, inviting local residents to school events, advertised school fund raising activities, working with the Children's Centre	No - some of local community has little interest in Primary School activities
Copmanthorpe Primary	Newsletter, Info on village newsletter, invites to special events	No - people too busy to read info
Dringhouses Primary	Some GPs who live in the area are recognised community leaders involved in numerous other community organisations and networks. Good use of school website and popular venue for local ward committee	No - you can never reach all parts of the community but rather a good proportion which reflects levels of proportionality on cohesion matters and the associated equality impacts
Huntington Primary	Fairs, PTAs	Yes - Parish Council, Parent Body, Law Enforcement, Community
Popperton Ousebank Primary	Through a 'School Brochure' which is delivered to every house in the village and through links with the Parish Council	No - We are currently looking for community sponsorship and recognise that we could do more
Rufforth Primary	Parents Newsletters, parish magazine, Yes Street Press every term, school profile on line / school website	Yes
Scarcroft Primary	Via the local press, school billboards to advertise local events, police bulletin board, newsletter displayed at school	No - Not possible to ensure that everyone in the local community sees the publicity/news items about the school
Skelton Primary	Via children and parents, parish newsletter, posters in village	Yes - we try hard to reach everyone but the nature of Skelton makes this difficult. Parish Council sees same problem
Westfield Primary Community	School newsletter, Governors newsletter, School Home Support, Family Learning Outreach, leaflet drops, the Press, Local Radio, Information letters, Doctors Surgeries, Libraries	Yes
Woodthorpe Primary	Governors newsletter to parents but there is no community as such in Woodthorpe/Acomb Park	No

Responses to Qu.14 - How do you consult the school local community?	
School	Response
Archbishop of York Junior	Stakeholder questionnaire
Burton Green Primary	Parent Questionnaires
Carr Junior	Parent Surveys, pupil surveys, ICC Partnership Board (local parents group)
Clifton Green Primary	Other than statutory consultation e.g. 'Building Works', tends to be via parents
Copmanthorpe Primary	Through links listed in Qu.11
Dringhouses Primary	with due regard to the issue being consulted on and which groups need to be actively engaged in that consultation. On wider matters good use has previously been made of the ward committee
Huntington Primary	Surveys, word of mouth, summer fayres
Lord Deramore's	We consult parents/ carers regularly by questionnaire, meetings, working groups and open events in school
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	Not sure what we need to consult on ? We are having an open evening this term which all member of the community will be invited to but more for information than consultation
Rufforth Primary	Consultation, questionnaires, public meetings
Scarcroft Primary	Through ward committee where relevant, parents regularly consulted on relevant issues obtaining views and
Skelton Primary	Via children and parents. Governor of Parish Council
Westfield Primary Community	Pupil and parent surveys, feedback on school and governing body letters, OFSTED survey, Children's Centre
Woodthorpe Primary	We Don't

Responses to Qu.15 - Are you aware of any need within the school's local community that the school does or could help to meet?

School	Response
Archbishop of York Junior	Recently sent out Extended School questionnaire but results not available yet - not expecting any major gaps
Burton Green Primary	Give a lot of support to families (many of whom are in great need) If we had more resources we could do more
Carr Junior	Provision of 'Learning to Swim' classes
Clifton Green Primary	Working with the police to reduce anti-social behaviour. Activities to promote community cohesion e.g. multi-cultural evenings, senior citizenship events
Copmanthorpe Primary	None that we are aware of
Dringhouses Primary	No
Huntington Primary	Childcare
Lord Deramore's	No
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	We are starting Parents Forums which may raise some needs
Rufforth Primary	Contribution to the Parish Plan. Provision of facilities for young people in the village
Scarcroft Primary	Holiday and extra after school provision
Skelton Primary	No
Westfield Primary Community	Extended provision as detail in Qu.18. Also provide services for Polling Station use, Pilot for Community Policing,
Woodthorpe Primary	We are the only available resource for the community to meet in, but there is no sense of 'Community' - perhaps our

This page is intentionally left blank

Qu 8. What additional training do you need to support you in your role as a Governor?

General

Heads & Chairs working together / Work life balance
 Understanding and overview of what is appropriate at the time you become a governor
 Experience and knowledge of other parent governors would help
 Better access to LA officers and their work
 better links with the community
 curriculum issues
 Awareness bulletins
 Marketing in how to increase school volunteers
 Developing the role of a new governor and integration into the GB
 dealing with practical issues and developing problem solving skills
 practical skills in how to monitor school effectively
 help in integrating old and new governors
 Procedures and who to contact with regard to issues with Headteacher and staff
 Time management training
 Regular e-mail updates about new responsibilities of governing bodies
 Opportunities to observe teaching sessions, eg videos at home
 Refresher courses to keep informed of updates
 To be kept up to date with educational developments
 Availability of training is more important than the content at present
 refresher courses to keep up to date
 Question and answer sessions prove very useful
 Short policy updates or key briefings
 More computer based courses because of time constraints
 ongoing refresher training
 Further guidance on monitoring and evaluation role
 training specific to ones own school would be beneficial
 Governor body training to understand the role of the governor
 Clear indications of how to run a years work and info on new responsibilities, eg examples of good practice

Government/Law

Help understanding jargon / and constantly changing political requirements / & changing means of assessment
 To be kept up to date with new requirements / Law etc.
 Timely updates on key government initiatives required
 Ongoing changes to legislation
 Continual updating on curriculum and legislation developments
 new initiatives/change to law
 Updates on government legislation as and when required

Finance

More insight into budget flow charts
Financial/budget training needed
Further training eg education budget, law relating to governors
more support with financial requirements
More financial training
understanding of the school budget
understanding financial spreadsheets

Health & Safety

health and safety training
Health and safety updates

Specific Roles

Help in understanding the role of governors in church schools
link governor - lesson observation technique and do's and don'ts
Roles and responsibilities of personnel chair
Role as curriculum committee chair
To fully understand my role as a parent governor, chair of finance committee & link governor for numeracy.

Specialist Training

Specialised training event courses and new curriculum issues
Child protection training courses to get more involved and qualified
Special needs and disability equality
Training on bullying, as this has been cancelled
Training on special needs if possible
Working with children course

Benefits to the Governor Support & Development Service As A Result of the School Governor Scrutiny Review

Training Provision

The responses to the questionnaire sent to individual governors have underpinned the and added weight to the case for extended training provision for governors. This extended provision will now provide access to three types of training:

Generic Core Training

The core training programme will continue to be offered.

Online Training

This is currently being piloted in all schools and governors are coming back with helpful and positive feedback. It is envisaged that online training will be offered to all schools from September 2008.

Whole Governing Body Training

A list of titles suitable for whole governing body training will be offered from September 2008. Where this training is taken up, and where it is appropriate to do so, the opportunity to participate will be opened up to other schools in the vicinity of the hosting school - this will ensure that the very best use of Officer time and value for money can be achieved.

These are all opportunities identified through the individual school governor survey and selected by governors as helpful methods of training.

In addition, as a result of the responses to the governing body questionnaire, it is planned to reinstate the annual governors' conference, although the responses showed a reluctance by governing bodies to contribute to the actual cost of such a conference, which is disappointing.

The take-up of governing body self-review continues and this also provides an opportunity to identify individual training needs.

Other Benefits

The governance service database has been updated with the equalities information gathered via the individual governor survey. This information has already been used to complete the National Benchmarking exercise, which asks for details of the ethnic representation amongst governors, the gender balance and other details collected by the survey.

The exit questionnaire is now part of the process undertaken when a governor resigns or ends his or her term of office and the information contained in that may provide invaluable information to support retention strategies.

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Management Committee**15 September 2008**

Report of the Democratic Services Manager

Update on Implementation of Recommendations of Previous Scrutiny Reviews**Summary**

1. This report provides Members with update information on the implementation of recommendations made as a result of previously completed review on Guidance For Sustainable Development.

Background

2. At a previous meeting of Scrutiny Management Committee, Members requested an update on the implementation of the recommendations made as a result of all completed scrutiny reviews since 2004, which were subsequently approved by the Executive. Many have been presented and those where implementation has been completed have been signed off.

Consultation

3. Relevant officers within the City Strategy Directorate have provided update information on the recommendations arising from the review and will be in attendance at the meeting to answer any arising questions.

Analysis

4. The review on 'Guidance on Sustainable Development' was completed in October 2006 and the Executive approved the recommendations listed in Annex A in March 2007. The first update on the implementation of those recommendations is attached at Annex A to this report.

Options

5. With regard to Annex A, Members may choose to :
 - a. Sign off those recommendations where implementation has been completed, and
 - b. Request further updates to clarify any outstanding recommendations

Corporate Strategy

6. The process of monitoring the implementation of approved recommendations will evidence our stated value to 'encourage improvement in everything we do'.

Implications

7. There are no known Financial, Human Resources, Equalities, Legal, ITT or Other implications connected to this report".

Risk Management

8. In compliance with the Councils risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with this report.

Recommendations

9. Members are asked to note the contents of this report and agree which recommendations arising from previously completed scrutiny reviews can be signed off.

Reason: To raise awareness of those recommendations which have still to be implemented.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager
01904 551030

Report Approved Date 13 August 2008

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes

Annex A – Update on the implementation of recommendations arising from the previously completed scrutiny review of 'Guidance on Sustainable Development'

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendation as approved by the Executive on 13 March 2007	Update on Implementation of Recommendations as of Sept 2008
Guidance For Sustainable Development (Review Completed in October 2006) Contact ?	1	That sustainability statements submitted by developers must clearly demonstrate that a) 'whole life' costing , have been properly evaluated and accounted for in terms of Best Practice b) 'life-long building principles have been applied to all proposed developments. This to be referred to the LDF Working Group for consideration, in the light of public consultation results and emerging national and regional guidance.	All commercial and residential development is required to be accompanied by a sustainability statement, in line with the criteria listed in draft Local Plan policy GP4a. This includes describing how the proposal would minimise the use of non-renewable resources, re-use materials already on the development site and consider how the 'whole life' costs of materials, their performance and maintenance has been factored in. The IPS explains the level of detailed assessment required (whether BREEAM or CSH) in relation to the scale and type of development proposed, ranging from completion of the domestic extensions questionnaire to full BREEAM submission for large scale commercial development. Other types of development, while not requiring a sustainability statement, should still accord with local plan criteria, and should therefore also have regard to whole life costing.
	2	That developers are required to incorporate of renewable energy heating or power systems into all future developments - This to be referred to the LDF Working Group for consideration, in the light of public consultation results and emerging national and regional guidance.	The IPS: Sustainable Design and Construction requires all developers to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation. 10% for large commercial (500m2 and over) / residential sites (over 5 dwellings) and 5 % for small scale developments (less than 500m2 or less than 4 dwellings) .
	3	That Solar Gain will be considered when assessing all planning proposals to ensure that proposed new developments or major refurbishments do not impact upon measures for active or passive solar gain in existing developments that surround them. Developers will be required to evidence assessment of the impact of development proposals on solar gain on neighbouring developments, whether they be existing structures or proposed structures in receipt of prior planning permission. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	This is currently not undertaken. Through the IPS solar gain is not considered for surrounding buildings, only directly for the building under construction.
	4	That all new or significantly refurbished developments will give consideration to incorporating sustainable – renewably powered – street lighting. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	This is currently not undertaken through the IPS. The IPS asks for efficient appliances only. However, the Council are currently considering trials for this under the carbon management programme.
	5	That developers be required to replace proposals for areas of impermeable hard standing with plans incorporate standing (or forms of pavier) which provides for water to soak away. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	Through the IPS, developers are required to include a statement on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) including justifications as to whether or not this can be achieved.
	6	That all new developments will incorporate the provision of water butts to ensure rainwater harvesting and water recycling from roof run-off - This to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group in the light of public consultation results and emerging national and regional guidance, and that it be noted that this proposal is included in the draft SPG that is currently being consulted on.	Through the IPS, residential developments are required to fit water butts with gardens or landscape areas
	7	That all new developments will incorporate grey water recycling - This to be referred to the LDF Working Group for consideration, in the light of public consultation results and emerging national and regional guidance.	Through the IPS all developments are required to include an evaluation of grey water recycling systems
	8	The Executive's support for the establishment of new woodland be recorded and the Director of City Strategy be requested to develop options for achieving this and for sustaining existing tree cover in the City - this recommendation to be referred to the LDF Working Group with a request that they consider and advise on establishing a policy that would increase the percentage of tree cover in the City	This will be considered as part of the forth coming Tree strategy
	9	That all new developments be encouraged to plant a fruit tree for each new property or, if a fruit tree is not suitable, that another small native species be planted. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	This is carried out where appropriate on an ongoing basis
	10	That developers are required to show planting plans for all new developments. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	This is ongoing through the planning process
	11	That all new developments shall require developers to plant native species hedging in preference to fencing or walls - the Executive has reservations about whether this form of boundary treatment would be appropriate in every case and requests the LDF Working Group to consider carefully the implications of adopting such a blanket policy of this nature.	This is considered where appropriate
	12	That environmental sustainability be specifically referred to within the context of the 'Historic Environment'. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	The Core Strategy will cover strategic policy issues concerning the historic environment. We will make sure this is cross referenced with considerations of sustainable design and construction.
	13	That efforts are made to ensure that historic buildings, including the space above shops, incorporate high quality insulation and double glazing, where it is possible to do so without compromising the appearance of the building. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.	The design of buildings within the historic environment is an issue considered as part of the Core Strategy Issues and Options document (Sept 2007). The document encouraged the preservation and enhancement of York's historic environment and explores options of how this can be done.

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendation as approved by the Executive on 13 March 2007	Update on Implementation of Recommendations as of Sept 2008
Guidance For Sustainable Development (Review Completed in October 2006)	14	<p>That overdevelopment should be avoided. In particular the LDF core strategy should prevent the construction of excessively high buildings, and seek to enhance the historic environment by, where possible, incorporating buildings and traffic-free public green space with the mutual aims of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Providing good views of architecturally significant build whether this be historic or modern ii improving biodiversity and green corridors iii improving air quality and rain water soak away iv creating a greater percentage of public open space across the city <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Executive recognises merits in the general approach of Recommendation 14 but in the absence of agreed definitions finds it impossible to understand the practicality of implementing the suggestion, and b. The recommendation be referred to Officers for further information and to incorporate the views of the LDF Working Group. 	<p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options document's (Sept 2007) vision stipulates that York's historical and archaeological wealth and setting should be recognised, preserved and enhanced; in particular its historic centre, skyline, street patterns, views of the Minster, Medieval and Roman walls and valued open spaces, including the Strays and its 34 conservation areas.</p> <p>In addition to the Core Strategy, the Council are also preparing a City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) which will eventually become the 20 year vision for the city centre. This document is currently at the Issues and Options stage. It considers design issues related to the city centre, including consideration of views and tall buildings.</p> <p>As part of the LDF evidence base, work is currently ongoing on the Biodiversity Audit and Action Plan for the city. It is anticipated that this will be completed by the end of the year. This work along with other work on open space and green infrastructure will form the basis of the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy. It is anticipated that this will be produced as a Supplementary Planning Document in support of the LDF Core Strategy.</p> <p>Guidance on air quality is currently being developed by the Council's Environmental Protection section. The issue of rain water soak away is included within the IPS.</p> <p>In August 2008, the Council approved an open space study which assesses current open space and makes recommendations for future provisions. This will now form part of LDF's evidence base. It will inform our future approach to writing policies and also setting targets for different areas of the City and for different typologies of open space.</p>
	15	<p>That green spaces and gardens are preserved, particularly in the city centre, and that new green space and/or sustainable designed water features be incorporated into all major new developments.</p>	<p>The IPS stipulates that relevant large scale commercial and residential developments should incorporate sustainable urban drainage, in practice allowing for sustainable water features. In addition the Council's recent open space study which will support the LDF process will allow added protection to be given to green spaces. This will be supported by ongoing work on green infrastructure, also being undertaken as supporting work to the LDF.</p>
	16	<p>That new developments should be built on 'Life-long' principles. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.</p>	<p>Within the Core Strategy Issues and Options document (Sept 2007) (which is a part of the Local Development Framework – LDF), information regarding Lifetime Homes is included. This promotes 'life-long' buildings which are able to adapt to people's changing needs throughout their lifetimes.</p>
	17	<p>That access to public transport be a material consideration when evaluating planning proposals for health service provision, such as dentists' or doctors' surgeries. This recommendation to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group.</p>	<p>Through the IPS, sustainability statements should include a detailed account of accessibility issues via sustainable means. i.e. walking, cycling, public transport (access to be within 400m). BREEAM also takes these issues into account. The Core Strategy Issues and Options document (Sept 2007) also looks at sustainable transport initiatives. Access to transport is a key indicator when looking at the development of existing settlements and deciding where future development should go. Again, further policy guidance will be produced through the production of an SPD.</p>
	18	<p>That work involving engagement with local architects to assess interest, familiarity with and use of sustainable construction methods be conducted by officers in Buildings Control. Following consideration by the LDF Working Group, officers to report back on the operational, workload and financial implications.</p>	<p>The previous sustainability officer (KP) was trying to arrange a series of workshops for local architects/developers to gauge interest. The original workshops were cancelled due to what is now the Sustainability IPS being withdrawn for further consultation, and it was not possible to reschedule due to resource issues. It is anticipated that this be now be reactivated with the current Sustainability officer.</p>
	19	<p>That Buildings Control investigate the sourcing and availability of materials for sustainable development in York and make that information readily available to the public. Following consideration by the LDF Working Group, officers to report back on the operational, workload and financial implications.</p>	<p>Due to the factors identified above and lack of staff resource (CYC BC officers currently operate at double the national officer caseload) this has not been possible.</p>
	20	<p>That City of York Council produce its own Sustainable Developers Guide. Following consideration by the LDF Working Group, officers to report back on the operational, workload and financial implications.</p>	<p>Completed. The new IPS: Sustainable Design and Construction was adopted in Nov 2007. Training has been implemented across the Development Control teams, with more to follow in 2008/09.</p>
	21	<p>That a feasibility study be carried out to explore the viability of Building Control acting as the Council's promoter of sustainable construction. Following consideration by the LDF Working Group, officers to report back on the operational, workload and financial implications.</p>	<p>The previous sustainability officer (KP) was trying to arrange a series of workshops for local architects/developers to gauge interest. The original workshops were cancelled due to what is now the Sustainability IPS being withdrawn for further consultation, and it was not possible to</p>

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendation as approved by the Executive on 13 March 2007	Update on Implementation of Recommendations as of Sept 2008
Guidance For Sustainable Development (Review Completed in October 2006)	22	That a single unified web portal be created with a direct link from the City of York council's Homepage, providing centrally linked information regarding recommendations (i) to (xi). Officers to report back on the financial implications as part of the budget build exercise for next year and, in the meantime, that such information as is readily and economically available be posted on the existing Council website.	This has not been possible however the IPS: Sustainable Design and Construction is available on the council's website and covers key aspects to sustainable design and construction. Other pages on this site also cover aspects as outlined above.
	23	That City of York Council, in consultation with the Local Strategic Partnership and steering group of LA21, adopt and monitor the following Local Quality of Life Indicators, with a particular bearing on energy and environmental impact: i levels of key air pollutants ii carbon dioxide emissions, by sector and per capita emissions iii average annual domestic consumption of gas and electricity (kWh) Officers to report back on the implications of this recommendation.	The national indicator set requires council to monitor I and ii. Iii is harder to achieve but Defra issues a figure per capita emissions in local area. The council will also continue to report on the carbon and ecological footprint of York and its own carbon emissions from estates and transport.
	24	That the improving reputation of the authority related to the standards of sustainable construction applied to the ecoDepot be maintained through the adoption of a policy requiring equal or higher standards of sustainable construction for all future commissioned properties, or the refurbishment of properties within the authority's portfolio and that this policy be applied whether the property is public amenity, business or domestic – eg: schools, leisure facilities and office environments. This to be referred for consideration by the LDF Working Group in the light of public consultation results and emerging national and regional guidance, and that Officers report back on the financial and practical implications of adopting a blanket policy of this sort, but that the attention of the Working Group dealing with the new City Hall project be drawn to this important issue.	The IPS and Intrim Sustainable Construction & Design Policy - Property Services ensure this achieved.
	25	That the executive support proposals to formally request the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly to endorse the development of recognised voluntary standards above the minimum promoting lower energy usage and emissions. Officers to provide additional information in the light of existing regional and emerging national policies and, in respect of ITT applications, resource, capacity and financing issues.	This has not been possible due to resource issues.
Scrutiny Comment as of ?:			

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Management Committee

15th September 2008

Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee – Co-option

Summary

1. This report asks Members to consider formally co-opting Sir Ron Cooke onto the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee.

Background

2. At the initial meeting of the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee held on 21st July 2008, the Committee suggested that Sir Ron Cooke be invited to join the Committee as a co-opted Member.
3. Sir Ron Cooke is the former Vice-Chancellor of York University and he is currently the Chair of 'Without Walls'; the Local Strategic Partnership. He was also Vice Chair of [York@Large](#) when the original idea of a Cultural Quarter was proposed.
4. Sir Ron Cooke is also very involved with the York Civic Trust and has recently written a book for them entitled 'York: A Special Place' which sets out a vision for a vibrant city.
5. Constitutionally, Scrutiny Management Committee has the power to make appointments to its established Scrutiny Sub-Committees.
6. Sir Ron Cooke, if appointed as a non-voting co-optee, will be eligible to claim travel and subsistence expenses for any meetings he attends and will of course, contribute, through his advice and expertise, to the work and final report of the Sub-Committee.

Consultation

7. Members of the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee are pleased to be able to benefit from the expertise of Sir Ron Cooke and would welcome his formal co-option. It is in keeping with the spirit of scrutiny reviews being informed by relevant 'experts'.
8. Whatever Members of the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee decide to recommend in relation to the Cultural Quarter will need the support of partners from 'Without Walls.'

Options

9. Members can either approve or reject the proposal to co-opt Sir Ron Cooke in a non-voting capacity for the remainder of the existing review.

Analysis

10. The benefits of inviting Sir Ron Cooke to become a formal co-opted Member are considerable. His expertise in this field and his knowledge of the local area and the proposed Cultural Quarter are essential to the progress of this review.

Corporate Strategy & Improvements

11. Although not directly relevant to the current identified corporate improvements, it would be beneficial to the Council and this particular scrutiny to maximise the technical knowledge and expertise available to it.

Implications

12. There are no known financial, HR, legal, crime & disorder or other implications associated with this report or the recommendation below.

Risk Management

13. There are no risk management implications in relation to this matter

Recommendations

14. That Members consider formally appointing Sir Ron Cooke as a non-voting co-opted Member for the duration of the Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Reason: In keeping with other existing co-option practices.

Contact Details

Author:
Tracy Wallis
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
01904 551714

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Quentin Baker
Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services
01904 551004

Report Approved **Date** 12th August 2008

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected: Guildhall, Holgate & Micklegate

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes: None



Scrutiny Management Committee

15 September 2008

Proposed Development of New Council Headquarters at Hungate – Feasibility Report

Summary

1. This report asks Members to consider a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor Jenny Brooks to scrutinise the proposed development of the new Council headquarters at Hungate.

Criteria

2. Councillor Brooks believes that this topic fits with the following eligibility criteria as set out in the topic registration form at Annex A:
 - Public Interest – the public have expressed their concern via the local newspaper at the location, design and costs involved with the proposed new council offices. It is highly likely that the ongoing work of the council to develop an alternative office building will continue to be of great interest to the public and therefore, if there are lessons to be learnt at this stage in the process then they need to be identified quickly.
 - Level of Risk – There has already been a significant increase in costs on the accommodation project to date and the risk is that this increase in costs will continue to grow if the reasons for the delays are not identified and addressed.
 - National/Local/Regional Significance – The decision on where to locate the new council office building and the ongoing development costs to the council, is of local significance, as evidenced in the public's comments to date.
3. The Head of Property Services has commented on the identified eligibility criteria as follows:

“I agree with the eligibility criteria, however, would wish to add Corporate Priorities, as the provision of the new accommodation and the consequential improvements in services to our customers will contribute to all of the Council's priorities.”
4. As the Hungate development falls within the remit of the Leader of the Council, Cllr Waller has provided the following comments:

“At this critical time it is essential that the scrutiny review does not delay the progress of the project, as the same officers will be involved in delivering that

scheme as would be engaged with the scrutiny review. It is important that the review remain focused on the specific issues raised and does not become a prolonged catch all re-invention of the project.”

Background

5. In early July 2008, the Council decided to withdraw its planning application for the proposed development of its new office accommodation at Hungate following comments from English Heritage that although the proposed building was a very impressive, sustainable and fit for purpose civic building, it would not fit properly into the proposed location. The Council were disappointed with their views as they had worked closely with English Heritage and other organisations to create the plans for the building.
6. Members of the public commented on this decision and previous decisions taken in regard to the Hungate development and as a result of the concerns expressed, Cllr Brooks submitted this topic for scrutiny review in order to fully understand those decisions and the costs involved to date.

Consultation

13. In order to answer the questions raised within the topic registration form, the Head of Property Services has provided information on the previous decisions taken in regard to:
 - Why the Hungate site was chosen and specifically why that plot on the Hungate site was chosen
 - The selection process that led to the appointment of the design team and the process for developing and selecting the final design submitted for planning approval
 - The initial budget and overspend estimates
 - Which CYC entity acted as the internal client and why
 - The consultation process i.e. how it was carried out and was the feedback used to inform the decisions
14. It is expected that this information (shown at Annex B) will raise a number of further questions in regard to the decisions taken, the procedures followed and the costs incurred to date. If this is the case, a decision should be taken to proceed with this review. In recognising what further information is required, the committee should agree a remit for the review which will help to identify the relevant missing facts.
15. It may be necessary to consult with English Heritage on the feedback they provided throughout the process, in order to better understand their final comments on the unsuitability of the building at the Hungate location.

Conduct of Review

16. If a decision is taken to proceed with this review, members of the project team will need to be involved, therefore their ongoing work would benefit from the review being commenced as soon as possible and completed within a minimum number of meetings. Key members of the project team are on annual leave during late September / early October and therefore they would only be able to provide support to the scrutiny process from mid October onwards. With this in mind and in consideration of the committee commitments in the Council calendar, the following series of meeting dates are suggested:

Meeting One (possible ½ day event on 10 October)	Consider a scoping report detailing the required information as identified within the remit for the review. Meet the relevant officers and if necessary representatives from English Heritage and the other organisations involved, to clarify any issues arising from the information provided in the feasibility and scoping reports
Meeting Two (30 October)	Consider an interim report which details the findings from the consultation sessions held as part of the first meeting Analyse those findings and agree any recommendations
Meeting Three (12 / 18 Nov)	Consider a draft final report which includes the findings, analysis and recommendations. Agree any amendments and/or sign off the final report

12. Please note, it will only be possible to carry out the review in the minimum number of meetings identified above, if the ad-hoc committee set up to carry out the review, are able to clearly and quickly identify what information they require and if that information is made available in a timely manner.

Implications

13. **Human Resources** – it will be necessary to involve members of the project team in any review of this topic, which in turn will reduce the time they can spend on their ongoing work on the development.
14. **Financial** – There will be some financial implications associated with officer time spent supporting this review but this should be limited due to the small number of meetings required.
15. There are no equalities, legal or other implications associated with the recommendation within this report

Risk Management

16. There is a risk associated with not approving the recommendation made below, in that it is possible that issues around the procedures being followed as part of the development process will not be identified, which in turn may lead to further complications and delays.

Recommendations

17. Having considered the information contained within this report and its associated annexes, it is recommended that an ad-hoc scrutiny committee be set up to carry out a review of the Hungate Development, with a start date around mid October. This will provide officers with sufficient time to pull together any further information required.
18. Having considered all of the information provided by the Head of Property Services in answer to the questions raised within the topic registration form, Cllr Brooks would like to suggest a remit for this review detailing an overall aim and a number of key objectives – see Annex C attached.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
Tel No. 01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Dawn Steel
Democratic Services Manager
Tel No.01904 551030

Report Approved



Date

3 September 2008

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Implications: HR & Financial
Neil Hindhaugh
Head of Property Services
Tel 01904 553312

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Annexes

Annex A – Topic Registration Form

Annex B – Information in response to topic registration form

Annex C – Suggested Remit for Scrutiny Review



Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

Fields marked with an asterisk * are required.

* Proposed topic: **Proposed Development of the Hungate Council Headquarters**

* Councillor registering the topic **Councillor Jenny Brooks**

Submitted due to an unresolved 'Cllr Call for Action' enquiry



Please complete this section as thoroughly as you can. The information provided will help Scrutiny Officers and Scrutiny Members to assess the following key elements to the success of any scrutiny review:

How a review should best be undertaken given the subject

Who needs to be involved

What should be looked at

By when it should be achieved; and

Why we are doing it ?

Please describe how the proposed topic fits with 3 of the eligibility criteria attached.

	Yes?	Policy Development & Review	Service Improvement & Delivery	Accountability of Executive Decisions
Public Interest (ie. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under Performance / Service Dissatisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In keeping with corporate priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level of Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National/local/regional significance e.g. A central government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* **Set out briefly the purpose of any scrutiny review of your proposed topic. What do you think it should achieve?**

To understand the decisions made, including the withdrawal of the planning application for the Hungate site and the costs involved to date, with a view to ensuring that any future decisions regarding the new council offices development are taken in a timely and cost efficient way.

* **Please explain briefly what you think any scrutiny review of your proposed**

topic should cover.

1. Why was the Hungate site chosen?
2. Why was the location on the Hungate site chosen?
3. What were the initial budget and overspend estimates?
4. What was the selection process which led to the design of the building?
5. Which CYC entity acted as the internal client and why?
6. Was the consultation process appropriate?
7. Why was the final design submitted?

*** Please indicate which other Councils, partners or external services could, in your opinion, participate in the review, saying why.**

York Civic Trust & English Heritage

*** Explain briefly how, in your opinion, such a review might be most efficiently undertaken?**

The review should be taken over a short period such as two or three days in October or November (as opposed to one meeting a month for six months) and should be completed by Christmas.

Estimate the timescale for completion.

- 1-3 months
- 3-6 months
- 6-9 months

Support documents or other useful information

None

Date submitted: Wednesday, 16th July, 2008, 11.50 am

Submitted by: Barbara Matthews on behalf of Cllr Jenny Brooks

Annexe B Hungate Report Accommodation Project - Scrutiny Topic

Overview

The accommodation project has been managed within a project management framework adopting the basic principles of the well-established PRINCE 2 project management methodology. This was a key component of the accommodation project business case approved by Members in November 2005.

The main features of the methodology include a modular planning approach with the project divided into manageable and controllable stages with a clearly defined organisational structure led by the project board made up of key directors and assistant directors representing each directorate. The board is responsible to the Corporate Management Team for the overall direction and management of the project within the parameters of the approved business case. Matters of policy or strategic interest or those, which fall outside the business case being directed to the Executive for discussion and/or approval. To support consultation across the council and timely decision-making the structure includes a Member steering group made up of representatives from each party. The project board meets on a monthly basis to review the status of the project, provide direction on issues and risk and give approvals as required.

The major controls for the project include the approved business case, project plan, risk register, issues logs, exception reports and end of stage assessments. The project is supported by a robust project filing structure where the entire project information is captured and recorded. This structure is the source of the information provided to the scrutiny committee.

Reference No.	Document Title
01	Administrative Accommodation: Project Initiation Document v4.0 (& 10* supporting annexes)

1. Why was the Hungate site chosen?

Through the review process, the council indicated a preference for a city centre one-site solution to maximise benefits through facilitating more collaborative team and partnership working, and rationalisation in areas such as ICT, post distribution and facilities management. A city centre location was also considered important in supporting the planning policy guidance (PPS 6) to retain the city's character as a place where people can both live and work and to retain the economic vitality of the town centre. A city centre location would also support the green travel plan whereby York currently enjoys a travel to work pattern, which is unique in that a large number of staff walk or cycle to work. In response to consultation with stakeholders, 80% of staff

placed working in the city centre as their top priority. It is for these reasons that a large out-of-town site was thought to be inappropriate.

In June 2004 property consultants Donaldsons worked with the council to carry out a site options appraisal to compile a short list of sites likely to be capable of responding to the future accommodation needs of the authority. At a meeting of the Executive on 1st February 2005, Members approved a site option appraisal to include the recommended short-listed sites at 84 Piccadilly, Blackfriars House (Rougier Street), 17-21 Piccadilly and Hungate. Each of the sites was appraised qualitatively in terms of its suitability and deliverability to meet the council's objectives using an agreed set of criteria. The one site solution at Hungate was the scheme, which represented the highest overall score in terms of suitability and deliverability and was recommended and approved as the scheme to be taken forward.

Reference No.	Document Title
02	Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres
03	Meeting of the Executive 1 st Feb 05: Accommodation Review – Site Option Appraisal (& 7* supporting annexes)
04	Meeting of the Executive 1 st Feb 05: Committee Minutes
05	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Business Case (& 8* supporting annexes)
06	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Committee Minutes

2. Why was the location on the Hungate site chosen?

The location on the site was chosen because a significant proportion (car park & Peasholme Hostel site) was in council ownership and available within the timescales of the project.

The Hungate masterplan designated the location for office use, providing an opportunity for a major office development of landmark status and sustainable design in the city centre.

Reference No.	Document Title
07	Hungate Master Plan Development Brief
08	Hungate Master Plan - Maps

3. What were the initial budget estimates and overspend estimates?

The information relating to the initial budget estimates and the current approved capital budget of £43.8m is detailed sequentially in the financial sections of the Executive reports listed below.

Reference No.	Document Title
05	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Business Case (& 8* supporting annexes)
06	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Committee Minutes

09	Meeting of the Executive 10 th Oct 06: Accommodation Project – Update (& 2* supporting annexes)
10	Meeting of the Executive 10 th Oct 06: Committee Minutes
11	Meeting of the Executive 24 th July 07 (& 4* supporting annexes)
12	Meeting of the Executive 24 th July 07: Committee Minutes
13	Meeting of the Executive 17 th June 08 (& 2 supporting annexes)
14	Meeting of the Executive 17 th June 08: Committee Minutes

4a. What was the selection process that led to the appointment of the design team?

Design Team selection, including the construction contractor, was carried out under Council financial and procurement regulations and through the OJEU procurement process. This included pre-qualification, tender and final interview stages. The outcome of the tender process was referred to the Executive (February 2007) to confirm acceptance of the most economically advantageous tender. The mechanism for selection is set out in reference document Admin_Acomm_Tender_Document_Sept06_v1 Appendix 3.

Reference No.	Document Title
15	Contract Documents for the Office Accommodation Project, York: September 2006
05	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Business Case (& 8* supporting annexes)
06	Meeting of the Executive 22 nd Nov 05: Committee Minutes
09	Meeting of the Executive 10 th Oct 06: Accommodation Project Update (& 2* supporting annexes)
10	Meeting of the Executive 10 th Oct 06: Committee Minutes
16	Meeting of the Executive 13 th Feb 07: Administrative Accommodation Project (& 5* supporting annexes)
17	Meeting of the Executive 13 th Feb 07: Committee Minutes
11	Meeting of the Executive 24 th Jul 07: Accommodation Project Update (& 4* supporting annexes)
12	Meeting of the Executive 24 th Jul 07: Committee Minutes

4b. What was the process for developing and selecting the final design submitted for planning approval?

Refer to Design Team end of Stage Report and responses to question 6 and 7.

Reference No.	Document Title
18	RMJM Stage B Report: June 2007
19	RMJM Stage C Addendum: March 2008
20	RMJM Stage D Report: May 2008

5. Which CYC entity acted as the internal client and why?

Resources – Property Services as the Corporate Landlord responsible for the delivery of the councils Asset Management Plan and responsible for the management of the administrative accommodation portfolio.

Reference No.	Document Title
21	Corporate Asset Management Plan

6. Was the consultation process appropriate?

The council carried out extensive consultation with key stakeholders, including English Heritage, about the design of the proposed new headquarters prior to submitting the planning application.

Residents were also able to view designs for the Hungate headquarters at Back Swinegate and in the Guildhall reception.

The consultation regarding the planning application was carried out strictly in accordance with the council's Statement of Community Involvement and it was during this process that the application was withdrawn.

Reference No.	Document Title
22	RMJM Consultation Process: Pre-Planning Application (August 08)
23	Summary of External Feedback on Building Design: Dec 07 – Mar 08
24	Pre Planning Design Exhibition – Staff Feedback
25	Pre Planning Design Exhibition – External Feedback
26	Staff Pre-Planning Design Exhibition Comments
27	External Pre-Planning Design Exhibition Comments

7. Why was the final design submitted?

Following consultation and a presentation to the Corporate Management Team (CMT), the Project Board and Member Steering group approved the final design for planning submission in April 2008. The Executive on 17th June 2008 approved the revised business case for the final design.

Reference No.	Document Title
13	Meeting of the Executive 17 th Jun 08: Accommodation Project – End of Stage Update (& 2 supporting annexes)
14	Meeting of the Executive 17 th Jun 08: Committee Minutes
28	CMT Digest – 23 rd Apr 08
29	Project Board Meeting Minutes – 25 th Apr 08
30	Member Steering Group Meeting Minutes – 28 th Apr 08

* some annexes contain exempt information

This page is intentionally left blank

Hungate Scrutiny Review

Remit

To clarify whether the correct strategy for the accommodation project was set and adhered to, in order to ensure any future council projects are delivered on time and on budget.

Key Objectives

- i. In light of the overspend, to identify whether the initial budget set was correct i.e. that all the relevant factors had been identified and included for
- ii. To understand the decision taken in regard to agreeing which CYC entity would act as internal 'client' and to understand the correlation between Planning and the client
- iii. To identify whether the consultation process was conducted properly and whether due consideration was given to the responses received when deciding how to proceed
- iv. To identify whether best practice was followed throughout the process in seeking the views of English Heritage specifically, and whether those views unduly influenced the decisions made
- v. To identify whether time was a factor in reaching the decisions made throughout the process e.g. in agreeing the design

This page is intentionally left blank