

City of York Council

Resolutions and proceedings of the Meeting of the City of York Council held in the Guildhall, York on Thursday, 17th July, 2014, starting at 6.30 pm

Present: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Julie Gunnell) in the Chair, and the following Councillors:

Acomb Ward	Bishophthorpe Ward
Horton Simpson-Laing	Galvin
Clifton Ward	Derwent Ward
Douglas King Scott	Brooks
Dringhouses & Woodthorpe Ward	Fishergate Ward
Hodgson Reid Semlyen	D'Agorne Taylor
Fulford Ward	Guildhall Ward
Aspden	Looker Watson
Haxby & Wigginton Ward	Heslington Ward
Cuthbertson Firth Richardson	Levene
Heworth Ward	Heworth Without Ward
Boyce Funnell Potter	Ayre

Holgate Ward

Alexander
Crisp
Riches

Hull Road Ward

Barnes
Fitzpatrick

Huntington & New Earswick Ward

Hyman
Runciman

Micklegate Ward

Fraser
Gunnell
Merrett

Osbaldwick Ward

Warters

Rural West York Ward

Healey
Steward

Skelton, Rawcliffe & Clifton
Without Ward

Cunningham-Cross
McIlveen
Watt

Strensall Ward

Doughty
Wiseman

Westfield Ward

Jeffries
Burton
Williams

Wheldrake Ward

Barton

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Orrell and Gillies (Lord Mayor)

13. Declarations of Interest

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

The following **personal** interests were declared:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Description of Interest</u>
Horton	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As Chair of Planning Committee he stated that he would be leaving the room during debate on this issue.
King	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As a member of Planning Committee he stated that he would be leaving the room during debate on this issue.
Richardson	5 i) Petitions – Frack Free York	Owing to the nature of his employment he stated that he would be leaving the room during debate on this issue.
Semlyen	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As a member of the Frack Free York group
Simpson-Laing	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As a member of the Local Plan Working Group and the Planning Committee she stated that she would be leaving the room during debate on this issue.
Taylor	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As a member of the Frack Free York group

Watson	5 i) Petition – Frack Free York	As a member of Planning Committee he stated that he would be leaving the room during debate on this issue.
--------	---------------------------------	--

14. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Ordinary meeting of Council on 27 March 2014 and the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 20 May 2014 be approved and signed by the Chair as correct records.

15. Civic Announcements

The Lord Mayor confirmed that whilst there were no specific items of civic business, the Group Leaders wished to individually speak to commemorate the anniversary of World War 1.

Cllrs Steward, Aspden and D’Agorne all spoke to mark the 100th anniversary since the start of World War 1. This was followed by one minute’s silence.

16. Public Participation

The Lord Mayor announced that twelve members of the public had registered to speak at the meeting. She confirmed that, in view of the number of petitions to be presented and the large agenda, she had used her discretion to allow two additional speakers at the meeting.

Tobie Abel spoke in support of a petition, to be presented later in the evening by Cllr Reid, from residents of Newborough Street asking the Council to consider making the street a Resident’s Parking zone. He referred to the difficulties resident’s of Newborough Street encountered from visitors, to the adjacent York Hospital and Bootham Crescent Football Ground, parking outside their homes. He asked Members to support their request.

Tony Fisher, spoke in support of a petition to be presented by Cllr Runciman, later in the meeting, relating to the allocation of land to the east of Strensall Road, Earswick in the draft Local Plan. He referred to the proposed scale of the development and to its effect

on the village's infrastructure and asked, on behalf of residents, for the site to be removed from the Local Plan.

John Williams, also spoke in support of a petition to be presented later in the meeting by Cllr Doughty, on behalf of Earswick residents, also opposed to plans to build houses on the Strensall Road site in Earswick. He reiterated the effects this scale of development would have on local roads and services pointing out that the sites addition to the Plan was contrary to local resident's wishes. Residents felt that resources should be targeted at brown field sites.

Gwen Swinburn spoke in respect of a recent Internal Audit Report on democratic governance considered by the Audit and Governance Committee. She highlighted that consideration had been given to a cover report rather than the full document and asked if future reports could be considered in full by the Committee, in the interests of transparency.

Peter Richardson, also spoke in relation to the Local Plan and proposals for housing developments in Haxby and Elvington. He pointed out that local infrastructure could not support large housing developments, particularly the drainage system and the outer ring road. He also asked if the fines imposed during the Lendal Bridge trial could be refunded from monies no longer paid by the authority to the North Yorkshire Police.

Geoff Beacon also spoke in relation to housing development, particularly to support the Council in building on green belt land in an effort to reduce house prices. He asked Members to consider the use of Walter Segal construction methods to build lightweight housing or designs based on properties available in holiday villages resulting in large savings in construction costs.

Barrie Stephenson spoke in support of Restore (York) Ltd and Cllr Lookers' motion, to be considered later in the meeting, regarding the provision of safe homes for vulnerable people. He explained that Restore provided properties in the York area, gave help and professional support to vulnerable people and provided volunteers who sought to prevent rough sleeping. He referred to the uncertainty for these people following changes in funding arrangements and asked Members to support the motion in order to resolve the delays in payment.

Richard Lane spoke on behalf of York and Ryedale Friends of the Earth in support of the petition to be presented and debated for a Frack Free York. He referred to the experiences of fracking in America and to subsequent environmental impacts. He asked the Council to protect the city and take action, similar to Preston and other UK cities in declaring the city Frack Free.

Sue Lister, spoke on behalf of York Green Peace and as a member of Frack Free York, also in support of the petition to be debated on fracking. She highlighted her support for not putting all the countries energy into green renewable options and to her concerns at the increase in greenhouse gas emissions and unpredictable climate changes and she asked Members to support a greener future to safeguard the city.

Christopher Rainger, spoke as a Fellow of the Institute of Civil Engineers, also in support of the Frack Free York petition. He referred to the difficulties involved in predicting ground conditions and settlement of land when considering fracking or similar works. He asked Members to think carefully before granting permission for drilling works in the authority's areas.

Kate Lock, spoke as Chair of the York Environment Forum, also in support of the petition for a Frack Free York. She confirmed that the Forum had also submitted their own statement to the authority expressing their concerns over any application for fracking in the city. She highlighted their concerns in relation to the volume of fresh water required in the process and the lowering of property prices but not the lowering of energy prices for residents. She also referred to the lack of long term employment, damage to properties and lack of consistency with the Council's Local Plan.

John Cossham, spoke as the organiser of the Frack Free York petition, referring to the 1,200 signatures on the paper copy with a further 750 signatures on the online version from both residents and tourists who did not want to see fracking take place in the historic city of York. He pointed to the presumption for sustainable development in the Local Plan and to the contamination of land and water supplies caused by fracking. He asked Members to consider the principle of proving that fracking for shale gas was safe prior to allowing works in the city and supporting the decision to make the city frack free.

17. Petitions

A. Petition – Frack Free York – signed by 1,193 people plus 750 online signatories

In view of the number of signatories to the following petition asking for a Frack Free York and, in accordance with the Council's current petitions scheme, this was discussed by Members. Consideration was also given to a background report from the Cabinet Member of Environment, Planning and Sustainability:

The signatories "*petition the Council to:*

not to permit any hydraulic fracturing (fracking) or coal seam gas extraction from within or underneath the York area"

Councillor Merrett presented the petition.

Following the debate the Lord Mayor confirmed that the petition and debate had been noted.

B. Petitions Presented Under Standing Order 7

Under Standing Order 7, petitions were presented by the following Members for reference to the appropriate Committee, Cabinet or Cabinet Member:

- i) Cllr Reid on behalf of residents of Woodthorpe and Acomb Park objecting to any development on Green Belt land south of Moor Lane, Woodthorpe.¹
- ii) Cllr Reid on behalf of residents of Newbrough Street in Bootham to ask the Council to consider taking the street into the Residents Priority Parking Scheme.²
- iii) Cllr Doughty on behalf of Earswick residents opposing plans to build houses on the Strensall Road site (Earswick).³
- iv) Cllr Runciman on behalf of local residents organised by the Strensall Liberal Democrats against the allocation of Site 810 (Land to the East of Strensall Road, Earswick) in the Draft Local Plan.⁴

- v) Cllr D'Agorne on behalf of local residents calling for a 20mph speed limit for the Heslington Road shopping area.⁵
- vi) Cllr Jeffries on behalf of residents of Westfield Ward asking the Council to improve their neighbourhood by resurfacing roads and footpaths, improving street sweeping, tackling anti-social behaviour and removing weed growth.⁶

Action Required

1-5 Schedule items on the Forward Plan, if required, and keep relevant Member updated on progress.

SS

6. Schedule item on the Forward Plan, if required, and keep Member updated on progress.

KS

18. Report of Cabinet Leader and Cabinet Recommendations

A written report was received from the Cabinet Leader, Cllr James Alexander, on the work of the Cabinet.

A Questions

Notice had been received of eighteen questions on the written report, submitted by Members in accordance with Standing Orders. The first four questions were put and answered as follows and Cllr Alexander undertook to provide Members with written answers to the remaining questions

(i) From Cllr Steward

“When the leader refers to good growth can he give examples of companies in York he believes are currently delivering bad growth?”

The Leader replied:

“I would not draw that distinction, rather that some growth is less beneficial to York and to the public purse where employers are delivering an increase in jobs but paying the minimum wage.

We want to support economic growth but clearly this is something that the council cannot deliver on its own and we need to work with businesses in the city. Clearly, there is an issue in York where we have large numbers of low paid jobs and high paid jobs but insufficient jobs in between. This means although York residents

have the opportunity to come off job seekers allowance and become employed, their income levels barely increase and they remain on benefits.

My argument would be to make work more attractive by increasing wage levels, thus reducing the benefits bill. The Conservative Liberal Democrat Government's answer is to demonise those on benefits and reduce access to this support. We want to build on the work we have already started with initiatives like the living wage which has seen two of the largest private sector businesses in the city, Aviva and Nestle, playing a key role.”

(ii) From Cllr Aspden

“Why did the Cabinet Leader fail to convince even his West Yorkshire Labour colleagues on the Combined Authority that they should support York’s Rail College bid?”

The Leader replied:

“Because the leaders never had a discussion to support any specific bid. Not all my colleagues on the West Yorkshire combined authority are Labour and the combined authority did not back any bid.”

(iii) From Cllr Barton

“Would the Leader expand on his statement saying that “£175,000 will be invested in the Public Environment in Hungate,” explaining what will be acquired with this money and how it represents an investment rather than simply a purchase?”

The Leader replied:

“My I first say how disappointed I am that you will be serving only one term on the council due to circumstances outside your control. I would not dream of attacking you for this as some Conservatives have attacked members of my party for making the same decision.

An investment can be a purchase. For example you could purchase an item that will increase in value as an investment or such an item could leverage additional funds.

The funding allocated will be used to improve the public environment in this area which is desperately needed after being left derelict for many years. It is an investment as such

infrastructure attracts new businesses to York, just as Kings Square has done.”

(iv) From Cllr Cuthbertson

“Whilst thanking ‘Welcome to Yorkshire’ for securing the event and the various organisations involved in delivering it, will the Cabinet Leader detail how much taxpayers’ money was spent on the Tour de France in York and what objective measures and targets are in place to judge the Tour’s “legacy”?

The Leader replied:

“The Tour de France coming to Yorkshire is amongst the best publicity the region has ever received. And is certainly good news for the tourist industry.

Whilst there are still a number of outstanding issues to resolve around the finances the latest indications show that the event has been managed within the £1,664k budget set by the council. The final costs of the event will be included in the report back to cabinet anticipated in October 2014 which will detail the outcomes of the event.

According to PWC, the concomitant impact of the Tour will exceed the £100m figure originally anticipated.

I am pleased Labour in York had the foresight to bid for the Tour and despite the talking down of the Tour by the Liberal Democrats, we delivered a fantastic event that will be remembered for years to come.

The Tour de France legacy will be:

Economic:

As well as the impact on tourism from 10 hours of continuous advertising for York and Yorkshire to half of the world's TV networks - this was the first Grand Depart to have a UK govt/UKTI and LCR sponsored business festival which showcased the city's businesses. As a result a memorandum of cooperation was signed with IAR the leading bio-economy cluster in northern France. Major bio-economy companies attended over three days.

Cultural:

Again the first Grand Depart to have a cultural festival, this brought work and audiences for over 100 events in the city. There will be a lasting cultural legacy.

Community:

This was the largest mass participation event ever to take place in the city and we will build on this in sustained work with communities for example through street closures, street parties and play days.

Cycling:

Cycle Yorkshire is taking the cycling legacy to get more people cycling more often. This already includes more cycling events, investment in cycling infrastructure such as the new velodrome, collaboration between road safety teams on urban and rural cycling safety, and between cycling business. Cycleyorkshire.com is the website to go to for more on this.”

(v) From Cllr Healey

“In light of the leader’s comments in his report on employment and economic growth and his tweet that the savings from the recent council strike will be given to foodbanks and health and social care, can the leader give:

1. The total amount saved?
2. The breakdown of how he will split this between foodbanks, health and social care?
3. The minutes and attendees at the meeting where this decision was taken?”

Reply:

“The exact figure will be unclear until next month but should it save a similar figure to last time there was industrial action, it will be in the region of £100k. On this basis, £10k will go to supporting food banks, the rest to health and adult social care.

While it's not entirely clear whether this is another Conservative attack on foodbanks and the service they provide to those struggling as a result of Coun. Healey's party's huge cuts to the most needy, I can assure him that the formal decision to agree this

support for foodbanks will take place in due course. The intent to take this decision I have publicised as I believe it is important that people know quickly where the money will be going.

Members of the public and opposition Members will have every opportunity to attend the meeting when this decision is taken and voice their opposition to it if they wish, or indeed support it. The Labour Group is fully supportive of this action.”

(vi) From Cllr Reid

“Will the Cabinet Leader now accept that with over 1,000 planning applications having already been approved over the last 18 months for the construction of homes on brownfield land in the city (none of which were identified in the draft Local Plan) his planned attack of the Green Belt around York is unnecessary and irresponsible?”

Reply:

“Will Councillor Reid now accept that York's requirements for homes cannot be satisfied by brownfield sites alone and can she welcome the progress being made on these stalled sites by Labour compared to the Liberal Democrats? I ask a very simple question. How many homes do the Liberal Democrats support and where should they be built? Until this is answered the Liberal Democrats are not having a proper debate about the future of the city, they are simply posturing.”

(vii) From Cllr Runciman

“Why does the Leader make no reference to the housing bubble generated under the last Labour government which pushed house prices beyond the reach of many in the city?”

Reply:

“There are any number of reasons - because the Labour Government wasn't solely responsible, because the Leader's report is that of the activity of the leader and the council rather than a Government that left office a number of years ago, because to do so would mean I couldn't without drawing the public's attention to your party's position on the Local Plan and its role in driving up house prices for those privileged enough to own a home and its abandoning of those who aspire to own a home in York but can't afford to.

It is about the 'now' and what Government or other agency decisions are affecting York. I do not believe Labour when in Government built enough homes just as I don't think the previous Liberal Democrat council did either. Labour in York, now, under my leadership is addressing this issue. The vast increase in planning consents has been recognised by your colleague in a previous question."

(viii) From Cllr Jeffries

"How much did the Fairness Conference cost to organise and can he explain why the money was better spent on this than on the direct relief of poverty in York?"

Reply:

"I refer you to the answer I gave to the question put by the main opposition Group Leader."

(ix) From Cllr Steward

"When the leader refers to wanting companies over 'a certain number of employees' to pay the Living Wage what is that number and why is he drawing a level?"

Reply:

"Clever people can make that decision but it is clear that some small to medium businesses are not in a financial position to pay the living wage. Therefore those who can afford to should and those that cannot should be helped to through Government support."

(x) From Cllr Ayre

"How many York based employees of Nestle have received a pay rise as a result of the company becoming a living wage employer and what is this number expressed as a proportion of the York based Nestle workforce?"

Reply:

"I do not have access to how many Nestle employees are York residents or not but I believe it will be significant as Nestle is a large employer."

(xi) From Cllr Barton

“Can the Leader identify, with the bypass as a geographical guide, the boundary between “urban” and “rural” York within this new Gigabit City and would he admit that the current developers plans primarily benefit Labour Wards?”

Reply:

“This is commercial sector investment and the 3x companies Sky, Talk Talk and City Fibre are currently working up the detail of their scheme and will share it in the Autumn. I cannot answer on their behalf but the level of coverage is expected to be very significant. We have also successfully bid for Government and other match funding to enhance connectivity in parts of the City where the private sector will not service.

I know that you are very aware of how great an achievement getting this investment is for the City and that we are very aware of the need to reduce any digital divide based on either location or wealth.

I find it fascinating the Conservatives argue for free markets unless it gives the outcome they do not like. We committed in 2011 to have 95% of York premises with access to Superfast Broad Band by 2014, this has been achieved as the current coverage level of Superfast Broad Band within the whole of York is now at 96%, from a start point of 8% in 2011.”

(xii) From Cllr Reid

“Will the Cabinet Leader apologise to council taxpayers for his decision to sell off – at the low point in the recession – this valuable development site which is now worth considerably more than the Council received for it?”

Reply:

“I can only assume from this question the Liberal Democrats think the sale should not have proceeded, that Hiscox should not have come to York and they did not want the 350 jobs that came with it. I can only also assume the Liberal Democrats would have been happy with the site remaining derelict, of no social value to the city.

If you want a real example of massively undervaluing a public asset you need only look at your party's role in the sell off of Royal Mail.

Let's get real and stop picking holes in success stories - it just talks down the city and York deserves better."

(xiii) From Cllr Aspden

"Could the Cabinet Leader outline the confirmed or estimated allocation York will receive under the two Local Growth Deals?"

Reply:

"York has been granted £1.7m for York Central, £8m for Biovale and the Biohub and a total of £10.9m for development at Askham Bryan college. These priorities were strongly reflected in both Leeds City Region and York North Yorkshire & East Riding Strategic Economic Plans, recognising York's importance to both economic geographies.

In addition, because of this Labour administration's commitment to constructive engagement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, York's transport priorities will be taken forward through the West Yorkshire Plus Transport Fund. As I hope the Councillor is aware, in recognition of the compelling case for investment in growth set out in the Leeds City Region Strategic Economic Plan and the robust governance that the Combined Authority represents, the coalition Government awarded the City Region a total of £1 billion in a 20 year settlement - the largest total award in any Growth Deal. This provides the opportunity for schemes such as access to York Central and improvements to the Outer Ring Road to be delivered."

(xiv) From Cllr Jeffries

"How does the Cabinet Leader defend the poor engagement with volunteer groups under his tenure with his comments in his report?"

Reply:

"I would argue we engage more meaningfully with volunteers than the previous Liberal Democrat administration and this was recognised by the comments mentioned in my report from

volunteers from Foxwood Residents' Association. This was the first time the council actually said thank you - and it won't be the last."

(xv) From Cllr Reid

"Will the Cabinet Leader say when he actually expects the development of the Hungate site to be completed (including the non Hiscox elements)?"

Reply:

"Construction work should be starting quite soon following the completion of on-site archaeological works and that construction may take up to two years. Officers are seeking an update on this situation which I will share with Members shortly."

(xvi) From Cllr Cuthbertson

"The Cabinet Leader says that "all premises" within urban York will have the opportunity to have a fibre connection". How much will it cost (installation/rental fees etc) a resident to have access to this network?"

Reply:

"Talk Talk and Sky are yet to announce their pricing structure."

(xvii) From Cllr Reid

"Is the Cabinet Leader aware that questions have been raised about possible state aid implications of extending the use of the CityFibre network (that was built to provide services to City of York Council) and if he is what action has been taken to ensure that there are no state aid implications for the Council?"

Reply:

"Yes and all of our work is legally compliant. Appropriate due diligence and legal compliance has been carried. We have made use of huge infrastructure that Liberal Democrats procured. Lack of vision held back the city for a long time in delivering on the digital economy. I am pleased to say Labour has reversed this trend and York is now set to have the fastest internet speeds in the country."

(xviii) From Cllr Reid

“Whilst the Cabinet Leader was happy to pick up the keys for the new Headquarters from a project that he inherited from the previous administration, does he not feel that democracy was enhanced by there being an all-party scrutiny review of the Hungate Project?”

Reply:

“Not particularly. I think it was a stick to beat your administration with and it worked.”

B Cabinet Recommendations

Capital Programme Outturn 2013/14 and Revisions to the 2014/15 Programme

Cllr Alexander moved, and Cllr Williams seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 16 of the Cabinet meeting held on 1 July 2014:

Recommended: That Council approve the restated 2014/15 to 2018/19 programme of £203.851m as summarised in Table 3 and detailed in Annex A of the report. ¹.

Reason: To allow the continued effective financial management of the capital programme from 2014/15 to 2018/19.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above recommendation in respect of the Capital Programme be approved.

Action Required

1. Make the necessary adjustment to the Capital Programme.

RB, DM

19. Recommendations of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee

As Chair of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee, Cllr Galvin moved and Cllr Runciman seconded, the following

recommendation contained in Minute 62 of the meeting of that Committee held on 12 May 2014, subject to the two references to 2015, in the paragraph headed 'Online Business/E-Commerce Scrutiny Review' being amended to read 2014:

Draft Annual Scrutiny Report 2013-14

[That Council] approve the Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report, covering the period June 2013 to May 2014, including the additional information in relation to the Loans and Grants Scrutiny Review.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above recommendation in relation to the Annual Scrutiny Report be approved, subject to the two references to 2015, in the paragraph headed 'Online Business/E-Commerce Scrutiny Review' being amended to read 2014 .

Request for Change of Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference

Cllr Galvin then moved, and Cllr Runciman seconded the following recommendation contained in Minute 8 of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting held on 23 June 2014:

Recommended: That Council approve the slight change to the remits of Economic and City Development and Community Safety Committees, as detailed in paragraph 7 of the report, to redress the balance of responsibilities between the two.

Reason: To enable the work of Scrutiny Committees to progress efficiently and deliver effective outcomes.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above recommendation in respect of the slight change to the remits of Economic and City Development and Community Safety Committees be approved.¹

Action Required

1. Amend the Constitution to reflect the change in remits.

JC

20. **Recommendations of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

As Chair of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Funnell moved and Cllr Doughty seconded, the following recommendations contained in Minute 99 of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 April 2014:

Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber)

[That Council]

- (i) Reconfirms its support for the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber), in relation to NHS England's new review of Congenital Heart Disease services.
- (ii) Delegates relevant functions, as set out in Annex A to the report, that shall be exercisable by the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber) (JHOSC), subject to such terms and conditions therein.
- (iii) Approves the appointment of Councillor Wiseman to serve on the JHOSC in relation to the new review of Congenital Heart Disease services.
- (iv) Confirms its support for the financial contribution of £1000 to Leeds City Council for the financial year 2014/15 to help cover administrative costs, printing, postage, room hire and other materials and an element of officer time in relation to the work of the JHOSC.

Reason: In order that the Council's voice is heard in relation to NHS England's new review of Congenital Heart Disease Services

On being put to the vote, the recommendations were declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the recommendations in relation to the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber) from the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 23 April 2014 be approved. ¹.

Action Required

1. Inform Leeds City Council of delegation of functions and financial support.

DS, JP

21. Recommendations of the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee

As Chair of the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee, Cllr Alexander moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded, the following recommendation contained in Minute 14 of the meeting of that Committee held on 23 June 2014:

Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies

Recommend: That Council agree to the appointment of Councillor Funnell as York's representative on the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for Yorkshire and the Humber.

Reason: In order to make appropriate appointments to the Council's Committees and Outside Bodies for the current municipal year.

[Note: Councillor Funnell, being recommended to Council as a result of Councillor Wiseman subsequently being appointed at the Annual Meeting to the Health and Wellbeing Board and therefore having a conflict of interest.]

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the recommendation relating to an appointment to the Joint Health and Overview and Scrutiny Committee for Yorkshire and the Humber from the Staffing Matters and Urgency Committee meeting held on 23 June 2014 be approved. ¹.

Action Required

1. Inform Leeds City Council of appointment. JP, DS

22. Recommendations of the Audit and Governance Committee

As Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, Councillor Potter moved and Councillor Brooks seconded, the following recommendations contained in minutes 13 and 14 of the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 25 June 2014:

Draft Revised Financial Regulations

[That Council] approve the amendments to the Financial Regulations, as set out at paragraphs 5,6,7, and 8 and Annex A of the report, subject to the deletion of the word “solely” from paragraph 38.¹

Audit and Governance Committee Effectiveness – Action Plan Update

[That Council] approve the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Audit and Governance Committee (as set out in Annex 2 of the report)².

On being put to the vote, the recommendations were declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above recommendations of the Audit and Governance Committee from their meeting held on 25 June 2014 be approved.

Action Required

1&2. Update the Constitution to include the revised regulations and changes to terms of reference. JC

23. Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee

Council received the Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee at pages 163 to 175, on the work of the Committee for the year ending 16 April 2014.

Councillor Potter then moved and Cllr Brooks seconded acceptance of the report and it was

Resolved: That the Annual Report of the Audit and Governance Committee for the year ending 16 April 2014 be received and noted.

24. Scrutiny - Report of the Chair of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee

Council received the report of the Chair of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee at pages 177 to 180, on the work of the Committee.

Councillor Galvin then moved and Cllr Runciman seconded receipt of the report and it was

Resolved: That the scrutiny report be received and noted.

25. Report of Cabinet Member

Council received a written report from Councillor Merrett, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability.

Notice had been received of nineteen questions on the report submitted by Members in accordance with Standing Orders. The first four questions were put and answered as follows and Councillor Merrett undertook to provide Members with written answers to the remaining questions

(i) From Cllr Watt

“Will the Cabinet Member explain why he has failed to honour the commitment made by the Labour Group to the people of York – through its support for the Council’s motion to respect the responses of York’s residents to the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation – by his issuing a Further Sites Consultation that confirms a disregard for the public’s consultation submissions?”

The Cabinet Member replied:

“Clearly Councillor Watt hasn’t understood, or doesn’t wish to, the nature of the recent limited supplementary consultation, despite sitting on the Local Plan working group where officers explained the purpose of this limited additional consultation in detail, which is about ensuring that additional sites that have been submitted as part of the initial consultation or where there have been significant changes to existing proposed sites that they are consulted on, so

we can consider the whole set of responses both to the original consultation and in regard to these additional sites on the same basis. The public response to both the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation and the Further Sites consultation are being used to inform the drafting of the revised Publication Draft Local Plan version, which will come back to members and be subject itself to consultation later this year.”

(ii) From Cllr Aspden

“Could the Cabinet Member detail how many recharges have taken place at each point since they were installed and what is the breakdown of users by council/public sector and private residents/businesses?”

The Cabinet Member replied:

“The six electric vehicle charging points installed by City of York Council in Council car parks and Park&Ride sites have been used 212 times since activation in October 2013.

62001 – 35 uses

62002 – 45 uses

62003 – 23 uses

62004 – 85 uses

62005 – 9 uses

62006 – 24 uses

Usage by Council of electric pool car is on-site at Ecodepot, not public charge point so the usage has been by private residents/visitors/businesses.”

(iii) From Cllr Doughty

“Referring to the Local Plan Extra Sites Consultation, how does the Cabinet Member propose to engage with residents' perceptions that the Labour administration is encouraging developers to bring forward proposals for development on proposed 'safeguarded land' prior to the Local Plan having been adopted, leaving residents to believe these developments are 'done deals'?”

The Cabinet Member replied:

“I’m happy to make absolutely clear that no decision has yet been made on the final portfolio of sites for inclusion in the Publication Draft Local Plan. This will be considered by Members later this year. Any discussion with developers and landowners are carefully placed in the content of the current stage of plan development, and are in order to get them to demonstrate sufficient thought and evidence that their sites address the Government’s requirements that proposed sites for inclusion are viable and deliverable, and meet the required housing trajectories. However we cannot control what individual landowners and developers say and claim about what they hope might happen with their sites. I hope Councillor Doughty and the Conservative Group and outer York MP will now correct some of the misleading information they have been giving to residents on this issue, and explain to their residents that this is what their conservative government requires us to do.”

(iv) From Cllr Reid

“Could the Cabinet Member outline exactly what the £10,000 secured for the Home Energy Programme will deliver?”

The Cabinet Member replied:

“The purpose of this project is to save residents money on their fuel bills, through two different streams of work: 1. switching energy tariffs via the CYC/ iChoosr Big Community Switch and 2. using less energy in the home.

- 1) Saving money by switching energy. This funding part supports a dedicated resource for helping residents save money by switching energy providers. It capitalises on the momentum built from the first switching scheme in December 2013 to February 2014, where 743 people registered and 242 people switched (a 32% conversion rate, which is significantly higher than the national average of 22%). The next two scheduled switches are August 2014 and January 2015.
- 2) Behavioural changes. There are simple, practical actions that anyone can do around the home, with possible savings of £280 a year¹. This funding also helps support a dedicated officer to reach the community through face-to-face advice is an invaluable way to disseminate the messages

¹ Source: Energy Saving Trust

This project is city-wide but has a particular focus on specific areas in need and currently experiencing fuel poverty and / or living in an energy inefficient home.”

(v) From Cllr Steward

“In light of the comments of Nick Boles MP, the Planning Minister, regarding housing targets, re: that the Council is required to “demonstrate ... reasons it needs to supply those numbers [of houses], which cannot be that it is ambitious or that it is going for growth. If it has no good arguments or good evidence, it is a Plan to meet not need but ambition and dreams, which is... not what plans are meant to do” and also that “a vaulting ambition is not a sufficient justification for threatening protected land. Ambition and the desire to grow faster than one’s neighbours or perhaps to build a small empire is not a sufficient justification for putting protections at risk,” will the Cabinet Member assure us that he and his officers will give serious consideration to reducing the housing targets within the proposed Local Plan to a more sustainable level and one that complements York’s actual housing needs and residents’ views?”

Reply:

“The Council are required to produce an Objective Assessment of Housing Need under the NPPF. This work is ongoing and will evidence the approach to housing in the Local Plan.

More specifically the NPPF indicates that local planning authorities should:

- *use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period;*
- *identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable 11 sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and*

competition in the market for land. In fact, at last week's meeting of Leeds City Region planning portfolio holders with him, he actually suggested that Council's look to a 40% buffer to give them a margin against particular sites not coming forward as expected so they would still have a five year housing supply in place and therefore be able to resist unplanned housing sites coming forward;

- *identify a supply of specific, developable 12 sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.*

We are doing exactly this, thereby hopefully avoiding the fate of a stream of other Conservative controlled Councils like Harrogate, who've pedalled illusions to their electorates that they can build minimally to protect green belts and who've been forced by the Conservative Governments National Planning Policy Framework via the planning inspectorate to withdraw their plans because of their failure to provide adequate housing land supplies in their local areas."

(vi) From Cllr Firth

"Could the Cabinet Member outline the timetable for the next stage of the Local Plan and explain what exactly he means by "later in the year"?"

Reply:

"Clearly the exact timetable will be dependent on the response we receive to the Further Sites consultation, we would anticipate, however, reporting a Publication Draft Plan to Members in September. This would be followed by a City Wide Consultation.

(vii) From Cllr Reid

"Could the Cabinet Member outline what York's share of the £4.95million secured by Leeds City Council from the DECC is and what is York's share of the 1000 vouchers connected to the Green Deal?"

Reply:

"Up to approx. £15k to refurbish and create a eco home in York which will support the promotion of the Council's new Green Deal programme (Paper on this new programme and delivery dates coming to Cabinet in October). Up to approx. £15k will be provided in the form of free measures that will be installed in a

home in York. The 1000 vouchers will be on a first come first served basis.”

(viii) From Cllr Aspden

“How can potential passengers exercise a preference to travel in an electric taxi and how are the services advertised?”

Reply:

“Services are advertised by the taxi firms directly.”

(ix) From Cllr Hyman

“Would the Cabinet member confirm the dates of the Local Plan Working Group meetings at which residents will have the opportunity to make their views known before a final draft is prepared for the examination in public?”

Reply:

“Please refer to the response to question (vi) above.”

(x) From Cllr Reid

“Whilst welcoming Labour’s commitment to continuing the Liberal Democrat programme of replacing the old 35 watt low pressure sodium lanterns to white LED lights, can the Cabinet Member outline who took the decision to turn off street lights in selected streets, when did they take it, where a cost analysis of the plan is, and how will residents be informed? As despite asking for this information on the 9th July I have yet to receive an answer.”

Reply:

“The operation of street lighting is the responsibility of my colleague Councillor Levene. I believe he would confirm that there are currently no schemes in place to turn off street lights in selected streets.

Officers have taken a decision to reduce the lighting intensity in the early hours of the morning as part of the roll out of LED lights as this is now an option with these new lights that continues to meet the council’s statutory street lighting duties. The roll out of LED lights with this capability was approved by the Executive Member for Communities and Neighbourhoods on 22nd June 2010. Paragraph 13 indicated the use of more efficient lighting including LED’s to replace the existing low pressure sodium (SOX) lanterns.

The funding for the project is through the council's capital investment programme and bids are submitted each year to support the works. In 2013/14 and 2014/15 the council provided £200k each year for the project. Due to the time taken to procure the supply of the LED lanterns it was not possible to install the LED's in 2013/14 and therefore £160k was carried over into this year equating to £360k. This fund is being used to install the LED lanterns."

(xi) From Cllr Watt

"I ask the Cabinet member for environmental services, planning and sustainability matters why he continues to pursue a local plan that will devastate the environment in our rural areas by destroying open countryside that is needed for future food production; grossly exceeds foreseeable planning needs for economic growth and housing needs; and is not sustainable as evidenced by the daily near gridlock traffic in the Northern sector of York?"

Reply:

"The approach included within the Local Plan is designed to allow the City address the priorities of housing need and economic growth whilst ensuring that York's unique built and natural environment is protected. The plan will consider the appropriate supporting infrastructure requirements and potential funding contributions from new developments via the new Community Infrastructure Levy process. You will also be aware of the major transport funding from the new Leeds City Region Combined Authority that will allow us to fund the Outer Ring Road upgrade if that is not sabotaged by you and your conservative colleagues."

(xii) From Cllr Steward

"When the Cabinet member comments that *"the Authority has continued to engage with developers in York"* and his discussion of sites that have already achieved planning permission, will he comment on the council's relationship with potential developers of sites identified in the draft Local Plan, none of which are anywhere near to achieving planning permission?"

Reply:

"Please see the response to question 3."

(xiii) From Cllr Reid

“Is the Cabinet Member aware that most of the electric bus trips from the Poppleton Bar Park and Ride site have been running empty over the last 4 weeks?”

Reply:

“The delivery and operation of the Park & Ride sites is the responsibility of my colleague Councillor Levene. I believe he would confirm that both of the new Park & Ride services have been designed with greater capacity than that required at launch. It is anticipated that, in line with the way we set up other Park & Ride sites, usage will grow significantly as awareness of the Poppleton service grows.”

	<i>Month 1 trip numbers</i>	<i>Month 13 trip numbers</i>	<i>Month 25 trip numbers</i>
<i>Grimston Bar (1994):</i>	3,889	14,525	21,891
<i>Designer Outlet (2000):</i>	9,606	18,495	21,524
<i>Monks Cross (2004)</i>	13,550	35,429	43,797
<i>Poppleton Bar (2014)</i>	9,148 (8/6/14 – 1/7/14)		

(xiv) From Cllr Steward

“Will he will acknowledge the deep concern within communities such as Earswick, Skelton and Rawcliffe, who are seeing eager developers already putting in the groundwork for planning applications, leading many residents to suspect an all-too-cosy relationship with the Council and worse still that these sites are already a ‘done deal’ and what is he seeking to do about it?”

Reply:

“Please see the response to question 3.”

(xv) From Cllr Reid

“Given that the electricity used to recharge batteries does not all come from renewable sources (and hence add to carbon emission levels) why did the Cabinet Member authorize the opening of the Poppleton Bar Park and Ride site before it was finished?”

Reply:

“The delivery and operation of the Park & Ride sites is the responsibility of my colleague Councillor Levene. I believe he would confirm that the electric buses charge overnight at the First Depot in York. The electricity grid is off-peak at this time and of lower carbon intensity. There was a wind turbine in the design for Poppleton Bar however the supplier went out of business a month before installation. Officers are currently exploring alternative suppliers of renewable generation equipment for Poppleton Bar which could supply sufficient power for the on-site Rapid chargers which boost the range of the electric buses.

It would not be possible to provide all the energy for the buses from renewable sources without both renewable generation and energy storage capability at the present time. However to address Climate Change Act requirements, the Government intends to increase renewable energy generation over time, which lies behind the vehicle electrification strategy. Energy storage capability is also currently under development in the UK however there is not an available product which could be purchased currently.

Charging an electric bus from grid does however represent a 60% reduction in CO2/km compared to conventional diesel buses due to greater ‘Well to Wheel’ efficiencies, leave aside removing the diesel particulate from an air quality and health point of view.

In respect of the timing of the opening of the facility I understand this decision was taken by officers to open the park and ride at the earliest opportunity to maximise the benefit to the public whilst providing a safe environment.”

(xvi) From Cllr Reid

“ How much will this depot cost to build and operate, who will pay for it, and why is it being located on a prominent Green Belt site?”

Reply:

“Assuming your reference to “this depot” actually refers to my comments on the compressed natural gas (CNG) / biomethane

refuelling facility linked to a freight transshipment centre, then it will be for the site promoter to demonstrate the viability and deliverability of the site as part of the local plan process. However I am aware from past discussions that there is clear commercial interest in a freight transshipment centre in York from the logistics industry. The particular site that has been proposed is apparently the one and only location in York where the CNG supply pipe currently surfaces. It is also a brownfield site and obviously extremely well located relative to the principal road network.”

(xvii) From Cllr Reid

“A number of residents in my ward have asked when those who responded to last year’s consultation will receive feedback. Could the Cabinet Member confirm when this will happen?”

Reply:

“The report on the Publication draft Local Plan that will be considered by LPWG and Cabinet will include responses to the points raised by residents and others. As indicated in other responses the exact timing of these reports will be dependent on the level of response to the recently ended consultation but we currently anticipate September.”

(xviii) From Cllr Reid

“During the last 18 months over 90% of approved planning applications for housing in and around the city have been on brownfield sites. In the light of that continuing trend would he agree to include all potential brownfield building sites able to accommodate 2 or more housing units in the next draft of the Local Plan and would he also agree to reinstate the 10% windfall allowance (which he supported when it was included in the 2011 draft) and which recognises the volatile and changing nature of land use in the City?”

Reply:

“We will seek to use the maximum amount of brownfield land that passes the Government’s viability, deliverability and other tests. We will also reconsider the use of a windfall allowance in the light of the latest Government guidance.”

(xix) From Cllr Reid

“How many houses have actually been completed (rather than just approved) for each of the following years 2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14 and so far in 2014/15?”

Reply:

“As a result of a request for housing completions details from Cllr Reid for tonight’s Full Council Meeting, the table below provides both net and gross house completions levels for the previous three years.

Year	Completions	New Build	Net Conversions / COU	Net Conversions	Net Change of Use	Demolitions	Net Dwelling Gain
2011-2012	354	279	45	5	40	3	321
2012-2013	540	441	70	9	61	29	482
2013-2014	374	302	57	3	54	14	345
2011-2014	1268	1022	172	17	155	46	1148

Completions for this year’s monitoring period, 2014/15 (starting 1st April 2014), are currently being compiled, however, these have not been confirmed and will only be verified after September of this year when a 6 monthly update has taken place based on site visits, Building Inspection Returns and contact with applicants/agents.”

26. Substitute Arrangements for Independent Members

Councillor Alexander, presented the report and recommendations of the Monitoring Officer in relation to substitute arrangements on Committees for the Councillors who were not members of a political group, namely:

“[That Council]

- 1) Approve an amendment to paragraph 6.5.1 (a) of Part 4B of the Constitution adding, at the end of that paragraph, the words: “Independent Councillors may also be appointed to act as named substitutes for other independent Councillors within this rule.”
- 2) Appoint the substitute Members set out in paragraph 5 of the report.

Reason: To ensure that each Committee with independent representation has the benefit of such representation even where the appointed Councillor is unable to attend a meeting.”

Cllr Alexander then moved and Cllr Simpson-Laing seconded the above recommendations and it was

Resolved: That the above recommendations in respect of substitute members for Independent Councillors be approved. ¹.

Action Required

1. Provide update to the Constitution.

JC

27. Activities of Outside Bodies

Minutes of the following meetings had been made available for Members to view on the Council’s website:

- Quality Bus Partnership – 17 March 2014 (Draft Version)
- Local Government North Yorkshire and York – 6 December 2013
- Local Government Yorkshire and Humber – Member Improvement and European Board -2 April 2013, 18 September 2013, 20 January 2014 and 15 April 2014
- Safer York/DAAT Partnership Board –3 February 2014

No questions had been submitted to representatives on outside bodies.

28. Notices of Motion

A Motions referred from the Cabinet in accordance with Standing Order 12.1(a)

(i) Lendal Bridge (proposed by Cllr Reid)

It was moved by Cllr Reid and seconded by Cllr Cuthbertson that:

“Council notes the report in *The Press* on 27th February which revealed important facts about the Lendal Bridge closure.

Council further notes that:

1. The Labour Cabinet's six-month trial closure of Lendal Bridge should have finished at the end of February
2. The closure has brought widespread criticism from local residents, business owners, tourists and tourist groups
3. Negative media and social media coverage has been generated to the detriment of our city
4. The closure has failed to significantly improve overall bus journey times
5. Traffic displaced by the closure has caused increased congestion elsewhere in the city e.g. Foss Islands Road and Water End at Clifton Bridge
6. Officers have admitted that the trial closure has had little impact on overall air quality
7. The Labour Cabinet Member responsible has admitted that the signage at the start of the trial was "very confusing"
8. Around 45,000 motorists have received fines for crossing the bridge.

Council therefore resolves to ask Cabinet to:

- a. immediately end the trial closure of Lendal Bridge
- b. publicly admit that the trial has been botched and to apologise for this
- c. immediately publish the raw data on the trial ahead of their detailed evaluation report
- d. commit to consulting with residents and local businesses before bringing forward any future plans for Lendal Bridge."

The first amendment was proposed by Councillor Aspden and seconded by Councillor Ayre as follows:

"Insert after paragraph 8.

9. In April when challenged as to what he would do if the fines given to motorists using Lendal Bridge were proved to have been unlawful, Cllr Merrett told BBC Radio York: "Yes, I accept that at the end of the day that if we've got it wrong to that extent that I'd have to resign".

10. The Cabinet's decision to reopen Lendal Bridge and withdraw the appeal against the Traffic Adjudicator's ruling that the fines given out were unlawful.

Following the words 'Council therefore resolves to ask Cabinet to:'

Delete paragraph a.

Replace paragraph c. with:

refund all Lendal Bridge fines as they were issued using an unlawful method of enforcement

Insert additional text

Council further calls on the Cabinet Member in charge of the trial to stick to his word and resign from the Cabinet; Council also calls for the Leader of the Council to take responsibility for this botched trial and resign.”

On being put to the vote the amendment was declared LOST.

At this point in the meeting, the guillotine fell and all the following business was deemed moved and seconded. Where a proposer and seconder were before Council, at the time of the guillotine falling, details are listed below:

A second amendment was proposed by Councillor D’Agorne as follows:

“**Add** a final paragraph:

“Council further resolves that:
The proposals for an 'independently chaired cross party congestion commission' should be brought to Audit and Governance Committee and a Leaders Meeting for consideration prior to Cabinet approval by September 2014. This should included a budget and smart targets for the work to deliver broad recommendations that are compatible with LTP3 and the Air Quality Action Plan, prior to May 2015.”

The second amendment was also declared LOST.

On being put to the vote, the original motion, was also declared LOST and it was

Resolved: That the original motion be not be approved.

B Motions submitted for consideration directly by Council, in accordance with Standing Order 12.1(b)

(i) Business Rates, Acomb Front Street (proposed by Cllr Burton)

“Council notes the difficult trading circumstances of the high street with challenges from internet shopping and a fragile economic recovery. Although York has one of the lowest shop vacancy rates in the country, Acomb has some of the highest concentrations of empty properties of any concentration of retail in the city.

Council believes that under the Liberal Democrats City of York Council did little to reverse Acomb’s fortunes and this was a stance backed by Conservatives.

Council resolves that under a Labour administration the Cabinet will receive options to consider extending business rates relief for all empty properties on Front Street being brought back into use.”

The first amendment was proposed by Councillor Steward as follows:

Delete the second paragraph.

On being put to the vote the first amendment was declared LOST.

A second amendment was proposed by Councillor Jeffries as follows:

Delete the second and third paragraphs and replace with the following:

“Council notes that additional pressure was placed on the Front Street commercial area by the Cabinet’s decisions to close the Council’s local Acomb Office in 2012, to dramatically reduce the funding that local ward committees had available to invest in the public realm at neighbourhood level, and by the Council’s decision to reduce public service standards such as the number of litter and salt bins available in the Acomb/Westfield area.

Council further notes that the present administration has allocated funding in excess of £5 million for projects to “reinvigorate” the city-centre while spending only £7,764, of an allocated £30,000 budget, on improvements in the Acomb commercial area.

Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to take the following action:

1. Consider options for extending business rates relief for long-term empty properties in the Front Street area which are brought back into use, while giving full support and publicity to the availability of increased business rates relief for existing small shops and businesses as championed by the Business Secretary, Vince Cable MP.
2. Agree to initiate a comprehensive regeneration package for the Front Street area including the development of a public/private investment plan aimed at transforming the safety, reputation and appearance of the whole area.
3. Take immediate steps to uplift the streetscape including improvements to cleanliness, footpaths, back lanes and lighting while renewing/painting street furniture and providing better ice clearance standards in winter.
4. To use its powers to encourage the diversification of the type of business and retail outlets available in the area while resisting a proliferation of betting shops, amusement arcades and similar establishments.
5. Work with the Acomb Alive team, traders and local residents to ensure that a street market is established in the area as soon as possible

The Council also records its appreciation for the work of residents and traders which has resulted in an increase in the number of social, arts and other activities taking place in the Front Street area. Council further places on record its belief that the increase, in the number of new businesses setting up in Acomb during the last year, reflects its growing confidence in the future of the neighbourhood”.

The second amendment was also declared LOST.

On being put to the vote, the original motion, was CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the original motion be approved. ¹.

(ii) West Yorkshire Combined Authority (proposed by Cllr Steward)

“Regarding York potentially becoming a fully constituted member of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA), council notes:

1. Lack of cross-party support on a commitment which will affect York for many years;
2. Lack of consultation with residents, businesses and community groups;
3. That a minority of residents know about the WYCA and its implications for York, and of those who do the majority oppose membership;
4. That payments have been made by the council to the Authority with nothing to show and no tangible benefits for the future;
5. Disappointment that WYCA failed to back York’s bid for the Rail College.

Council notes that legislation requires local authorities to provide proof of support for joining a combined authority and therefore, as this exercise has never taken place, commits to an appropriate consultation period to engage with residents, businesses and community groups on membership of the WYCA and that it will take all such views into account prior to committing the City of York to permanent membership of the same.”

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared LOST and it was

Resolved: That the above motion be not approved.

(iii) Pupil Premiums (proposed by Cllr Runciman)

“Council notes:

- the Pupil Premium is an additional allowance to support certain groups of school-aged children and young people at risk of not achieving their potential;

- this year's allocation of £4,884,000 means that primary and secondary schools in York have received over £12.6 million since the Pupil Premium was introduced in 2011;
- children entitled to free school meals are eligible for Pupil Premium of £1,300 a year for primary pupils and £935 a year for secondary pupils;
- whilst eligibility for free school meals is the main criteria for entitlement to Pupil Premium, other groups are also entitled to the Pupil Premium, including children in care, adopted children, children in hospital schools and service personnel children.
- Tim Farron MP, Liberal Democrat Party President, along with groups such as the Carers Trust has called for this eligibility to be extended to include young carers;
- There are 113 young carers registered with the York Carers Centre; however, the number of young people undertaking caring roles in York is widely believed to be far higher;
- The Government is currently consulting on its plans to extend the Pupil Premium in April 2015 to include a new 'Early Years Pupil Premium' for three and four-year-olds alongside plans to move the statutory entitlement to early learning for disadvantaged two-year olds to a participation funding model;
- An Early Years Pupil Premium would pay early years providers up to an additional £300 for each of the estimated 359 children currently eligible in York, providing an additional £103,330 in funding every year.

This Council believes that including young carers as a category of recipient eligible to receive the Pupil Premium would enable schools and colleges to provide additional support to these young people in York.

Council further believes that introducing an Early Years Pupil Premium would help all children get the best start in life and tackle what the Sutton Trust has identified as a 19 month gap at the start of school between the most and least advantaged children.

This Council therefore resolves to ask:

- The Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Education, the Minister of State for Schools, and Dr. John Dunford OBE, the national Pupil Premium Champion, noting the

- contents of this motion and asking the Government to widen the eligibility for Pupil Premiums to include young carers;
- The Chief Executive to respond to the current consultation on Early Years Pupil Premium and funding for two-year olds in support of the Government’s proposals and its plans for rolling–out the schemes.”

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above motion be approved. ².

(iv) Safe Homes for Vulnerable People (proposed by Cllr Looker)

“Council notes the good work carried out by a range of organisations in the city providing safe homes for vulnerable people. Some of these and the people they help are facing an uncertain future with changed funding arrangements, tighter benefit entitlement and no clear plans for the bulk transition of existing claims to Universal Credit.

Council also believes that the absence of choice that can be exercised by tenants in deciding who the housing element of Universal Credit is paid to is a particular worry.

Council resolves to invite the Chief Executive, on its behalf, to write to the Minister for the Department for Works and Pensions expressing concern over the roll out of Universal Credit, the implementation of Personal Independence Payments (PIPs) and difficulties with the delays in the processing of Employment & Support Allowance (ESA) claims, all affecting people in very difficult circumstances, and to appeal to the Government to resolve these issues quickly.”

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED and it was

Resolved: That the above motion be approved. ³.

Action Required

1. Schedule report to Cabinet for extension of business rate relief. WB, KE
2. CX to write to the S of S for Education, Minister of State for Schools and Dr Dunford in the terms stated in the motion. WB, KE

3. CX to write to the Minister for the Dept for Works and Pensions in the terms stated in the motion. WB, KE

29. Questions to the Cabinet Leader and Cabinet Members received under Standing Order 11.3(a)

Fifty nine questions to the Leader and Cabinet Members had been received under Standing Order 11.3(a). The guillotine having fallen at this point, Members agreed to receive written answers to their questions, as set out below:

(i) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Steward:

“What were the full costs, including everything from time of officer salaries to pre conference wine and canapes of the recent Fairness Conference and what are the tangible outcomes which the conference led to?”

Reply:

“The recommendation to host an International Fairness Conference was a recommendation of York’s Independent Fairness Commission.

The drinks reception was kindly provided by the University of York. The event was held on Sunday to welcome our overseas guests and no staff overtime was claimed by City of York Council Employees.

The overall cost of the International Fairness Conference itself was £18,635.58. £8,635.58 was provided by City of York Council and £10,000 was donated by JRF. Some elements of the conference were provided free of charge, including the venue hire cost, by the University of York.

We are sharing policies and other evidence-based ways of tackling poverty with cities nationally. Much of this is to do with influencing government policy. The event and contacts made through the event will help inform the future development of the Financial Inclusion and poverty strategies.

We also used the session to share and discuss the experience of poverty and fairness in York. I was pleased that there was an excellent session led by the pupils of York High School and other York residents. Over the next few weeks, we will be working with the JRF and the York residents that ran the community session at

the conference to run sessions in York to help us better understand how to address financial hardship in the city.”

(ii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Healey:

“What were the reasons given for the University of York's withdrawal of funding from Science City York?”

Reply:

“As a result of a strategic review of priorities for the institution the University of York has determined that it wishes to strengthen its work between university departments and business directly. The University will continue to partner and to co-invest in Biovale, an innovation cluster in biorenewables technologies, with City of York Council, continue to own York Science Park with the Council and has also expressed a willingness to engage with the new company being established to consolidate wider business support activity in the city.

The council's representative on the board of Science City was briefed during the change in policy as was the Chair of Economic and City Development Scrutiny Committee.”

(iii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Jeffries:

“Why did the Council Leader not take earlier action to address the overspends being recorded on social care budgets and what is his latest estimate of expenditure against budget for this area for the current financial year?”

Reply:

“I have been raising issues about expenditure in this area since December 2009 when I was Chair of the council's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. I invited the Executive Member at the time to the committee to discuss the issue but he refused to attend on two occasions.

The council has received a 45% reduction in Government funding over the course of this parliament and this has clearly played a role in adding to financial pressures just as demographic changes have. You will recall from when you were elected as a Labour councillor that you used to stand up against such reductions in funding and support Labour's position of modest increases in council tax to place funding into health and social care. However you have chosen to support a Liberal Democrat policy of defending

these Tory cuts and to oppose modest council tax increases for this long term expenditure.

The pooling of health service funding with social care is recognised as essential by all parties, and this has not been helped by the low amount York receives in health funding from the Government you now support, nor from the reorganisation of the NHS you also now defend.

Significant progress has been made over the last six months by officers and both Cabinet Members; putting in place better financial controls that have been long overdue. I expect further progress to be made, rather than refusing to engage on the issue, as the former Liberal Democrat Executive Member did before your party lost control.

There has been well recorded pressure on adult social care budgets locally and nationally for the last 4-5 years due mainly to demographic changes and rising costs in the care sector. In the last five years, demographic change alone has increased demand nationally by an average of 14%. As a result, the budget has consistently overspent - by £1.453M in 2010/11, by £1.660M in 2011/12, by £2.083M in 2012/13 but by an improved £1.766M in 2013/14. These significant pressures have been recognised and, despite average adult social care budgets falling nationally by 12% over the last three years, we have provided £2.5m of extra growth funding in York in 2013-14 and a further £2.5m in 2014-15 as well as an additional one off £957k in 2013-14. I expect the progress made last year in reducing the overall overspend to continue this year.

The next 2-3 years will be an even greater period of challenge for Adult Social Care than the last 2-3 have been, both nationally and locally, as a direct result of the Conservative-led government's imposed austerity and legislative change.

The Care Act recently completed its passage through Parliament and is the biggest overhaul of social care statute for over 60 years. It creates a new duty for local authorities to promote and protect the well-being of local people and their carers with a duty to consider their physical, mental and emotional well-being and to provide preventative services to maintain people's health.

The Care Act provides the legislative platform that, coupled with the requirement for greater Health and Social Care integration

through the Better Care Fund, will drive huge transformational change in Adult Social Care. This transformational change will mean existing patterns of expenditure will need to be quite significantly amended to place greater emphasis on prevention and early intervention thereby enabling a balanced budget to be created.”

(iv) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Brooks:

“If the Leader of the Council may exercise any function of Cabinet where a decision cannot reasonably wait until the next meeting, will he explain what was so important about the decision to re-open Lendal Bridge that it could not wait until the Cabinet meeting?”

Reply:

“The published decision of the traffic adjudicator created confusion for residents and clarity was required quickly. This was a position supported by the Conservative Chair of Scrutiny Management Committee and I thank him for his help in dealing with this matter so swiftly.”

(v) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Aspden:

“As the council’s revenue account only came in on budget last year because of Automatic Number Plate Recognition fine income and lower than anticipated debt charges (itself the result of low interest rates coupled with many capital projects having slipped into the current financial year), will the Cabinet Leader agree now to abandon at least some of his profligate “vanity” projects?”

Reply:

“I find this question fascinating. I assume through the question you are arguing against the expenditure included in the Economic Infrastructure Fund Labour set up to boost York’s local economy and number of job opportunities.

Part of the same Fund in fact that you sought to re-badge as Future York Fund in your last council budget amendment and attempted to pass off as something original. Demonstrating once again, in a consistent way it has to be said, that Lib Dem trait of adopting conflicting positions on the same issue depending on which day of the week it is.

I would like to remind Council the Fund is financed through New Homes Bonus (NHB) and prudential borrowing at historically low interest rates. The NHB element is trumpeted by Liberal Democrats nationally as supporting York's economy, but locally is opposed. Further evidence of consistent inconsistency from the Lib Dems.

The following list of events funded from the EIF has or will result in a positive economic impact:

- 1. New Park and Rides, supported by all parties*
- 2. Investment in Newgate market, supported by Conservatives but not Liberal Democrats*
- 3. A commitment to a new bridge to unlock York Central, supported by Conservatives but not Liberal Democrats*
- 4. Investment in the high street, not supported by Conservatives or Liberal Democrats.*
- 5. Tour de France – talked down by the Liberal Democrats*

The amount being spent on council debt per year has increased by £300k a year since the budgets set by Liberal Democrats and Conservative councillors, yet we are delivering a huge amount more than they ever did.”

(vi) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Steward:

“Will the leader use this opportunity to finally apologise to York’s residents for the shambles of the Lendal Bridge trial?”

Reply:

“Councillor Steward may think I am naive in the art and science of politics and this question clearly shows such qualities.

What is important is we now build the consensus over the issue of congestion, cross-party, on what action is required in this city to cope with the problem of congestion. Opposition parties may wish to beat their chests over the issue, but it is an issue that is not going to go away without some action. We have received no suggestions on how to tackle congestion from the opposition over the course of this council.”

(vii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Healey:

“What have been the outcomes and jobs created from the additional 2 year funding given to Science City York by this administration?”

Reply:

“The 2 year funding given to SCY is from EIF for high growth business support and the 3 year Innovate York programme. As the EIF programme has only just finished and the Innovate York programme is still ongoing, the outcomes are still being measured, but early outputs and outcomes are as follows:

High Growth Business Support Programme

The high growth business support programme has provided over 30 high growth businesses with business support, totalling over 96 mentoring days worth of support. GVA and job outputs are being calculated following engagement with businesses assisted.

Innovate York Programme

Positioning York as a Major Global Innovation Player

- *LLGA Global Awards and Pilots: Received Global Awards for proposals to pilot in Cape Town (2012) and Glasgow (2014) (£22k est. funding received)*
- *Lead city in URBACT EU pilot transfer programme sharing our GeniUS! York approach with Syracuse in Sicily, San Sebastian in Spain and Tallinn in Estonia. (EU 325k funding received)*
- *In top 21 most innovative cities in Europe through finalist status in Bloomberg ‘Mayor’s Challenge’ competition, with the intent to be in the winning top 5 most innovative cities by end September 2014. (est. funding if we win EU 1-5m)*
- *In talks with Citymart global innovation network around 2-3 year partnership with York to fast track alternative procurement solutions through their global innovation network of solution providers.*

Embedding Innovation as a Key Driver in the City of York

- *We have comprehensively mapped existing innovative businesses, initiatives and activities in York, and provide an accessible source of 'innovation intelligence' to the city through our web site. We have further enhanced this knowledge hub through contributing regular blogs, research, communications and innovation opportunities. (120 contributors to the innovation map)*
- *Created a draft 'Roadmap for innovation' paper which will assist CYC in developing their strategy for future innovation in the city*
- *We are continuing to develop an 'innovation ecosystem' through the 'GeniUS! York' platform, linking CYC with Businesses, the Community and Residents in a more meaningful way. To manage and deepen relationships between these groups and CYC, with a focus around 'open innovation'. To date we have 434 registered members on the GeniUS! platform and 1145 twitter members. 99 individuals have been involved in taking the pilot ideas forward from the previous 8 challenge areas.*

Delivering a City-wide Innovation programme of events and workshops to Catalyse Development

- *We have had over 1600 people attending the 43 events and workshops we have delivered over the last 22 months. Feedback has consistently been over 80% good/excellent for all events.*
- *Included in the workshops we have delivered, is a programme of Workforce Development to increase 'intrapreneurship' skills in the organisation. These took the form of lunchtime taster sessions over a five week period, and places were oversubscribed within a few days of becoming available and feedback from staff was excellent. We are now running the same course for a second time in CYC.*
- *Through partnership working with the University of York and the Institute of Leadership and Management, we will be offering intensive three day Innovation Leadership*

workshops for 25 more senior members of CYC staff to further embed innovation capacity within the organisation. This course is endorsed by ILM and can lead to further accreditation.

Comprehensive Provision of Support Activities to Drive Innovation

- *We have worked with 190 members of CYC staff over 33 service areas to build innovation capacity within the council.*
- *Over the last 22 months we have assisted 8 organisations to draw down funding from external sources e.g. TSB, Art Council, Joseph Rowntree Foundation etc to enable their projects. This amounted to £167,000 additional funding.*
- *We are working with TSB SBRI, to develop a Yorkshire-wide match funded initiative with the Technology Strategy Board to run pre-procurement competitions, to identify cutting edge solutions to challenges facing the region, and to implement them quickly in the city through pilot and scale approach. This system is similar to GeniUS! except that TSB SBRI looks for existing solutions rather than co-designing a new solution. This has great potential to support our SMEs as well as to fast track innovative solutions in the region.*

So as you can see the investment already has or has the potential to leverage significant extra funding to develop innovation both inside and outside the council.”

(viii) To the Cabinet Leader from Cllr Healey:

“How many applicants have been considered for the Interim Director position of the new company to be formed to provide 'Marketing and Business Development'?”

Reply:

“The post of Director for the new company (interim or permanent) has not yet been advertised. In the short time since Cabinet agreed the next steps, work has begun in a job description and recruitment process but no decisions have yet been made.”

(ix) To the Deputy Leader from Cllr Ayre:

“There has been interest from citizens in contributing to the revised council constitution – could the Deputy Leader explain how this can be facilitated in the light of the Leader's commitment to coproduction and engagement?”

Reply:

“The Council’s services, due to drastic cuts in funding from the Conservative Liberal Democrat Government, are as Cllr. Ayre’s knows having to under go dramatic change. The loss of around £80m in government funding will result in many services being delivered differently, if at all, in the future and so to ensure provision the Council will undertake engagement and work with partners and residents in coproduction. I am glad that Cllr Ayre now supports this process after his opposition to the services that have already become social enterprises.

With regard to the Constitution Cllr. Ayre is, of course, a member of the Audit and Governance Committee. That Committee has the responsibility of bringing forward proposals for amendments to the Constitution. We have such a proposal on the agenda tonight and we did at the last ordinary Council meeting. No doubt Cllr. Ayre has ensured that, if appropriate, the public have been able to make any contributions to the recommendations brought to Council. I am aware that the Audit and Governance Committee held a public engagement event in May at which members of the public were invited to express views as to how the Council operates. There is also a current Scrutiny review which has amongst its objectives:

- Examine national best practice by other Local Authorities currently achieving excellence level in their democratic traditions.*
- Identify optimum methods for raising awareness of the democratic process amongst York’s Communities of Identity.*

I look forward to seeing recommendations from the Group in due course – including any which suggest constitutional change- and I am sure that the Chair of the Task Group would be very happy to receive contributions from interested members of the public.

Of course it does have to be remembered that the Constitution has to reflect complex statutory provisions including those in the Local Government Acts of 1972 and 2000, the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Localism Act 2011 as well as a myriad

of other Acts, Statutory Instruments statutory guidance and case law.

The Council has an expert legal team that undertake this work and they also work in partnership with colleagues in the region to ensure that our Constitution is legally compliant. Members of the public can send in suggestions to the legal team and these will be considered by them, but due to 'process' changes that can be made are limited."

(x) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Barton:

"Has the Dutch government's "Container Housing Scheme" been investigated for York and if so what conclusions have been drawn?"

Reply:

"I can inform Cllr Barton that I first instructed Officers to look at alternative build methods over two years ago. The council are currently considering a number of modular and prefabricated build options, including the Y:Cube and Portakabin methods. The investigations to date have been encouraging in terms of quality, construction time and quality, but the council will need to be satisfied that this represents the best value option for new housing before progressing."

(xi) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Barton:

"Does the Cabinet Member have statistics available showing the success in York of the Government's "Help to Buy" scheme?"

Reply:

"No the scheme has not been a success as many people are realising that the scheme is not for them. The York number is 94 I would point out to Cllr Barton that the Public Accounts Committee have said the portfolio of Help to Buy mortgage loans will create a "heavy administrative burden" and a "medium and long-term risk to the taxpayer" The Committee have also questioned whether it represented value for money for the taxpayer.

There is also concern that the scheme has fuelled price increases and worry in the markets that many people will not be able to pay the loan aspect of the scheme back after 5 years."

(xii) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Jeffries:

“When will tenants receiving the garden assistance service be notified about how the new contractor will catch-up the backlog of work which has left very neglected gardens all around the west of the city and what steps have the council put in place to ensure that this situation is not repeated?”

Reply:

“Cllr Jeffries should already be aware that letters have already been sent to all customers. The first letter advised residents of the appointment of Oakdale and the second that there may a delay due to the new contractor taking over the contract and catching up on work that needed to be done. A further letter will be sent next week, once we have received the weekly update from Oakdale as to where they are on the list of addresses.

In order to work through the backlog Oakdale are completing the grass and hedge cut simultaneously. They have also engaged more staff to assist with the rectification works. Oakdale have put together a managed route map. They are monitoring the gardens that were cut first and will divert further resources to them for grass cut 2 to ensure the situation does not arise again. The contract also has been awarded for 2 years with the option of a further 2.”

(xiii) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Jeffries:

“On the garden assistance scheme why were tenants not informed of the meeting to re-tender the work with yet another decision being made behind-closed-doors?”

Reply:

“The decision taken was not ‘behind closed doors’ – to suggest so is a factual inaccuracy- and Cllr Jefferies should know, if she had read our own Constitution Part 3D – Officers Delegation Scheme (version 4) and Section 13 Local Government Act 2000: The Local Authorities (Functions & Responsibilities) (England) Regulations that the decision has been discharged in accordance with arrangements made under Section 9E of the Local Government Act 2000.

Our Constitution sets out the aforementioned arrangements. This policy, which adheres to legislation, has not been altered from when used by the Liberal Democrat controlling administration.

The decision to re-tender was then made as part of the day to day business of the Council and the awarding of the contract was logged and published on the Council's website as an Officer decision made under the scheme of delegations set out in Part 3 of the Constitution.

The Constitution allows Officers to award contracts which are not "key decisions". The financial threshold for key decisions and the power for Officers to award these contracts were contained in the Constitution which the Labour administration inherited from Cllr. Jeffries' party. It was a sensible provision then and it is a sensible provision now.

It is not, nor has it ever been, standard practice to involve customers in the re-tender process. However, the feedback that they provided for last years scheme was that the quality of the cuts was poor. As a result the contract now has more robust performance monitoring elements, which include a break clause in the contract, should CYC receive a certain number of complaints.

I am then content that the contract was award by the correct legal process. I am concerned that Cllr Jeffries, and the Liberal Democrats seem to want every operational decision made in to a long process that will cost York's residents money. Cllr Jeffries should note then that Council is undertaking its legal requirements, and that her question is at the very least miss-leading."

(xiv) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Reid:

"What are the net additional dwellings delivered in the council area over the last five years - is this the same as the Communities and Local Government figures or is it defined differently?"

Reply:

"Cllr Reid is aware that she can ask Council Officers at any time the 'net additional dwellings delivered in the council area over the last five years' and whether it 'is this the same as the Communities and Local Government figures or is it defined differently?"

For her convenience I am supplying her with the figures over the last 10 years although I know she already has much of this.

The housing completions contained within City of York Council documents do differ to those presented by DCLG as they provide a full assessment of all housing permissions through to completion – this is a normal practice of Local Authorities. Housing figures are updated at least monthly through Building Control updates and include NHBC housing completion details, regular contact with developers, up to four site visits per year and contact with internal departments including Housing, Electoral Services and Council Tax.

Figures on the DCLG web-site will differ from our data as a result of delays in DCLG receiving paperwork from the private sector Building Control Services and the potential inaccuracies involved in monitoring this information.

I and Officers are of the opinion is that figures above provide below are a more accurate assessment of housing completions due to the methods of monitoring implemented and form a reliable source of evidence of past housing supply.”

Dwelling Completions and Demolitions by Year, 1st April 2004 - 31st March 2014

Year	Completions	New Build	Net Conversions/ COU	Net Conversions	Net Change of Use	Demolitions	Net Dwelling Gain
2004-2005	1193	993	180	27	153	13	1160
2005-2006	949	784	139	11	128	17	906
2006-2007	875	734	110	18	92	46	798
2007-2008	557	442	87	19	68	6	523
2008-2009	502	391	73	23	50	13	451
2009-2010	606	513	64	-2	66	70	507
2010-2011	571	489	65	9	56	40	514
2011-2012	354	279	45	5	40	3	321
2012-2013	540	441	70	9	61	29	482
2013-2014	374	302	57	3	54	14	345
2003-2013	6521	5368	890	122	768	251	6007

Housing Consents 2013/14

A significant increase in housing consents took place last year with a total of **1531 net additional homes** gaining permission.

Housing Consents 2013-14 (1st April 2013 to 31st March 2014)

Year	Type of Approval	Number of Sites Granted Consent for Housing	Gross Additional Homes Consented	Net Additional Homes Consented
1 st April 2013 - 30 th September 2013	Residential (Use Class 3) Approval	67	251	235
	Office Residential Conversion (ORC)	1	8	8
	Privately managed off campus student accommodation	1	361	361
1st October 2013 - 31 st March 2014	Residential (Use Class 3) Approval	63	623	614
	Office Residential Conversion (ORC)	6	136	136
	Privately managed off campus student accommodation	1	177	177
2013-2014		139	1556	1531

Housing Permissions Granted Between 1st April 2004 to 31st March 2014

Year	Gross Housing Permissions	Net Housing Permissions
2004/2005	927	859
2005/2006	1218	1176
2006/2007	1359	1316
2007/2008	1700	1629
2008/2009	665	534
2009/2010	207	182
2010/2011	224	198
2011/2012	203	174
2012/2013	365	337
2013/2014	1556	1531
2003 to 2012	8424	7936

(xv) To the Cabinet Member for Homes and Safer Communities from Cllr Reid:

“There is apparently a new housing office opening on Lindsay Avenue. Where is the business case that supports this decision?”

Reply:

“It is a shame that Cllr Reid has not read the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan as this contained the agreed approach to

engaging with communities. The plan placed emphasis on creating local touchdown bases for Council Staff and our partners to hold advice sessions in hubs in communities lacking appropriate facilities or facilities that lend themselves to becoming a hub where services can operate. This is about localising the service.

I would refer Cllr Reid to:

http://www.york.gov.uk/info/200485/housing_plans_and_strategies/417/housing_plans_and_strategies_page_19

The shop in Lindsey Avenue was a vacant premise that had been difficult to let. The previous use was as a takeaway and as there is already another takeaway within the precinct the ability to re let the shop as a takeaway or any other commercial concern was consider extremely limited.

Work was required on the premises to remove asbestos and to ensure that the building meets all statutory requirements including disabled access. This has been paid for from within an existing budget.”

(xvi) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Doughty:

“Can the Cabinet Member please give all details, including dates, when any officer or member has had any dialogue, written or otherwise, with any agent, developer, housing association or other interested party regarding the proposed removal of 220 acres of green belt land at Earswick, which as part of the Local Plan further sites consultation, is to be re-categorised as ‘safeguarded’ land for future development?”

Reply:

“I’m not in a position to confirm absolutely all these details at such limited notice. What I can say is that from both a planning and housing perspective there have been officer meetings with the site promoter of this site both before and following its submission during and after the June to July 2013 Local Plan Preferred Options consultation. Planning officers discussed and outlined concerns relating to the issues detailed in the Local Plan Further Sites Consultation document and technical appendix. They also met with them again during the latest consultation to explore these issues.

From the housing side, the Council has been aware of emerging proposals for this site since October 2012. Advice was sought by a property agent working on behalf of a single landowner regarding affordable housing policies. Officers were contacted by and met with Fabrick Housing Group in July 2013 where the broad ambitions of the current proposed development were presented. Following submission of the site under the 'call for sites' the Development Director of Fabrick Housing Group attended a meeting of the Get York Building Board in December 2013 to outline the vision for the development including 50% affordable housing and construction training opportunities. The council were also asked if they would be interested in investing in the development. Officer views are that if the site is allocated in the Local Plan the potential for housing investment could be considered depending on the business case presented. Also in December the site sponsor met with the Homes and Communities Agency and with the representatives of the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership. Officers from the council were present at these meetings which explored whether there might be LEP or HCA funding available towards infrastructure costs were the development to proceed."

(xvii) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Richardson:

"Using Defra calculations fly tipping removal costs for York have risen year on year, with removal costs for 2011/12 approximately £44,618 and rising to £56,720 for 2013/14. How does the cabinet member propose to address this continuing overspend?"

Reply:

"The removal costs derived from Defra calculations do not accurately reflect the actual cost of removal/collections in York. It is not possible to accurately calculate this as many fly tips are removed as part of a number of scheduled tasks carried out in a day and disposed of amongst other daily collected rubbish, they are used by Defra as a bench marking tool."

(xviii) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

"Would the Cabinet Member confirm that residents will have an opportunity to address members of the Local Plan Working Group before a final draft Local Plan is drawn up?"

Reply:

“Following the current consultation on Local Plan Further Sites which ends on 16th July the Council will be producing the final (Publication) draft Local Plan. This Publication draft will be taken to the Local Plan Working Group and Cabinet prior to the commencement of public consultation which it is anticipated will take place later this year prior to Submission to the Planning Inspectorate with the usual public.”

(xix) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Richardson:

“Given Councils additional funding from Government of £311,000 for road repairs. Will Council replace the many pot holes across the City with infill of a consistent thickness and sealed with a proprietary sealant so as to reduce the number of return visits required by contractors?”

Reply:

“If you’d directed the question to the correct Cabinet member he would probably say, carriageway repairs will be undertaken using a permanent method as per our patching programme, repair method will be to excavate damaged area using a planing attachment / clean area / edge seal the area and fill with hot material.”

(xx) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Aspden:

“What steps does the new Cabinet Member propose to reverse the decline in recycling rates?”

Reply:

“Waste services has recently undertaken a trial in the Clifton area to identify ways to encourage more recycling and to assess the feasibility and affordability of a wider city roll out. The trial included a campaign against junk mail and incentives were used to increase public participation. After three months there was a 6% rise in participation and a 6% rise in recyclate collected, despite paper level dropping by 1% (an outcome of the success of the junk mail campaign).

The service is also trialling the collection of mixed plastics in the Upper Poppleton area. Again, this trial is aimed at assessing any

impact on our service capacity and how such collections might improve our recycling rate. The trial is still ongoing but early signs are encouraging with over 100 residents asking for more boxes to allow them to recycle more plastics.

We will continue to explore the potential for recycling kitchen waste.”

(xxi) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Aspden:

“The Government has recently announced new incentives for local authorities to build homes on brownfield sites, including an idea to put local development orders on brownfield sites that are suitable for housing. Will the Cabinet Member explore whether these options could help develop brownfield sites in York?”

Reply:

“Yes, when guidance or policy is published following the Chancellor’s announcement we will consider whether this type of Local Development Order would be an appropriate approach for any of York’s brownfield sites.

York’s Local Plan as a whole seeks to deliver sustainable patterns and forms of development and a key element of this is to maximise the development potential of existing brownfield sites. It is critical when planning for the future of the city that the Plan seeks to deliver for all development needs identified. In this way it can best meet the city’s economic and social ambitions and fulfil the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that ‘local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three’ (paragraph 152). An important part of the Plan’s vision is to ensure sustainable growth patterns and it is therefore considered important that economic and housing growth is linked.

In taking sites forward we will consider all available policy approaches and appropriate funding streams available at the time. It should be noted that once allocated through the Local Plan, the principle of development (for housing or other types of development) would be established on all sites, including brownfield sites such as York Central, therefore providing a similar

planning basis as would be achieved through a Local Development Order.”

(xxii) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services,
Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

“How many Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff did the council have working on gully cleaning in each of the last 4 years, how many vehicles are used for this purpose, and how many and what proportion of gullies were/are routinely cleaned in each year since 2010?”

Reply:

- *“2010-2011, 4 no FTE, approx 38000 scheduled gully cleans*
- *2011-2012, 4 no FTE, approx 39000 scheduled gully cleans*
- *2012-2013, 4 no FTE, approx 20664 scheduled gully cleans*
- *2013 -2014, 2 no FTE on 8 + 8 hour shift system rotation, approx 20664 scheduled gully cleans”*

(xxiii) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services,
Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Reid:

“How many FTE street cleaners were/are employed in each year since 2010?”

Reply:

“I am advised it is difficult to produce comparator figures due to changes in working practices - in order to increase efficiencies and the flexibility of our service a role of general operative has been introduced whereby some staff carry out a combination of grounds maintenance and street cleansing operations depending on seasonal workloads.”

(xxiv) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services,
Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Hyman:

“In the light of encouragement for cycling and the need to ensure a safe road surface could the Cabinet Member detail the response time for filling in potholes from being reported to the work being completed?”

Reply:

“If you’d directed this to the correct Cabinet Member, he’d probably say, the aim of the team is to rectify noticed defects within 20 days which are reported within the adopted highway network.”

(xxv) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services,
Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Firth:

“Could the Cabinet Member detail the response time for the removal of graffiti as reported to the council?”

Reply:

“We aim to remove graffiti from relevant land within 1 working day if the graffiti is offensive, and within 4 working days if non offensive. (Relevant land is land that the local authority is responsible for and excludes private property).”

(xxvi) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services,
Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Jeffries:

“Whilst recognising that staff are working hard to make the best of the situation they are being let down by the council in keeping the city tidy, in particular the state of grass cutting and strimming. When will the Cabinet Member take a lead on the situation and detail what will be done to make the city presentable?”

Reply:

“The issues with grass cutting and strimming are mainly due to the excessively wet and warm weather we saw in May and June, which in many areas led to delayed grass cutting, increased rate of growth and hence poor standards of cut, however following the recent two or three weeks mostly dry period, standards of cut are getting back to normal.

As part of the councils work with The Humberside, Lincolnshire and North Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company Limited’s (formerly The York & North Yorkshire Probation Trust) Community Payback team, we identify tasks for offenders to undertake as reparation for their offences, one of the ongoing tasks is undertaking the strimming of obstacles in grass areas across the city, which has taken some of the pressure of our front line staff as well as benefitting residents across the city at no cost to the authority.

We are as part of our annual fleet replacement programme constantly looking at new types of equipment that may cope better with the differing grass conditions.

We are as part of our annual fleet replacement programme constantly looking at new types of equipment that may cope better with the differing grass conditions.”

(xxvii) To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability from Cllr Richardson:

“Following Councils decision to close Haxby Hall and to relocate its residents to other homes across the City the site has a potential of helping reduce the parking congestion in Haxby. Would the Cabinet Member support its transfer to the local community?”

Reply:

“You will need to put the question of any transfer to the correct cabinet member, my colleague Councillor Dafydd Williams.”

(xxviii) To the Cabinet Member for Health and Community Engagement from Cllr Doughty:

“Can the Cabinet Member explain why we cannot receive an update on the Council’s Elderly Person’s Homes programme, a project way overdue?”

Reply:

“I am always happy to provide an update for Cllr Doughty on any aspect within my portfolio. As he is aware, the re-provision of Elderly Person’s Homes was subject to a tender process. We are currently in the Competitive Dialogue Phase and, as with any procurement process, the negotiations are confidential.”

(xxix) To the Cabinet Member for Health and Community Engagement from Cllr Doughty:

“Like myself, the Cabinet Member must be concerned that two Assistant Director’s and at least two other Senior Officer’s within Adult Social Care have either resigned or already departed recently. Has the Cabinet Member sought reasons for this and what will she do to steady the ship, protect services for our city’s most vulnerable and restore morale in the department?”

Reply:

“It is inevitable that staff will leave us and new staff will join – the average turnover rate for all CYC staff is 14.47% and for Adult Social Care is 16.57%. The two Assistant Directors have both been with CYC for over 7 years and it is coincidental that they have left at around the same time to take up new opportunities elsewhere. Two new Assistant Directors have already been appointed who had a two handover with the departing ADs to ensure good business continuity. Protecting and supporting vulnerable residents is and will always be my number one priority.”

(xxx) To the Cabinet Member for Health and Community Engagement from Cllr Jeffries:

“What is the expected timetable for the development of the Lowfields Care Village, when will local residents be updated on the project, when will a planning application be submitted and what are the estimated completion and occupation dates?”

Reply:

“The re-provision of the EPH was subject to a tender process. We are currently in the Competitive Dialogue Phase and, as with any procurement process, the negotiations are confidential. A finalised timetable for planning, construction and occupation cannot be given until negotiations are complete.”

(xxxii) To the Cabinet Member for Health and Community Engagement from Cllr Jeffries:

“On the Lowfields Care Village, would the Cabinet Member confirm that she intends to restrict any development to the “footprint” of the former school and would she indicate what the future of the rest of the site is please?”

Reply:

“The Lowfields site is 13.71 acres of which the proposed care home and care village will cover 6.95 acres. The remaining 6.76 acres is not part of the proposed scheme and there are currently no plans for that part of the land.”

(xxxiii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“Would the Cabinet Member confirm the total cost – including the provision of external disabled parking spaces – of the new barrier

controlled system at the Marygate Car Park and would he say who made the decision not to include a charge card payment option as part of the new arrangements?"

Reply:

"The total cost of the Marygate car park scheme, long a key ask from city centre businesses, is approximately £100k. As has already been explained, there is an ongoing national issue which has affected the installation of chip and pin devices and this facility will be installed at the earliest opportunity, which the current national timetable for roll out would suggest will be available in early autumn."

(xxxiii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Aspden:

"Would the Cabinet member confirm the number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued for breaches of the access restrictions on Coppergate since 1st April 2014 and would he confirm that no action is currently being taken to enforce the restrictions?"

Reply:

"No Penalty Charge Notices have been issued since 1st April 2014 and no enforcement action is currently occurring, due to the uncertainty created by the Traffic Penalty Tribunal's decision and the ongoing review of that decision."

(xxxiv) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

"Who took the decision, and when, to open the new Park and Ride site at Poppleton before work had been completed (the outstanding works on 9th June included car parking space, signage, traffic signals, road junction layout, layout, A1237 junction improvements etc) and when will all work connected with the Park and Ride site and associated road works be completed?"

Reply:

"The opening of the Park & Ride site at Poppleton Bar was taken by officers to make the facility available at the earliest opportunity that it was safe to do so, in order to maximise the benefit of the facility to the public and the city. The contractors are scheduled to leave site by the end of the month."

I would like to briefly thank Poppleton residents for bearing with the disruption while the works were undertaken."

(xxxv) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Doughty:

“Can the Cabinet Members please advise when work will be completed on the cycle path and the shoulder length grass and weeds on the northern A1237 between Haxby and Wigginton, whether costs will exceed further the already £400,000 over budget cost and what general maintenance will take place in the future as it currently stands as a very sad and expensive Labour ‘legacy’ to the Tour De France?”

Reply:

“The installation of the new bridge is the key activity, and following a tender process the Council will shortly award the contract for this. If all goes to plan, the bridge should be installed by the end of the year, but this is dependent on weather and limited to a few available dates available to us when the railway line can be closed to facilitate the lifting of the bridge onto its foundations. The construction of the embankment paths at either end of the bridge and the toucan crossing on Haxby Road will follow the bridge installation, and will probably take place in early 2015.

It is not expected that the scheme cost will exceed the current budget. Once the scheme is complete the area in question will be included in the council’s routine grass cutting and other highway maintenance programmes.”

(xxxvi) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“What has been the number of vehicles parked on average each day at the new Park and Ride site at Poppleton and how many passengers have been carried by the new buses on each day since 9th June?”

Reply:

“From opening, the number of cars parked at the new Poppleton Park & Ride site is between 70 – 100. On a Saturday this increases to 200. Once the permanent signage and landscaping is completed, the site will be considerably more visible to the public and increased use is anticipated.

The number of passengers carried on route 59 from 8th June to 1st July is 9148. This is in line with other Park & Ride services. The route 7 service to the Designer Outlet Park & Ride carried

9606 passengers in its first month. On comparable Park & Ride services, passenger numbers after the first month averaged about 40% of passenger numbers after a year.”

(xxxvii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“Would the Cabinet Member confirm the numbers who were killed and seriously injured on York’s roads in each of the last 5 years and what target for accident reduction has he set for the current calendar year?”

Reply:

“The KSI figures are as follows:

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
KSI	60	62	63	51	58

The Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government scrapped nationally-set casualty reduction targets in 2010/11 and the Council have never had a locally-set target. Our local policy is to monitor them year on year and strive to keep them as low as possible by working locally and regionally with other road safety groups to maximise our budgets and campaigns.”

(xxxviii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“How many residents have so far applied and paid for one of the new “Minster” badges and when, where and by whom was the decision taken not to allow non-residents, who make frequent trips to the City, to purchase a badge if they wished to do so?”

Reply:

“From the 1st July to the 9th July almost 1000 Minster Badges have been purchased by residents.

Minster Badges have only ever been available exclusively to residents and the decision to introduce a charge for the Minster Badge did not alter this. Either we have a resident discount or we do not – if we do, it needs to be properly enforceable, if we do not and the Liberal Democrats are simply calling for an across-the-board cut in parking charges, they should explain a) how they will pay for this in the face of massive cuts from their Party in Government, and b) how they will deal with the resulting increase in congestion.”

(xxxix) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“At the March Council meeting the Cabinet member confirmed that car parking space availability information had not been accessible through the Council’s website “since the move to West Offices”, but assured Council that “live information from the car parks (would be) available on the web site by May 2014”. Why was this deadline not met and what alternative steps have been taken to provide real time parking information for those travelling to the City for events like the Tour de France?”

Reply:

“Live car park availability information can be found on the Council's YorkLive website for many car parks with more to be added in the near future. We also employ a range of channels to communicate event information, including extensive use of social media, and this was the case with the Tour de France.”

(xl) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“When can we expect the car park space availability information to be available again “on-line” and when does the Cabinet Member anticipate that the street located Variable Message Boards will all be working reliably?”

Reply:

“In terms of the online facility, would refer Cllr Reid to my previous answer.

For the street-based facility, much of this technology is obsolete, and finding compatible components to replace and upgrade the technology has proved a challenge. This work has been scoped and agreements are in place to ensure that this is done expeditiously.”

(xli) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Runciman:

“When will the relevant part of the Council’s website be updated to allow residents to see when road repairs in their area are likely to take place?”

Reply:

“Perhaps Cllr Runciman needs to look at the website more closely, as this information is already available at

http://www.york.gov.uk/info/200328/temporary_restrictions/1023/temporary_traffic_restrictions”

(xlii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Reid:

“How long have the automated car park spaces signs been out of action, why haven't they been working, and when will they be working again?”

Reply:

“The ageing technology - not addressed by the previous administration but being addressed by this administration as set out in my previous answer as part of a rolling plan of refurbishment and investment in our parking facilities - is indeed coming to the end of its useful life, with some units being out of action for around 12 months while others are far more recent.”

(xliii) To the Cabinet Member for Transport from Cllr Richardson:

“Government funding for the Real Time Information System has been a resounding success for many of the bus users of this City. However given the displacement of the information points are mainly in the City Centre. Can Council confirm when the remainder of routes across the City are to be installed including the replacement of bus shelters?”

Reply:

“There is an ongoing Better Bus Area Fund programme of works (funded by national government, local government, and private operators) for bus stops outside the city centre that have been identified for improvement. The BBAF works will be completed by spring 2015, but budget permitting, we would of course plan to continue to improve bus stops across the city beyond this point.”

(xliv) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Steward:

“Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that it is wrong so many officers have been appointed on what Cllr Warters correctly calls ‘living it up wages’ of over £500 per day without any elected member input?”

Reply:

“Other than trying to score points I am really not sure what the purpose of this question is as clearly I do not accept the premise that lies behind it.

For permanent directors, a budget provision of £132,000 is made to cover salary and employer costs such as tax, national insurance and pension. This is one of the lowest amounts for unitary authorities in the country. Whether or not he thinks this represents value for money, in York we generally pay less than the market rate. Assuming he does not want the Council to carry vacancies at a senior level and put front line services at risk, I would be interested to know what Cllr Steward's suggested alternative approach would be.”

(xlv) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Galvin:

“Given that the Guildhall complex has been empty for some 12 months what plans are being discussed by officers or Cabinet member for it’s future use?”

Reply:

“There is a full report coming to October Cabinet outlining progress made on the Guildhall project which will clearly set out proposals for its future use. The complex is still in regular use with the Guildhall having forward bookings through to spring 2015 and the offices being used for rehearsal space for local theatre productions. Other interim uses are also being explored.”

(xlvi) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Galvin:

“What have been the overall costs expended on the Guildhall complex in the past 12 months in terms of heating, business rates and any other charges incurred?”

Reply:

“Total costs incurred on the Guildhall in 2013/14 were £118.4k, breakdown as follows:

	£000's
<i>Repairs and Maintenance</i>	<i>14.8</i>
<i>Energy Costs</i>	<i>26.6</i>
<i>Business Rates</i>	<i>63.1</i>

<i>Cleaning and Domestic Supplies</i>	<i>13.0</i>
<i>Other misc charges e.g alarms</i>	<i>0.9</i>

(xlvi) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Richardson:

“With the introduction of the new Residents Parking Discount Badge at £20 for two years in September. Can Council state what is the expected average savings expected for a resident over that time frame and will residents be given extra discount for paying for there parking by Credit/Debit Card?”

Reply:

“There are potentially over 30,000 active Minster Badges in use at this time. It will be up to individual residents to decide for themselves whether the Minster Badge makes economic sense to purchase. For those that work in the city during evenings – savings of up to £1,000 could be achieved from not paying evening charges over a two year period. However for those that only park on an irregular basis it may not make any financial sense to purchase a badge and pay the higher rate.

It should be noted that a range of parking options are available for residents.

There are no plans to provide discounts for paying by credit / debit card as the primary advantage to motorists of being able to pay this way is the convenience of not having to find the correct change, rather than any financial saving.”

(xlviii) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Barton:

“What measures is the Cabinet Member taking to investigate the cause of what appears to be job dissatisfaction amongst senior officers?”

Reply:

“Much as I like Cllr Barton and want to give him the full and frank answer he deserves I am finding it hard to do so on this occasion as I have absolutely no idea what he is talking about.

We have had two recent promotions amongst senior staff and the results of staff surveys are showing as 'Green' (thereby good) in all

but one area, which would not indicate the job dissatisfaction he refers to.”

(xlix) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Richardson:

“Given Councils flagship call centre has had time to find its feet, will Council provide the following information:

1. What is the longest time taken to answer an incoming call?

Reply:

“In the last quarter the longest time to answer a call was 29mins 46 secs, which is clearly unacceptable. However it is also quite exceptional. The average time to answer calls across the call centre in the last quarter was 53 secs across all of our lines. Average waiting times for the quarter across each of our lines is outlined below:

	Average Speed of Answer
Operators	00:00:38
Council Tax	00:00:58
Smarter	00:01:00
Neighbourhoods	00:01:00
Parking	00:00:10
Planning	00:00:58
Benefits General	00:01:43
Benefits Changes	00:01:01
Benefits New Claim	00:00:51
YFAS Freephone	00:01:45
YFAS	00:01:17

2. What was the cost of that phone call based on the standard local call rate?”

Reply:

“Based on BT phone tariff guide for residential customers of 3.3p per minutes is (so 29.76 x 0.033 =) £0.98p for the longest call in the quarter.”

(l) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Ayre:

“Why is the facility to report potholes, faulty street lights, blocked footpaths etc from the “Do it on line - Report it” section of the council website still not available despite assurances given by the Cabinet Member in March that this would be available by the end of April?”

Reply:

“I could give a long and technical answer to this question which would no doubt be dismissed as gobbledegook so I will give the shortened version which is simply technical problems. Cllr Ayre raises a valid issue and I know that officers are working hard to ensure that the commitment given on this is honoured.

The revised and current plan is to start the phased replacement programme to allow this to happen for these services within the next 3 weeks.”

(li) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Reid:

“Residents are still not being given a reference number for any complaint that they raise and instead are being given a standard response saying: “at present, due to current technical problems, we are unable to provide you with a reference number”. This has been the position for over 12 months now. When can those reporting issues to the Council expect to be given a reference number?”

Reply:

“All customers whose complaint is logged directly via ‘haveyoursay’ or passed to ‘haveyoursay’ inbox / email address or via phones direct to the Customer Centre - are all given a unique CF or CCF reference number.

The Customer Centre Manager has spoken to the customer centre phone team manager and they think the issue might be that until recently we were not communicating sufficiently that the complaint will be passed to another team and a reference number allocated.

This has been rectified and we now let customers know when we are taking complaint details from them, that the customer feedback team will contact them with a reference number.”

(lii) To the Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance from Cllr Ayre:

“What is the current gap between the Council’s overall borrowing requirement and the amount that has currently been borrowed and does the Cabinet Member expect that borrowing to take place before or after the local elections?”

Reply:

“The difference between the actual current borrowing and the borrowing requirement (capital finance requirement) is set out in regular reports to Audit and Governance, and to Cabinet, therefore this information is freely available to all Members of the Council. I can confirm the figures below at the end of 13/14 financial year :-

*13/14 capital finance requirement £ 311.2m (includes £140.3m Housing revenue account)
13/14 actual debt £253.3m*

All decisions regarding the actual borrowing are delegated to the Chief Finance Officer (the Director of Customer and Business Support), and he determines when borrowing is taken, and the balance between actual borrowing and underlying need for borrowing. This is influenced by a number of factors including levels of cash balances, current/forecast future interest rates, and planned capital expenditure. There is no political influence in terms of these decisions. As such I cannot confirm when borrowing might be taken, though clearly the member can speak to the Director himself.”

(liii) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People from Cllr Brooks:

“Does the Cabinet Member have an estimate of the expected uptake of free school meals for classes up to Year 2 in September?”

Reply:

“We have been very focused on this issue since the change in the law came in and as I visit primary schools it is always something I ask about; responses vary, some schools are very confident,

others have some concerns particularly about managing the length of lunch breaks when an increase in uptake from younger children may mean that the overall meal time may take longer. But all are confident they will manage the situation. We have worked generally on an 85% take up – in line with the two pilot schemes in Durham and Newham. This will be monitored across all Key Stage 1 schools in the first few weeks of the new school year and this will allow us to monitor the impact on kitchens and kitchen staff as well as how the schools manage the increased take up. We have put in new equipment to many school kitchens to assist catering staff.

One side benefit from the expected increase in school meal take up in key stage 1 has been that the LA have been able to re-negotiate the contract with our catering contractor ISS and as a result for the parents of children in those schools which are in the contract and whose child is in KS 2 the price of a school meal reduces from £2.25 to £2.00 per day from September.”

(liv) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People from Cllr Barton:

“In view of the shortage of foster parents, does the Cabinet Member agree that the dissemination of what little information that exists to the general public is sadly lacking and needs to be more proactive?”

Reply:

“It is one of our major priorities to recruit and approve more foster carers and it is an ongoing exercise as well as the targeted work that was done during the recent Fostering Week initiative. The Team work with the Council’s Communications Team to ensure that all our marketing and publicity is targeted to achieve the best outcomes. In addition we also work with North Yorkshire, East Riding and Fostering Network to explore new initiatives, which enhance the publicity and recruitment of new foster carers.

We have revised our arrangements with foster carers recently and believe that we now have a very strong and attractive offer to people wishing to become foster parents. We are currently developing a piece of work that could further enhance the role of foster carers and therefore make it a more attractive opportunity. The Corporate Parenting Board receives regular reports on all aspects of the Fostering and Adoption Service.”

(lv) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People from Cllr Runciman:

“Could the Cabinet Member update Council on what is happening with Space 217?”

Reply:

“Regrettably Space 217 does not fall within my sphere of influence – although I very recently went past it on my way to somewhere else.”

(lvi) To the Cabinet Member for Education, Children and Young People from Cllr Aspden:

“Will the Cabinet member make a commitment to retain the same number of Youth Centres as currently exist and detail the activities which will be available to young people operating from them?”

Reply:

“Both the Council’s local Youth Centres – 68 Centre and Moor Lane Youth Centre have been retained. There are no immediate plans to close either centre and we are looking to find a wider community role for them. We are opening up our buildings to other youth groups at minimal cost.

A full programme can be circulated. Members are being given every opportunity to attend regular briefings around youth and community services.”

(lvii) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Barton:

“Can the Cabinet Member inform the council what stage has been reached in the discussions between the York Conservation Trust and the York Theatre Royal to take over or purchase the Theatre Royal and the De Grey rooms, and has a value been agreed for the properties?”

Reply:

“I am not party to any discussions that might have taken place between the York Conservation Trust and the York Theatre Royal and cannot therefore comment.

Just in case Cllr Barton is confused over who owns what: The Theatre Royal in fact belongs to the Council, whilst the de Grey building is owned by the York Conservation Trust.

However, with regard to the Theatre, the Council is open to innovative ideas about the best way forward to secure investment in the building to secure its long-term future, especially in light of the excellent news concerning the Theatre's successful Arts Lottery bid supported by £500k of capital from the Council.

Culture is a vital part of the life of this city and York Theatre Royal is a vital part of our cultural heritage. It is therefore in the interest of this council that we support and encourage the increased sustainability of York Theatre Royal.

I have therefore instructed officers to investigate all the options and talk to all interested parties."

(lviii) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism from Cllr Cuthbertson:

"Regarding the "Grand Depart" held at Huntington Stadium on 4th July, how much was spent on this event (broken down by artist fees, charity contributions, equipment hire, stadium costs, traffic management, staffing costs, hospitality etc), how much income was derived (broken down by ticket sales, sponsorship etc), and who took the decision – and when – to add this event to the Tour de France calendar?"

Reply:

"The Huntington Stadium concert was added to the calendar of events under the delegated authority of the Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods.

The final costs and income of the concert, along with an evaluation of all aspects of the immensely successful Tour de France York Depart are currently being worked on and a report will be produced shortly and available to members.

I would personally like to thank and congratulate the ward councillors who worked with residents on all of our community events, officers who enabled them to do that and most importantly our communities for embracing the Tour de France and ensuring there were so many wonderful aspects to the cultural and sporting calendar in York and Yorkshire in the run up to the 6 July."

(lix) To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Tourism
from Cllr Cuthbertson:

“What is the Cabinet Member’s deadline for starting work on the ground at the new Community Stadium at Huntington and what is her current best estimate of its opening date?”

Reply:

“The current best estimate for the start of work at the new stadium is March 2015 with an estimated completion date of July 2016.”

Cllr Julie Gunnell

DEPUTY LORD MAYOR OF YORK

[The meeting started at 6.30 pm and concluded at 9.55 pm]