



---

# ***Transforming Neighbourhood Services North East Area***

Version: Final January 2017

Decision to be taken by: Cllr Kirk Master  
Decision to be taken on: 23 January 2017  
Lead director: John Leach

---

**Useful information**

- Ward(s) affected: Belgrave, Rushey Mead, Troon, Humberstone & Hamilton, Thurncourt
- Report author: Lee Warner
- Author contact details: 454 3542
- Report version number: vs Final January 2017

## 1. Summary

The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide an overview of progress to date of the Transforming Neighbourhood Services (TNS) Programme
- Present a summary of the results of engagement work and consultation carried out in the North East area of the city
- To set out the proposals that are intended to be implemented by the TNS programme in relation to the North East area

The City Mayor and Executive are asked to:

- 1) To note the activity that has taken place to date
- 2) To agree the model as presented in the report into implementation upon completion of outstanding action points including consultation with affected staff
- 3) To note the comments and recommendations of the Neighbourhoods and Community Involvement Scrutiny Commission
- 4) To reflect the anticipated £74.3k p.a. revenue savings in the approved budget and budget strategy, and reduce the budgets accordingly from January 2018.
- 5) To note the release of £500k from the corporate Service Transformation Fund, being the indicative capital costs of the required building alterations and improvements
- 6) To delegate authority to the Director of Finance to determine the specific budget ceilings affected

## 2. Main report:

### 2.1 Background

The TNS programme is scoped to identify different ways of organising how services are delivered within the neighbourhoods of the city of Leicester, with a view to reducing the costs of delivery by around 30% while maintaining the quality of our services.

The programme approach is to consider each of 6 geographical areas in turn to identify methods by which the service delivery model can be transformed through opportunities to co-locate services and make better use of the assets available.

Initially the scope of the programme covered four service areas:

- Community Services
- Libraries

- Adult Skills & Learning
- Neighbourhood based customer services

In addition some other council services with a presence in the neighbourhoods were included where they could form a part of the future delivery model, for example, by sharing locations.

In October 2015 the Council announced a city-wide review of its buildings called “Using Buildings Better”. The Transforming Neighbourhood Services programme now forms part of this wider programme and is extended to include other neighbourhood based service points. In the north east area this has meant the inclusion of council run youth centre buildings. The inclusion in UBB also enables dependencies with other relevant areas of work including a wider review of staff accommodation and channel shift to be better managed.

The full scope of the north east area includes the following buildings:

Property	Ward
Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre	Belgrave
Belgrave Library	Belgrave
Armadale Centre	Humberstone & Hamilton
Hamilton Library & Learning Centre	Humberstone & Hamilton
Netherhall Community Centre	Humberstone & Hamilton
Northfields Neighbourhood Centre	North Evington/Troon
Rushey Mead Library	Rushey Mead
Rushey Mead Recreation Centre	Rushey Mead
Ocean Road Community Centre	Thurncourt
Thurnby Lodge Youth & Community Centre	Thurncourt

Under the Council’s Using Buildings Better programme Children, Young People and Family (CYPF) Centres form part of the Early Help work stream. However CYPF Centres and council pre-school provision are considered within the TNS programme where there are opportunities to achieve joined up solutions for groups of buildings.

## 2.2 Development of the draft model

In order to develop a draft model the following activities have been undertaken:

- Data collection exercise to identify the buildings in scope, costs associated, services provided, usage statistics, historical information
- An initial engagement exercise was carried out for the city as a whole between April and July 2013 to raise awareness and gain an overview of the general views and attitudes of residents towards neighbourhood services
- An in-depth and focussed engagement process was carried out in the north east area between 6th June and 17th July 2016 to collect suggestions and comments from service users and residents
- Analysis of the data collected and the responses received through the engagement exercises to construct a draft model, which was presented to the City Mayor and Executive in August 2016.
- Assessments of equalities impact of the options proposed
- Consultation on the draft model during September and October 2016, involving a series of meetings with resident groups, stakeholder groups and community group and the availability of a form to complete to provide feedback, comments and suggestions against the draft proposals (see section 2.2.1)
- Refinement of the model into that proposed in this report following the results of the consultation and further detailed design work surrounding the proposed projects

### **2.2.1 Engagement and Consultation Activity**

Details of the previous engagement between June- July 2016 have been previously reported. The main outcomes of these previous exercises were:

- Good support for the principle of retaining services over buildings
- Strong support for the co-location of services, providing busy places from which multiple services can be accessed
- Some support for transferring of assets through the Community Asset Transfer procedure
- Some concern to ensure existing groups continue to have fair and equal access should buildings undergo community asset transfer
- Significant support for libraries and the functions they perform and likewise for activities in community and youth centres.
- There is potential for using buildings better by bringing services together in some buildings

Following the previous report to the Executive in August 2016, a consultation exercise has been carried out on the draft proposals that were presented to the City Mayor and Executive at that time. Views were sought on the suitability and practicality of those proposals.

The consultation took place between 12<sup>th</sup> September and 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2016. A wide range of stakeholders developed during the engagement phase were contacted to promote the consultation and to gain views on the proposals. Two large open meetings were held at Hamilton Library and Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre. Around 18 meetings were held with stakeholder groups, community groups who currently use the buildings and informal meetings and conversations were held throughout the consultation period. Ward Councillors and the local MP attended the open events and other meetings. Around 720 residents, stakeholders, partners and service users attended the meetings.

A consultation questionnaire was promoted online and at all Council run buildings and GP surgeries in the area throughout the duration of the exercise. The questionnaire was also available in Gujarati, Punjabi and Urdu. Promotional materials were displayed in a wide range of public buildings including community, youth and leisure centres, GP surgeries, temples and schools. An early press release generated articles in the local newspapers and radio stations.

A full report of the engagement carried out in June and July 2016 is attached to this document as Appendix A

A full report of the consultation carried out in September and October 2016 is attached to this document as Appendix B.

### **2.2.2 Consultation Outcomes and Alterations to the Proposals**

In total, at the closure of the consultation on the 23<sup>rd</sup> October a total of 1,436 completed response forms have been received representing a high response rate. The following points provide a summary of the outcomes of the consultation:

#### **Group Meetings – key outcomes**

- People attending the groups were protective of the sites that they currently use, but there was a general acceptance that locality based services are more important than particular buildings
- There were concerns about the busyness and capacity of some buildings proposed for amalgamation
- There was concern about the impact of co-location of services on existing user groups
- There was concern about the quality of the services proposed for reorganisation under the proposals, and in particular regarding the library service, community events and the lunch club in Belgrave.
- Concerns were raised about costs of using buildings increasing, particularly if they are transferred to other organisations.
- Enquiries and discussions were held around the potential for asset transfer of buildings.
- There is a general concern that training, guidance and support is needed for groups to understand expectations and requirements placed upon groups when entering into asset transfer arrangements.
- There was strong feedback in the Netherhall area that an alternative suggestion should be explored to collocate services in the Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre rather than the Armadale Centre.

#### **Questionnaire – key outcomes**

- There is good support for the services and activities offered by community centres and a high level of support for library services
- A large number of responses were received from Belgrave and Rushey Mead wards regarding the proposals for buildings in this area.
- Many respondents are concerned about the proposal to relocate Belgrave Library to Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre. Key concerns were around the availability of sufficient space and the impact on existing services and activities currently running in both buildings.
- Respondents are concerned to ensure that existing activities and services can

continue under the building changes proposed. This was the case for users of the Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre lunch club and exercise classes.

- There is strong support for the Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre and for the pre-school which operates there and concern that current activities may not be accommodated in the Armadale Youth Centre.
- There is good support for the proposal to improve access to the community hall at Hamilton Library

### **Lessons Learned**

The following are a summary of the lessons learned from the engagement and consultation process:

- The method of engagement with the groups has resulted in a high quality level of response, particularly given the ability to tailor conversations to answer specific concerns when meeting groups individually
- There has been a significantly increased response rate compared to the previous consultation on proposals in the other areas of the city. This could be due to the early engagement of stakeholders prior to the official start of the consultation.
- The overall approach of involving Ward Councillors, the local MP, stakeholders and members of the public early has been good as it helps to ensure that all concerns are heard, and provides sufficient time to respond to these concerns on an evidence basis
- The process undertaken has led to good co-operation between stakeholder individuals and groups, as well as other services
- A similar model of engagement will be used for the other areas of the city
- The process has highlighted the potential staffing impact on staff whose primary base is one of the sites proposed for closure and/or asset transfer and the need to commence an appropriate change consultation process

### **2.2.3 Impact of Consultation on Model**

Following the consultation the following amendments have been made to the proposed model for the north east area:

- Belgrave Library will not move into Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre at this time. There were discussions with residents and service users about moving the library into the neighbourhood centre whilst other changes were also proposed there. The proposal to move the library will therefore not be explored while other operational changes are being implemented at Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre.
- Further consultation will be undertaken on options for the Armadale Youth Centre and Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre. There was significant community support for an alternative option to be considered to retain Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre instead of the Armadale Centre. There was also support from young people for the proposed option to develop the Armadale Centre for community activities.
- Community space and library services will be delivered from the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre. There was strong support for retention of the community space at Rushey Mead and also for the library

## 2.3 Draft Model Summary

### 2.3.1 Principles of the model

The following principles have been used to develop this model:

- Retention of locality based services are a higher priority than the retention of specific buildings
- A key principle of shared buildings providing multiple services
- A reduction of around 30% of current Neighbourhood Services spend is to be achieved.
- The services provided should remain and where possible be enhanced
- At this stage the model is based around the use of the buildings only. The implementation of the changes may have an impact on some staff based at these buildings.
- Opportunities for alternative use should be investigated for buildings identified as surplus to requirements

### 2.3.1 Rationale

A target saving of a 30% reduction in building running costs for Neighbourhood Services buildings has been identified through the TNS programme. In addition there is a requirement to identify building running cost savings for other public facing buildings in the area under the Using Buildings Better programme and via other elements of the Using Buildings Better programme including staff accommodation and channel shift.

The proposals are to invest in well located and well used buildings to collocate services. This was the most popular suggestion for re-organising services during the engagement period. The following buildings are proposed based on analysis of the responses from the stakeholder engagement exercises and local buildings data.

### 2.3.2 Draft Model in detail

The overall model is to reduce the number of buildings in operation by combining the services provided into fewer, multi-purpose centres. The main focus of these centres will be Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre and Belgrave Library, Rushey Mead Recreation Centre, one of the two buildings located on Grantham Road in Netherhall, Hamilton Library and Thurnby Lodge Youth and Community Centre.

The following section describes the proposed model in relation to each building in the area.

#### **Belgrave Ward**

*(Some concern was expressed during the consultation with regard to the proposal to move Belgrave Library into Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre. Some stakeholders were keen to be involved in proposals to review room hire arrangements to generate income for the Neighbourhood Centre.)*

The recommendation is retain the library service at Belgrave Library on Cossington Street at this time. Also to change operations at Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre and to invest in the building to free up more space to increase income. The location of the

library service in Belgrave will be reviewed after operational changes have been embedded at Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre.

### **Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre**

- Redecorate some areas of the building including the main hall
- Work with centre users to change lunch club provision. Work with partners to develop a reduced size kitchen facility suitable for community use. It is likely that the current operating model will change and consideration will have to be given to the capacity to cook a high volume of meals onsite.
- Move adult learning classrooms into Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre to deliver more English language and other classes
- Review room hire arrangements to free up more space for additional activities and to increase income.
- Explore car parking controls to improve availability for centre users

### **Belgrave Library**

- Retain the library service at the current location at this time
- Review service operations in line with consultation feedback to improve efficiency
- Review the location of the Belgrave library service after operational changes have been embedded at Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre
- Install library and customer self-service terminals to provide additional access to council services

### **Rushey Mead Ward**

*(There was concern regarding the space available for bringing services together in either building as currently configured. There was interest from a number of groups in the potential for Community Asset Transfer of one of the buildings).*

The recommendation is to combine library services and community activities at the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre. Investment will be made to reconfigure the layout of the building to free up more space.

### **Rushey Mead Recreation Centre**

- Invest in the building to free up additional space
- Work with stakeholders to combine staffed library services and community activities at this centre
- Install library self-service equipment

### **Rushey Mead Library**

- Move library services in to Rushey Mead Recreation Centre
- Explore a range of options for disposal of Rushey Mead Library including lease, sale or demolition.

### **Troon & North Evington Wards**

*(There was some support for Community Asset Transfer as an option for Northfields Neighbourhood Centre under the proposal.)*

### **Northfields Neighbourhood and Youth Centre**

- Dispose of the building as a community resource. Explore options including community asset transfer, rental or sale of the centre or reuse of the centre.
- If groups need to move, work with them to identify the best location for their



needs

- Explore alternative options for delivering youth sessions in the area, including street based sessions

### **Humberstone & Hamilton Ward**

*(There was local concern regarding the proposal to transfer community activities to the Armadale Centre and an alternative suggestion retain Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre instead of the Armadale. There was support for the initial proposal to improve access to the community hall at Hamilton Library.)*

It is recommended to undertake a short period of further consultation to include consideration of an alternative proposal for Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre and the Armadale Centre.

### **Armadale Youth Centre and Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre**

- Consult on additional options for Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre and Armadale Centre.

### **Hamilton Library & Learning Centre**

- Redevelop the building as “Hamilton Library and Community Centre”
- Improve access to the hall for community use
- Review service operations in line with consultation feedback to improve efficiency
- Install a customer self-service facility to enable additional access to council services

### **Thurncourt Ward**

#### **Ocean Road Community Centre**

- Explore options for disposal of the building including demolition or sale
- Work with groups to identify the best location for their needs

#### **Thurnby Lodge Youth and Community Centre**

- Retain the youth and community centre
- Increase use of the youth and community spaces to accommodate some relocated activities
- Explore ways of reducing centre running costs with existing partners

## **2.4 Costs and Benefits**

### **2.4.1 Current Costs**

#### **Neighbourhood Services**

The budgeted running costs (based on financial year 2015 / 16) for **Neighbourhood Services** buildings scoped into the north east area are shown in the table below:

<b>Neighbourhood Services Buildings</b>	<b>Building running costs budget 2015/16</b>
Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre	£78,100

Belgrave Library	£25,700
Hamilton Library & Learning Centre	£30,300
Netherhall Community Centre	£19,000
Northfields Neighbourhood Centre	£22,000
Rushey Mead Library	£14,800
Rushey Mead Recreation Centre	£11,000
Ocean Road Community Centre	£9,500
Thurnby Lodge Youth & Community Centre	£29,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>£239,600</b>

The total Neighbourhood Services budget figure of £239,600 provides a guide savings target of £71,900 (30%) for the asset based review only.

### Youth Services

The budgeted running costs (based on the financial 2014 / 15) for Youth service run buildings scoped into the north east area are shown in the table below.

<b>Youth Services Buildings</b>	<b>Budgeted Service Building Running Cost</b>
Armadale Youth Centre	£9,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,500</b>

### 2.4.2 One-off costs

In order to support the proposals, investment is required for building enabling works. A contingency sum is reserved for unforeseen costs.

For the implementation of this model initial visual building surveys have been carried out to estimate the costs to carry out the alterations required. The following table shows indicative capital costs to carry out the work required:

<b>Budget</b>	<b>Estimated Allocation</b>
Building works	£400k
Contingency	£100k
<b>Total</b>	<b>£500k</b>

Costs include a provision for internal and professional fees. Funding for these one-off costs will be sourced from the Corporate Transformation Budget as per a previous agreement.

### 2.4.3 Financial Benefits

At the point of releasing the buildings the following financial benefits will be available (full year basis):

<b>Building</b>	<b>Efficiencies (1 Year)</b>	<b>Efficiencies (5 Years)</b>	<b>Effective from</b>
Bring adult learning provision into Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre and increase income target	£23k	£115k	Jan 2018
Netherhall/Armadales Centres*	£10k	£50k	TBA*
Northfields Neighbourhood Centre	£17k	£85k	Jan 2018
Rushey Mead buildings	£14.8k	£74k	Jan 2018
Ocean Road Community Centre	£9.5k	£47.5k	Jan 2018
<b>Total</b>	<b>£74.3k</b>	<b>£371.50k</b>	

\*The combined saving from Netherhall and Armadales Centres will be released following a separate decision.

Comparing the total savings shown in the table above (£74,300) with the total Neighbourhood Services building running costs of the area (£239,600) shows that this is in line with the principle of the programme of aiming to reduce building running costs by at least 30%. Under the proposals the combined saving stated for the Netherhall and Armadales buildings is dependent upon the outcome of further consultation.

#### **Notes on the above tables:**

Efficiency savings are based on the budgeted building running costs for 2015/16 minus the non-transferable income generated by the building.

#### **Additional financial benefits**

The proposed savings relate specifically to building running costs incurred by Neighbourhood Services. However the proposed changes also help to reduce existing financial pressures on building management and maintenance costs. In addition, the proposals for Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre will negate the need for significant capital investment to refurbish the extensive kitchen which would otherwise be required for the existing service model to continue.

The model is in line with a review of the Neighbourhood Services organisation which has already been completed and which was implemented in January 2016 and which delivers £586k savings.

### 2.4.4 Non-financial benefits

There are a number of non-financial benefits that apply to this draft model as follows:

- The result would be continued delivery of services while achieving a 30% reduction in spending

- The model is in line with the majority of views received from the engagement process i.e. increase co-location of services in the most appropriate buildings for the area.
- Convenient, co-located services including some new services
- Better use of buildings, especially with regard to community space.
- Investment in multi-service sites ensures the longer-term viability of the services in the area
- A potential reduction in energy use of approximately 30% and associated carbon dioxide savings that will contribute towards achieving corporate environmental improvement objective to reduce the council's greenhouse gas emissions

## 2.5 Risks and Dependencies

The following list describes the risks and issues currently identified

- The overall model is dependent on the credibility, acceptability and quality of the offers made by other organisations to take over the costs and management of the buildings made available through asset transfer, as this will form the basis of the efficiencies available. Support sessions for community groups will be made available from an independent organisation. The sessions will aim to provide advice, guidance and support in relation to managing community asset transfers and the expectations and requirements made of the community groups.
- Potential implications relating to cleaning staff could financially impact on some community groups dependent on the service provision they intend to offer through asset transfer. This should be explored at the support sessions stage.
- For all improvement works the identification and remedial actions required arising from the presence of asbestos may increase the costs and delay completion of any works.
- Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre is a grade II listed building. Permission to implement building improvements will be required from the planning section with possible impacts on timescales and cost.
- There are some individual groups in the area which have specific needs which may be difficult to relocate in alternative locations. In some cases the most suitable alternative locations may be available in non-council settings.
- There are a number of interdependencies to consider as part of the TNS work which includes the remodelling and reduction of the Council's early help services (youth service, children centres and family support services) Proposals from TNS and Early Help Remodelling include the disposal (meaning sale, transfer or demolition) of the Northfields Neighbourhood and Youth Centre and Northfields Children Young People and Families Centre (CYPF) which are both located within the North East.

The following list describes the dependencies that have been identified to this point:

- The Using Buildings Better programme encompasses six work streams to review the wider council buildings estate. TNS proposals will need to link in with assumptions and proposals put forward by other work streams as part of the overall picture. There will be crossover with the accommodation strategy where back office functions are linked to TNS proposals.
- Early years remodelling Board will review council provision of pre-school and children, young people and family centres. Decisions will impact upon the delivery of services in some Neighbourhood Buildings, and on assumptions with

- regard to alternative provision in the local area.
- The completion of the projects will rely significantly on other support services within the council, particularly property, planning, and housing.

### 3. Details of Scrutiny

The Scrutiny Commission has been kept updated with regard to the progress of TNS and recently Using Buildings Better Programmes.

The final proposals were presented to the Neighbourhood Services and Community Involvement Scrutiny Commission on 30 November 2016.

### 4. Financial, legal and other implications

#### 4.1 Financial implications

The proposals in this report would deliver the target savings of 30% of premises running costs, namely annual savings of £74.3k. Some £16k would be achieved in 2017/18, with the full year effect from 2018/19 onwards.

The estimated £500k capital cost of improving the retained buildings would be met from the corporate service transformation fund.

In the event that no changes to service provision are made, then significant capital investment in the outdated kitchen facilities at Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre would nonetheless be required.

Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance, ext. 37 4081

#### 4.2 Legal implications

This report takes the product of the North East Area Consultation in to consideration in the decision making process in a transparent way. The responses are clearly detailed within the report and integrated within the assessment.

In relation to the alternative option put forward during the consultation process for the Armadale Youth Centre and Netherhall Neighbourhood Centre as this appears to be a significant change, given that the original proposal was to close one and retain the other, fairness and legitimate expectation dictates a further proportionate re-consultation only on the alternative option.

In relation to the period for re-consultation, provided there is not a large volume of new information the consultation period could be less than 6 weeks as consultees already have considered the alternative and commented.

If the model is approved there will be a requirement for legal support in relation to legal

agreements relating to/resulting from the model and it is advised that this is sought as soon as possible in the delivery phase.

Jenis Taylor, Commercial, Property & Planning Team, Legal Services Ext 37 1405

#### 4.3 Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

The Council has a corporate carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) reduction target of 50% of the 2008/09 level by 2025/26 and the consolidation of neighbourhood buildings and the co-location of services will contribute towards achieving this target. It is estimated that a 30% reduction in energy use and associated carbon dioxide emissions could be achieved through implementation of the proposed model.

- Duncan Bell, Environment Team (x37 2251)

#### 4.4 Equalities Implications

##### 4.4 Equalities Implications

The council's Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set out in the Equality Act 2010 requires decision makers to be aware of and take account of the impact of its proposals on those likely to be affected. The process undertaken to determine the development of proposals which would produce the required savings highlighted in the report is based on consultation with those communities affected - as detailed in the appendix describing consultation undertaken and the responses received. Respondents were clear as to what local services would benefit them and meet their particular needs - the bulk of which involve continued social interaction and the benefits this provides them in terms of improved health (access to exercise and lunch clubs), cultural expression (celebration of cultural events), and practicing their faith (facilities for their shared prayers and celebration of their faith), opportunity to socially engage with others they identify with (youth groups). The proposals set out in the report acknowledge and for the most part reflect these communities' priorities and how they will continue to be met. Where there is uncertainty as to how these will be met, there is an expressed commitment to work with the group to best accommodate their specific needs. The proposals also reflect the work being undertaken by the council in regard to channel shifting and it is the proposals for change in the form of self-service that receive most concern. The mitigating actions highlighted by other identical channel shift proposals that are being successfully implemented will form the basis for mitigating actions for these concerns. The consultation was thorough in involving the main groups of people who are local service users with the protected characteristics of age (young as well as elderly), race, disability, and religion and belief which reflect the main groups of people using these community buildings scoped into this TNS review.

Irene Kszyk, Corporate Equalities Lead, ext 374147.

#### 4.5 Planning implications

The following considerations apply to buildings proposed for disposal:

<b>Site</b>	<b>Planning policy</b>	<b>Constraints</b>
Netherhall Community Centre	No designation, residential acceptable in principle.	50% of site flood zone 3, Critical drainage area.  This would restrict amount of residential development. Sustainable Development may be required. Trees on site.
Rushey Mead Library	Retail Centre, retail and community uses acceptable.	Landfill Buffer, meaning mitigation may be required for landfill gas.
Rushey Mead Recreation Centre	No designation, Residential acceptable in principle.	SE area of site (approx. 30%) Flood Zone 2. This might limit the amount of residential development. Landfill Buffer just to E of site.
Northfield Neighbourhood Centre	No Designation, Residential acceptable in principle.	Critical Drainage Area meaning sustainable drainage may be required, Trees on site.
Ocean Road Community Centre	No designation. Residential acceptable in principle.	Critical Drainage Area, 100% Flood Zone 3, 50% near Main River Bank EA access. This may limit the amount of residential development possible on the site. Trees on site.

Alternative uses/development, including residential, acceptable subject to need for retention of community facilities.

<b>Site</b>	<b>Planning policy</b>	<b>Constraints</b>
Armadale Youth Centre 0624	No designation.	Southern edge of the site is in a Main Bank Buffer zone for Scraftoft Brook. Critical Drainage Area so SuDS would be required. Education, community and leisure uses likely to be acceptable. Residential would have to be carefully considered due to relationship with neighbouring uses and the nature of the area.

Belgrave library 2033	No designation.	Building is locally listed therefore presumption in favour of retention. Article 4 direction in progress, so external alterations likely to require PP. Education, community and leisure uses likely to be acceptable however as there are houses nearby noise controls might be sought. Flood Zone 2 so FRA might be required for COU. Critical Drainage Area so SuDS required for any new development eg car parking.
Comments issued 11/11/2016		

4.6 Other Implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

A range of services deliver in the buildings scoped into the north east area. Service delivery strategies will need to be aligned to ensure a robust service offer for the area as a whole. The services working with the programme are:

- Neighbourhood Services
- Adult Skills & Learning
- Neighbourhood based customer services
- Youth Services

**5. Background information and other papers:**

None

**6. Summary of appendices:**

Appendix A: TNS north east area engagement report, August 2016

Appendix B: TNS north east area consultation report, October 2016

**7. Is this a private report (If so, please indicated the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?**

No



**8. Is this a “key decision”?**

Yes.

**9. If a key decision please explain reason**

The decision affects changes to service delivery in 5 wards in north eas Leicester.