

# Scrutiny Inquiry Report

## Home Farm Temple Newsam

Scrutiny Board (City Development)  
May 2011



**Leeds**  
CITY COUNCIL

# **Review of Home Farm, Temple Newsam**

## **Scrutiny Inquiry Report**



# Introduction and Scope

## Introduction

1. The Scrutiny Board (City Development) at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011 considered requests for scrutiny of the farming operations at Home Farm, Temple Newsam. The requests for scrutiny were from the Rare Breed Survival Trust, Rare Breeds International, the Shetland Cattle Breeders Association, the White Park Cattle Society and a number of individuals who feared for the future of Home Farm and the rare breed centre.
2. They were responding to the City Development Directorate's "Farming Operations Consultation" document which had been circulated in December 2010 to all key stakeholders and other interested parties. This stated that "savings" needed to be made at Home Farm, suggested ways this could be achieved and invited comments and alternative proposals.
3. At the Scrutiny Board meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011 Parks and Countryside officers reported that as a consequence of their consultation with key stakeholders several areas for further consideration had emerged as to how savings could be achieved without closing the farming operation.
4. It was reported that at the Council budget meeting in February 2011 it had been agreed that the operating budget of Home Farm, Temple Newsam would be reduced by £100k in 2010/11 but was left open to the City Development Directorate to determine how this should be achieved.
5. It was agreed at the Scrutiny Board meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011 to establish a time limited working group to consider

the outcome of the consultation and to submit a report and recommendations to the Scrutiny Board in May 2011 for consideration. It was also agreed that representatives from the Rare Breed Survival Trust and Rare Breeds International be invited to the meeting of the working group.

6. The working group's findings which are endorsed by full Scrutiny Board and recommendations are presented below.

## Scope of the Inquiry

7. The purpose of our inquiry was to identify areas of savings that would allow Home Farm to continue as a commercial working farm whilst also continuing as a visitor and rare breed centre.

## Anticipated Service Impact

8. We hope that the working group's findings, and the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, will have a positive impact on the service by maintaining Home Farm as a commercially viable operation whilst also maintaining the visitor and rare breed centres but at a reduced operating cost and maximising all available resources.
9. We also hope to see more Leeds schools considering using the Home Farm visitor centre as a resource for their pupils.

## 2 Review of Home Farm, Temple Newsam



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Accounts of Home Farm

10. We were advised that whilst the livestock are a key part of the visitor attraction, the numbers on display at Home Farm only represent a small proportion of the total managed. Most farming operations are conducted either on a commercial basis or to sustain the rare breed herd. The result is a net cost to the Council of £347k each year.

11. We understand from the accounts presented to us that the true income and expenditure that is attributable to the management of Temple Newsam Farm and other external agricultural holdings held by Parks & Countryside (P & C) is at present spread across 5 separate cost centres which are listed in the table below. A full print out of these accounts was provided to us and these included total spending in the previous financial year, the budget for the 2010/11 financial year, and then spending against these same headings for this financial year.

### Cost Centres

<b>22144</b>	<b>Temple Newsam Farm Account</b>
<b>22149</b>	<b>Temple Newsam Estate Account</b>
<b>22148</b>	<b>Lotherton Hall Estate</b>
<b>22152</b>	<b>Temple Newsam Fees Account</b>
<b>22892</b>	<b>P &amp; C Financing Charges</b>

12. In addition to the account statements, a summary of each of the 5 costs centres were provided to us and is set out in appendix 1. This document clearly defines all applicable income and expenditure that can be attributed to the farming operations undertaken by Parks and Countryside. Furthermore, this

statement draws out those costs which are presently contained within the broader cost centres of Temple Newsam, Lotherton Hall and P & C Workshops.

13. The salient conclusions that we drew from analysing the information provided in appendix 1 are:

- The gross operating expenditure in 2009/10 was £563k of which staffing costs amounted to 60% of the total.
- The net operating cost was £347k once overheads and income had been accounted for.

14. The table in appendix 2 summarises total farm income over the last 7 years.

15. We noted that when operating costs from the last financial year are considered against average income, the net operating cost would be reduced to £332.5k. Notwithstanding that, it should be noted that when considered over a longer time frame, a major source of income is received from paying visitors to the farm. Given that P & C has already sought to increase income by removing subsidised entrance fees to Temple Newsam Farm for Leeds card holders, where possible operating costs should be reduced to meet the revised budget figures.

16. What became clear to us during our discussions was that the accounts as presented were complicated and difficult to understand. Often it was unclear what percentage allocations had been included under the various cost centres and why. The reasons for the accounts being presented in this way were largely historic and include Lotherton Hall.

### 3 Review of Home Farm, Temple Newsam



# Conclusions and Recommendations

17. We strongly recommend that the accounts for Home Farm are simplified to show more readily income and expenditure for the farm and which excludes all other operations.

## Recommendation 1

**That the Acting Director of City Development ensure that the accounts for Home Farm are simplified to show more readily income and expenditure for the farm and which excludes all other operations.**

## Consultation Findings

18. A copy of the consultation document is attached as appendix 3. We were provided with a summary of the key findings from the consultation process, categorised under each consultee.

### a) Temple Newsam Ward Members

- Ward Members were unanimous in commending the value of the farm to their constituents and in emphasising the need to preserve and enhance the farm as a visitor attraction.
- Similarly, Members sought comfort that any proposal to reduce the volume of land farmed at Temple Newsam was not being driven by an aspiration to develop part of the estate.
- In light of the budget pressures, Members accepted that savings were inevitable and they desired comfort from officers that visitors to the farm and the wider estate

would not experience a diminished offer from their visit to Temple Newsam.

### b) Rare Breed Survival Trust(RBST)

- RBST would prefer the following breeds to be retained at Temple Newsam

**Cattle:** Vaynols, Gloucesters, Shetland

**Sheep:** Boreray (as rare as Vaynols), White Faced Woodlands, Norfolk Horns and Portlands

- RBST guidelines for a minimum breeding group size to be effective are five cows and 1 bull, and 15 ewes and 1 ram.
- RBST have also facilitated visits for officers to farm parks at both Sandwell Park and Tatton Park in order to obtain data and understanding to enable comparison between these successful farm parks and Home Farm, Temple Newsam.

### c) Sandwell Farm and Tatton Farm

- Both operate on a smaller scale in terms of livestock, land holdings and staff when considered in comparison to Temple Newsam.
- Farm staff undertake a visitor service function in addition to daily farming duties.
- Both seek to exploit voluntary labour to bolster and support specialist farm staff.

## 4 Review of Home Farm, Temple Newsam



# Conclusions and Recommendations

- Both sites rely on hired support for fodder production.

## **d) Lineham Farm**

- The trustees at Lineham Farm have confirmed that they are comfortable with Leeds City Council no longer farming the land adjacent to the centre. Subsequently, both the management and the charity's trustees have confirmed their interest in extending the landholding to include land presently farmed by P & C.

## **e) Farm Management and Staff**

- Staff have identified areas in which they feel livestock numbers can be reduced.

## **f) Other Research**

- Some limited benchmark comparisons have been obtained with reference to the Farm Business Survey (backed by the Government Department responsible for agriculture). It should be noted that this survey is based on commercial farms and that Temple Newsam has a unique operational context with extra labour implications associated with the breed mix, so the benchmarking data is mainly a pointer for further investigation. From the data the following can be concluded:

◇ Machinery costs, cost of sales and income from external subsidy are all broadly comparable

◇ Sales per hectare are significantly lower, by a factor of 3 to 7 times

◇ Labour cost, whether per hectare or per £100 turnover, is higher by a factor of 15 to 25 times.

## Visitor Attraction

19. We take the view that Home Farm cannot be seen in isolation from the visitor and rare breed centres as they complement one another and work as a whole. The loss of the farm would inevitably reduce visitor numbers.
20. We felt strongly that part of the appeal of Home Farm was that people were visiting a working farm and not a petting farm that uses animals as displays.
21. We should seek to ensure that we maximise all grants and subsidies that are available.
22. We strongly oppose any proposal that would cease commercial farming operations as suggested in the Consultation Document.

### **Recommendation 2**

**That the Acting Director of City Development considers engaging a consultant to look specifically at**

**(i) how the farm could operate on a more commercial basis but integrated as a whole visitor experience rather than seeing the current visitor attraction in isolation from the farming operation.**

**(ii) maximising all grants and subsidies that are available for Home Farm.**



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Farm Managers

23. It became clear to us during our discussions that the Farm Manager and his Deputy are not able to fully manage Home Farm because of the duties they are required to undertake at Whinmoor Farm, Lotherton Hall and Lineham Farm. We are not convinced that their costs are being charged properly to these operations and credited to the Home Farm accounts as income.
24. We would like to see the Farm Manager's key role being the commercial success of Home Farm and as an integrated visitor and rare breed centre.
25. We would also like the establishment of a clear business plan and defined terms of reference and objectives for Home Farm as a commercial activity but which integrates and enhances the visitor experience and conserves rare breeds. The Farm Manager and staff have considerable expertise but they do not run the Home Farm visitor attraction
26. We would also like officers from P & C to explore possibilities to engage in agro environmental schemes including higher level stewardship.

### Recommendation 3

**That the Acting Director of City Development identifies the Farm Manger's key role as the commercial success of Home Farm and its integration as a total visitor experience and that a business plan and timetable be developed to achieve this.**

## Staffing Costs

27. Clearly since staffing costs at Home Farm, whether per hectare or per £100 turnover, are higher by a factor of 15 to 25 times this is an area which should be reviewed. The net cost of farming operations is estimated at £347k, for which there are the equivalent of nearly 9 full-time staff employed. We recognise that Council employment terms and conditions present some difficulties with the nature of livestock farming due to the 24/7 nature of the job. As a result, staff costs contribute over 60% of the total expenditure.
28. We were advised that currently two members of staff were on long term sick leave and on half pay. As a consequence there are some savings in staffing costs which will contribute towards the necessary savings of £100,000. We suggest that as a consequence of the reduced staffing costs currently being implemented further adjustments need to be made rather than wholesale radical change.
29. However, we recognise that vacancies cannot be sustained in the long term and a review of staffing levels and duties needs to be undertaken.
30. We noted that Friends of Temple Newsam had expressed interest in helping at the farm. We would like to see the development of the use of volunteers at Home Farm Visitor Attraction to help reduce operating costs.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Recommendation 4

**That the Acting Director of City Development**

**(i) undertakes a review of the staffing levels and job descriptions at Home Farm to incorporate the Visitor Attraction.**

**(ii) considers how to attract volunteers to work at Home Farm and where they could best be used to reduce operating costs.**

## Stock & Land Management

31. We support a review of livestock numbers and mix of breeds as this will reduce the agricultural workload undertaken by farm staff and reduce the demand for winter feed and the subsequent cost associated with production.

32. We do not support the leasing out of any grazing land. The leasing of land and major events held at the estate could be in conflict. We strongly support an increase in land stewardship.

## Recommendation 5

**That the Acting Director of City Development, in conjunction with the Farm Manager and RBST, determines the land management, livestock numbers and mix of breeds for Home Farm and the visitor and rare breed centres which ensures the continued viability of Home Farm.**

## Temple Newsam Café

33. We take the view quite properly that the success of Temple Newsam Café is a direct consequence of visitors being attracted to Home Farm visitor and rare breed centres.

34. We therefore consider the profits made by Temple Newsam Café should be ring fenced for use by Home Farm and not simply allocated to the general rate fund.

## Recommendation 6

**That the Director of Resources ring fences the profits from Temple Newsam Café for use by Home Farm, Temple Newsam.**

## Visitor Entrance and Ticket Office

35. We strongly support a review of the visitor entrance arrangements at the farm to develop a more cost effective mode of operation whilst providing an improved visitor experience.

36. We would support the creation of a new shop at the farm entrance which would be used as an access point for the farm. This would provide an opportunity to close the small P & C run shop in the courtyard at Temple Newsam which would realise a saving of approximately £20,000.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Recommendation 7

**That the Acting Director of City Development undertakes a review of the visitors' entrance to the farm to identify a more cost effective and appropriate way for visitors to gain admission to the farm and which improves their overall visitor experience.**

## Visitor/Educational Experience

37. We would like to see greater promotion of Home Farm visitor and rare breed centres as one of the jewels of the city.
38. As part of the longer term plan for Home Farm we would like resources to facilitate an improved visitor/educational experience. This would also encourage schools to visit as part of their studies and a fee could be charged for this opportunity.

## Recommendation 8

**That the Acting Director of City Development**

**(i) considers how Home Farm and the visitor and rare breed centres can be better promoted to increase visitor numbers and income.**

**(ii) develops a long term strategy that would improve the educational experience of the centres and would encourage schools to participate and pay a fee for the experience.**

## Conclusion

39. We feel strongly that officers shall not simply take the easiest and quickest options to address the reduced budget for Home Farm.
40. We believe that in the short term the current savings in staffing costs are helping to reduce the anticipated shortfall and this gives a breathing space to reflect on a way forward. The approach should not be one of slash and burn as proposed in the consultation document but a measured approach to reduce costs and increase income.
41. We are impressed with all the work that goes on at the farm and hope that it can be developed to provide even greater experiences for visitors in the future especially the children of Leeds including those with additional needs.
42. We would like to conclude by thanking the officers, farm staff and representatives from the Rare Breed Survival Trust and Rare Breeds International for their advice, guidance and co-operation with our investigation



# Evidence

## **Monitoring arrangements**

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

## **Members of the working group**

Councillor John Procter (Chair)  
Councillor Bernard Atha  
Councillor Judith Elliott

## **Reports and Publications Submitted**

Report of the Chief Recreation Officer

Farming Operations: Consultation Document

Financial Management Accounts – Temple Newsam

Financial Management Accounts – Temple Newsam Estate

Financial Management Accounts- Lotherton Hall Estate

Financial Management Accounts – Temple Newsam Farm Fees Account

Financial Management Accounts Financing Charges

Farm Cost Analysis

Submission by the Rare Breed Survival Trust

Submission by Rare Breed International



# Evidence

## **Witnesses Heard**

Mr Peter Titley, President of the Rare Breed Survival Trust

Mr Tim Brigstocke, Rare Breed Survival Trust

Mr Lawrence Alderson, Founder President, Rare Breeds International

Mr Sean Flesher, Head of Parks and Countryside

Mr David Bradley, Farm Manager, Home Farm, Temple Newsam

Mr Anthony Springwell, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Countryside

## **Dates of Scrutiny**

8<sup>th</sup> March 2011 Scrutiny Board ( City Development)

13<sup>th</sup> April 2011, Home Farm, Temple Newsam Working Group

17<sup>th</sup> May 2011 Scrutiny Board (City Development)



# APPENDIX 1

## Farm Cost Analysis

22144	Temple Newsam Farm Account
22149	Temple Newsam Estate Account
22148	Lotherton Hall Estate
22152	Temple Newsam Fees Account
22892	Appropriation Account

	22144	22149	22 148	22 152	22 892	TOTALS
	Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 10/11	
<b>Staff</b>						
1 Basic Pay	£216,289	£0	£19,126	£35,921	£0	
4 Overtime	£32,098	£0	£0	£1,073	£0	
11 National Insurance	£18,850	£0	£3,736	£2,270	£0	
21 Superannuation (Non Teaching)	£28,409	£0	£0	£4,777	£0	
27 FRS17 Wypf Adjustment	-£3,631	£0	£0	-£611	£0	
Consultation Findings Adjustment	-£16,202	£0	-£6,859	£0	£0	
Sub Total	£275,813	£0	£16,003	£43,430	£0	£335,246
<b>Buildings</b>						
123 Gas	-£155	£0	£0	£0	£0	
124 Electricity	£9,040	£0	£0	£0	£0	
125 Water Services	£593	£0	£0	£0	£0	
126 Removal Of Workplace Waste	£4,212	£0	£0	£0	£0	
129 Cleaning Agency Recharge	£1,848	£0	£0	£0	£0	
162 Premises Security Services	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
Sub Total	£15,538	£0	£0	£0	£0	£15,538



## APPENDIX 1

<b>Equipment and Materials</b>	<b>22144</b>	<b>22149</b>	<b>22 148</b>	<b>22 152</b>	<b>22 892</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	
	09/10	09/10	09/10	09/10	10/11	
203 Operational Furniture And Equipment	£8,092	£0	£0	£0	£0	
205 Operational Materials	£65,104	£0	£0	£0	£0	
213 Telephones	£637	£0	£0	£385	£0	
214 Computer Software & Equipment	£132	£0	£0	£0	£0	
226 Memberships	£353	£0	£0	£0	£0	
241 Clothing & Uniforms	£2,331	£0	£0	£0	£0	
255 Hospitality	£14	£0	£0	£0	£0	
262 Security Services non infra	£0	£0	£0			
Sub Total	£76,663	£0	£0	£385	£0	£77,048



## APPENDIX 1

<b>Services</b>	<b>22144</b>	<b>22149</b>	<b>22 148</b>	<b>22 152</b>	<b>22 892</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	
	09/10	09/10	09/10	09/10	10/11	
265 Other Hired And Contracted Services	£8,963	£0	£0	£2,093	£0	
Sub Total	£8,963	£0	£0	£2,093	£0	£11,056
<b>Vehicles and machines</b>						
301 Vehicle maintenance	£0	£2,880	£3,247	£0	£0	
304 External Hire -Occasional	£0	£428	£0	£0	£0	
305 Plant Hire - By Directorate	£0	£185	£0	£0	£0	
311 Car & Motorcycle Allowances	£375	£0	£0	£0	£0	
313 External Hire Fleet Man	£0	£573	£0	£0	£0	
315 Hire Of Movable Plant & Machinery	£853	£11,201	£27,842	£0	£0	
317 Non Leasing Adjustments	£0	-£3,311	-£2,159	£0	£0	
321 Fuel (non LCC supplies)	£0	£13,405	£6,416	£0	£0	
322 Tyres	£0	£243	£0	£0	£0	
324 Miscellaneous Transport Related Costs	£14	£0	£225	£0	£0	
337 Leasing& Internal recharge	£0	£3,311	£4,409	£0	£0	
341 Repairs to LCC vehicles	£0	£5,019	£389	£0	£0	
342 Repair & Maintenance of Plant	£0	£219	£3,188	£0	£0	
344 Outside repairs	£0	£128	£2,509	£0	£0	
346 Plant Spares	£0	£1,447	£559	£0	£0	
Sub Total	£1,242	<b>£17,864</b>	<b>£34,969</b>	£0	£0	£54,075



## APPENDIX 1

<b>Central costs</b>		<b>22144</b>	<b>22149</b>	<b>22 148</b>	<b>22 152</b>	<b>22 892</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
		Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 09/10	Actual 10/11	
410	Professional Legal Services Charges	£3	£0	£0	£0	£0	
442	Internal Reallocation Of Central Costs	£11,388	£0	£0	£0	£0	
444	Resources support service Charges	£17,082	£0	£0	£0	£0	
	Sub Total	£28,473	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28,473
677	Trf to cap reserve equip	£0	£0	£0	£0	£41,180	
	Sub Total	£0	£0	£0	£0	£41,180	£41,180
<b>Income</b>							
890	Internal Income Received By L & L	-£2,392	£0	£0	£0		
910	Grants - DEFRA	-£10,000	£0	£0	£0		
913	Sale Of Food & Drink	-£2	£0	£0	£0		
914	Other Sales	-£43,931	£0	£0	£0		
933	Admissions, Booking Fees & Ticket Sales	-£254	£0	£0	-£129,373		
934	Penalties, Fines & Car Parking Charges	-£148	£0	£0	£0		
973	Other Income	-£1,416	£0	£0	£0		
	Sub Total	-£58,143	£0	£0	-£129,373	£82,360	-£187,516
		<b>£348,549</b>	<b>£17,864</b>	<b>£50,972</b>	<b>-£83,465</b>	<b>£82,360</b>	<b>£375,100</b>

The above spreadsheet provides a summary of the current cost's and income associated with Temple Newsam Farm. As is evident, these costs are presently spread across 5 different accounts held by the Parks and Countryside Service. At present the Vehicle and Machinery costs for the farm are ambiguous with machinery, vehicle and plant costs attributable to the farm and its operations spread across 3 separate budgets 22148, 22149 and 22600. On that basis 50% of the costs associated with Vehicles and Machinery at Temple Newsam and 75% at Lotherton Hall have been apportioned to the farm. Actual spend against 26000 has been used as opposed to 2009/10 to reflect the fact that 2 new tractors were leased in 2010 for use on the farm.

Furthermore staff costs also require clarification. Presently the Lotherton Hall account 22152 includes costs associated with a scale B3 tractor driver who's time is presently split between Temple Newsam and Lotherton Hall. It estimated by estate management that 70% of this costs is applicable to the farm.



## APPENDIX 2

**This table summarises total Home Farm income over the last 7 years**

	<b>2010/11 Actual to date</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>22144</b> <b>Temple Newsam Farm Account</b>	£157,447	£58,143	£100,203	£72,372	£53,365	£81,733	£75,242	<b>£85,500</b>
<b>22152</b> <b>Temple Newsam Fees Account</b>	£120,757	£129,373	£115,339	£127,390	£114,952	£102,982	£109,759	<b>£117,224</b>
<b>Total</b>	£278,204	£187,516	£215,542	£199,762	£168,317	£184,715	£185,001	<b>£202,725</b>



## APPENDIX 3

### Farming Operations: Consultation

---

#### **ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION**

Home Farm is the largest Rare Breeds Survival Trust approved farm in Europe. It has developed over many years and there are now over 500 livestock (mostly cattle and sheep), that utilise over 250 hectares of land centred around Temple Newsam Estate.

Whilst the livestock are a key part of the visitor attraction, the numbers on display at Home Farm only represent a small proportion of the total managed. Most farming operations are conducted either on a commercial basis or to sustain the rare breed herd. The result is a net cost to the Council of £366k each year.

Savings are needed, but the council believes that it will be possible to improve the quality of the visitor attraction at Home Farm and to reduce the level of public subsidy. This will only be possible by a planned approach to reducing the number of livestock and related managed land, and increasing the level of investment for the visitor attraction. It has provisionally identified 3 main approaches to achieving these aims:

- To reduce the number of cattle and sheep whilst displaying other animals including pigs, goats, donkeys and poultry enhance visitor interest in the attraction.
- To directly manage approximately 45 hectares of land around the visitor core of the estate to enable livestock for display purposes, and to support events and activities. Surplus land would be offered under grazing licences or under agricultural lease, but still remain in the ownership of the Council.
- To seek ways to improve the quality of the visitor attraction by reviewing the use of buildings currently used for large scale farming operations, and refocus resources around the visitor as part of an overall investment plan.

These proposals are based on evidence that is presented in this document. But there may be other options, and the detail also needs to be worked out. So before taking decisions, the council wants to open a discussion with staff, 'friends' group,



## APPENDIX 3

Rare Breeds Survival Trust and other interested parties to ensure that its plans are shaped to produce a strong and sustainable approach to Home Farm.

If you want to help shape future plans for Home Farm, please read this document and then let us have your views. You can feed your views back to us in the following ways:

- write to us at **Parks and Countryside, Farnley Hall, Hall Lane, Leeds LS12 5HA.**
- e-mail us at [parks@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:parks@leeds.gov.uk)



## APPENDIX 3

### **TIMESCALE**

The consultation period will close on **31<sup>st</sup> January 2011**. Following this, detailed proposals will be formulated for the final decision to be taken.

### **CURRENT PICTURE**

#### **Number of Livestock**

Home Farm is the largest Rare Breeds Survival Trust approved farm in Europe. As at July 2010 there were over 500 head of livestock, including 274 cattle, 168 sheep and 41 pigs. Stock management in the public areas currently does not match expectations of the visitor and is compromised by the needs of the commercial farming operation both in terms of time allocated and in the safe operation of large equipment. The visitor attraction is in need of further investment, without which Home Farm may struggle to compare with similar attractions in the area. The following is a snapshot of stock numbers and breeds for sheep and cattle as at July 2010:

<b>Sheep</b>	<b>Jul. 2010</b>
Norfolk Horn	35
White Faced Woodland	32
Kerry Hill	35
Portland	24
Boreray	24
Wensleydale	10
Hebridean	8
Dorset Horn	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>168</b>

<b>Cattle</b>	<b>Jul. 2010</b>
Vaynol	38
Red Poll	53
B. Galloway	48
Kerry	0
Gloucester	28
White Park	10
Shetland	27
B. Shorthorn	34
Irish Moiled	36
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>274</b>



## APPENDIX 3

### Land Holding

A relatively small number of livestock are made available for display in the farm visitor attraction. Land that is used for agricultural purposes associated with sustaining these livestock is as follows:

Location	Hectares
Temple Newsam	150
Lotherton Hall	35
Lineham Farm	48
Whinmoor	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>257</b>

### Cost and Comparisons

The net cost of farming operations is estimated at £366k, for which there are the equivalent of nearly 9 full-time staff employed. Council employment terms and conditions present some difficulties with the nature of livestock farming due to the 24/7 nature of the job. As a result, staff costs contribute over 70% of the total expenditure. The 2010/11 council budget has a target of £100k saving related to farming activities.

Some limited benchmark comparisons have been obtained with reference to the Farm Business Survey (backed by the Government Department responsible for agriculture). It should be noted that this survey is based on commercial farms and that Temple Newsam has a unique operational context with extra labour implications associated with the breed mix, so the benchmarking data is mainly a pointer for further investigation. From the data the following can be concluded:

- Machinery costs, cost of sales and income from external subsidy are all broadly comparable
- Sales per hectare are significantly lower, by a factor of 3 to 7 times
- Labour cost, whether per hectare or per £100 turnover, is higher by a factor of 15 to 25 times



## APPENDIX 3

### PROPOSAL

#### General

To cease all commercial farming operations with the exception of retaining approximately 45 hectares around the visitor core of the estate to enable livestock for display purposes, and to support events and activities. This would substantially reduce current grazing stock numbers to match the available land, whilst ensuring that the farm visitor attraction is sustained with further potential for improvements.

#### Stock Management

The mix of breeds will be based on those suitable for visitor display, and views are welcomed on how best this might be achieved. However, the proposal is to display a mix of cattle, sheep, pigs, goats, donkeys and poultry in Home Farm and to have cattle and sheep on display to the visitor on the land that forms the core of the estate. There will be a decrease in grazing animals (cattle and sheep) which make up the greatest proportion of overall livestock numbers that cannot be viewed either at Home Farm or the estate core.

#### Land Management

The Council view is that in general surplus land should either be leased to a tenant as a partnership agreement engaging environmental principles, or alternatively grazing licences. In order to be attractive to a tenant, a minimum amount of land would have to be available, and there may be an opportunity to resolve existing tenancy issues to the perimeter of the estate as part of this solution. It has been suggested that the proposed rental value would be in the region of £148/Ha. Proposals are now considered for each area of land currently used for agricultural activity.

**Temple Newsam.** Of the 150 hectares currently grazed and cropped for hay or silage the proposal would be to retain 45 hectares for grazing and a small grass crop. The land retained would be around the visitor core of the estate that serves a dual purpose for livestock and events. The balance of 105 hectares would include some land for events so could be managed in partnership with another farmer under a grazing licence. Remaining land mainly on the edge of the estate would be managed on an agricultural let, however, public access would continue to be maintained and enhanced through the network of advertised trails and rights of way.

**Lotherton Hall.** The 35 hectares at Lotherton would be retained as part of the estate to be managed as public access space, event sites and car parking. This will also provide an opportunity to remodel the estate around improvements to visitor experience.



## APPENDIX 3

**Lineham Farm.** The proposal would be to have commercial agricultural letting on this site. There are 48 hectares of land around Lineham farm which is currently farmed for grass crops. There is no animal grazing but the Royal Armouries do keep their jousting horses here when not required for shows, which could be relocated to Lotherton or Temple and thus add to the visitor experience there.

**Whinmoor.** The 24 hectares at Whinmoor would be managed by short to medium term grazing lets/licences. The landholding on this site will be required for a future cemetery and to accommodate both playing pitches and operational facilities such as the Nursery to allow the potential capital receipt from the Redhall site to be realised.

### Financial Implications

A reduction in land holdings and livestock numbers would mean a smaller workforce required for agricultural activities. Current staff costs are £247k and a reduction of nearly 4 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff would offer a saving of £112K per annum. Front line staff would be redeployed within the Parks and Countryside service. Reduced land holdings would also enable a reduction in machinery along with associated fuel and repair costs, at an annual saving of £41.5k.

The estimated financial benefits of this proposal are set out in the following table:

Summary	Current	Proposal	Difference
Staff Numbers	8.7 FTE	5 FTE	3.7 FTE
Main Livestock numbers	483	94	389
Land Holding	257Ha	45Ha	212Ha
	£	£	£
Income Subsidy	29,149	8,310	-20,839
Income rental	0	29,581	29,581
Animal Income	47,648	13,073	-34,575
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>76,797</b>	<b>50,964</b>	<b>-25,833</b>
Operating costs	442,535	284,204	158,331
<b>Net Cost</b>	<b>365,738</b>	<b>233,240</b>	<b>132,498</b>



## APPENDIX 3

Carrying out these proposals provide further opportunity to fund development opportunities for the large farm buildings which would no longer be need to store fodder. One example might be to create a play barn that could be run by a third party operator. There could also be potential for a future HLF funding bid for Temple Newsam Estate.

### **FARMING OPERATIONS - WHAT DO YOU THINK?**

Thank you for reading this document. Now please let us know what you think about the future of farming operations at Home Farm, Temple Newsam. We have set out above our current thoughts based on the information we have: but we believe that staff and organisations have a lot to add to our understanding of the issues and the way forward.

We are interested in your views in general, but the following questions may help:

1. **The current picture** - is there anything important missing from the description starting on page 2? Is it an accurate picture?
2. **Land management** – do you agreed with this proposal? Are there other viable alternatives that would not increase the liability to the Council?
3. **Stock management** – do you agree with this proposal? If the Council no longer directly manages many of the cattle and sheep, what alternative arrangements could be made?
4. **Thoughts on other improvements** – do you have views on how the visitor experience at Temple Newsam could be improved?

The closing date for consultation is **31st January 2011**. You can respond in the following ways:

- write to us at **Parks and Countryside, Farnley Hall, Hall Lane, Leeds LS12 5HA.**
- e-mail us at [parks@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:parks@leeds.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Board (City Development)  
Home Farm, Temple Newsam  
May 2011  
Report author: Richard Mills