

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

8 October 2013
5.00 - 10.40 pm

Present: Councillors Kightley (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Marchant-Daisley, Owers, O'Reilly, Reid and Tunnacliffe

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services: Jean Swanson

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Tim Ward

Executive Councillor for Public Places: Councillor Reiner

Officers:

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

Head of Tourism & City Centre Management: Emma Thornton

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager: Alistair Wilson

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Brendan Troy

Cambridge 20mph Project Officer: Ben Bishop

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers:

Cambridge BID Chair: Michael Wiseman

BID Manager: Edward Quigley

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/21/Env Filming of Committee

The Chair gave permission for Mr Taylor to film the meeting. It was confirmed with Mr Taylor that the filming would take place from a fixed position and cease if members of the public or speakers expressed a desire not to be filmed. Members of the public were given an opportunity to state if they did not want to be filmed.

13/22/Env Apologies

No apologies were received.

13/23/Env Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillors O'Reilly, Reid & Saunders	13/31/Env & 13/33/Env	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillors Reiner	13/28/Envc & 13/36/Env	Personal: Conservator of the River Cam

13/24/Env Minutes

The minutes of meetings held on 12 March, 14 May, 23 May and 11 June 2013 were approved and signed as correct records.

13/25/Env Public Questions

There were no public questions in this section of the meeting.

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out under individual minute items.

13/26/Env Petition - 20mph Speed Limit on Victoria Road for Safety Reasons

Mr Quinn presented a petition requesting a speed limit of 20 mph on Victoria Road for safety reasons. Mr Quinn addressed the committee in support of his petition.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change made the following comments regarding the petition:

- i. Thanked Mr Quinn for submitting his petition.
- ii. The County Council policy was not to fund 20 mph schemes, but it would allow communities to pay for schemes; so long as these were not on class 'A' or 'B' roads.
- iii. The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change had liaised with the former County Cabinet Member (responsible for highways), who

- had agreed that the City Council could make the city a 20 mph zone except for 'A' and 'B' roads.
- iv. The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change has subsequently liaised with the current County Cabinet Member responsible for highways, who reiterated the City Council could make the city a 20 mph zone except for 'A' and 'B' roads.
 - v. Victoria Road was currently a class 'A' road, and so could not be included in the main 20 mph project. Councillors noted residents wish for a 20 mph limit in Victoria Road, so North Area Committee propose to take it forward as a separate project to the main 20 mph one. The Victoria Road 20 mph project should be taken forward in line with the East Area one. Monitoring work was being undertaken to provide an evidence base of need for presentation to the County Council.
 - vi. It would be easier to implement a 20 mph limit in Victoria Road if it were not an 'A' road. The City Council is intending to suggest to the County Council, in a response to their transport strategy consultation, that they consider declassifying Victoria Road. This might not happen until the remodelling of Mitcham's Corner.

Mr Quinn stated that the remodelling of Mitcham's Corner had been proposed for some time; he hoped the 20 mph project could be implemented before then.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said that 20 mph work was not dependent on the remodelling of Mitcham's Corner.

13/27/Env Presentation by Cambridge BID Limited on its Activity Since the Launch on 1st April 2013

Public Question

Ms Preston raised the following issues:

- i. **Referred to a Council meeting in 2012 where members of the public were concerned that security guards would be employed by the Grand Arcade. The Council gave assurances that security guards would not be present on the city streets.**
- ii. **More recently, Ms Preston had been reassured by Mr O'Shea regarding security guard arrangements around St Andrew's Street, but she still expected them on the perimeter of the Grand Arcade. Ms Preston asked if this role could be undertaken by maintenance staff. Ms Preston still had concerns about security guards on the city streets.**

iii. Queried why the Business Improvement District (BID) report had moved from Strategy & Resources Committee to Environment Committee.

The Director of Environment said the BID report had moved to Environment Committee due to the rearrangement of Executive Councillor responsibilities.

The Head of Tourism & City Centre Management said the BID had committed not to have enforcement powers or security guards. Security guards were privately hired by the Grand Arcade, not the BID.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a presentation from the BID Manager regarding the activities of Cambridge BID Limited since its launch on 1st April 2013.

In response to Members' questions the BID Chair and BID Manager said the following:

- i. Legislation set out the BID was required to pay the City Council for services provided.
- ii. A typographical error had led to a delay in payment of some historic invoices, but this issue had been resolved since telephone payment details had been amended.
- iii. The BID Rapid Response Team would not duplicate the responsibilities of the City Council Rapid Response Team, they would work in partnership. Details of the service were being worked up based on good practice from elsewhere.
- iv. BID Ambassadors would provide general information plus specific BID organisation information to members of the public on request.
- v. The BID would undertake projects that others would not find viable, these could be old and new ones. For example, Christmas lights. The BID website had full details of projects on offer. BID Officers offered to liaise upon request with Councillors post meeting regarding projects offered by the BID.
- vi. The BID would cease in five years unless members voted to continue.

13/28/Env Decisions Taken by Executive Councillors

13/28/Env Dog Control Orders

Matter for Decision

To approve the creation of four Dog Control Orders under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005:

- i. The Dogs Fouling of Land (City of Cambridge) Order 2013
- ii. The Dog Exclusion (City of Cambridge) Order 2013
- iii. The Dogs on Leads (City of Cambridge) Order 2013
- iv. The Dogs on Lead by Direction (City of Cambridge) Order 2013

The Council proposes to use these Orders to introduce greater control of dogs in particular areas, promote responsible behaviour through the ability to ask that dogs are placed on a lead when out of control or exclude dogs from some sensitive areas.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

Agreed to make the following Dog Control Orders following consultation:

- i. The Dogs Fouling of Land (City of Cambridge) Order 2013.
- ii. The Dog Exclusion (City of Cambridge) Order 2013.
- iii. The Dogs on Leads (City of Cambridge) Order 2013.
- iv. The Dogs on Lead by Direction (City of Cambridge) Order 2013.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

The Director of Environment undertook to provide Councillor Owers with copies of the report appendices post meeting.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/28/Envb Tourist Information Centre - Air Cooling (Special Urgency)**Matter for Decision**

The Executive Councillor was asked to approve the commencement of the Tourist Information Centre Air Cooling Project, which was already included in the Council's Capital and Revenue Project Plan (SC573).

The total cost of the project is £34,480, funded from Reserves, of which £25,000 has been approved and £9,480 is pending approval.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

Approved the commencement of the project, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan (SC573).

The total cost of the project was £34,480, funded from Reserves, of which £25,000 had been approved.

The Executive Councillor approved the additional funding of £9,480.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/28/Envc Stourbridge Common Riverbank Restoration

Public Question/Comment

Mr Phillips said that residents had been asking for improvements to the common and riverbank for some time. He asked if mooring rings for the boating community could be included in bank restoration work. Mr Phillips also said trees on Stourbridge Common raised safety issues for river users.

The Executive Councillor for Public Places noted Mr Phillip's comments and offered to liaise with him post meeting. She said the moorings issue would be covered under agenda item 13 (13/36/Env).

Matter for Decision

The Executive Councillor is recommended:

To approve the tendering and letting of a contract for a design and build of a river bank restoration programme at Stourbridge Common.

To approve the spending of £100k in year 2013/14

To approve the preparation of future capital bids for future works along the Stourbridge Common river bank

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

- i. Approved the tendering and letting of a contract for a design and build of a river bank restoration programme at Stourbridge Common.
- ii. Approved the spending of £100k in year 2013/14.
- iii. Approved the preparation of future capital bids for future works along the Stourbridge Common river bank.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/29/Env Rule-in of A14 Report

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the late item from the Head of Planning Services be considered despite not being made publicly available for this committee five clear days prior to the meeting.

The reason that this document could not be deferred was that it was impracticable to defer the decision until the next committee.

13/30/Env A14 Consultation

Matter for Decision

Cambridge City Council has been consulted by the Highways Agency on proposed improvements to the A14 between Ellington and Milton.

This initial stage of public consultation runs from Monday 9 September to Sunday 13 October 2013.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Agreed the City Council's proposed representations to the Highways Agency's consultation as set out in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services.

The Head of Planning Services said Section 3, paragraphs 3.21, 3.22 and Section 4.0 Financial implications of the Officer's report contained typographical errors. All references should be 'Keep **Cambridge** Moving Fund', not 'Cambridgeshire'.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Appropriate cycle route and park'n'ride site provision should be included in the submission.
- ii. Information regarding traffic modelling was not forthcoming, despite repeated requests.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Planning Services said contributions to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' could be ringfenced from the overall A14 funding required by Central Government

Councillor Owers sought clarification how composition of the County Council could affect its policy towards infrastructure funding. The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said the position would only become clear after the change from cabinet to committee structure in 2014. Policy should be unaffected in the meantime.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/31/Env Cambridge Cycle Parking Project

Public Question

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Councillor Bird raised the following points:

- i. Raised concern at the loss of disabled parking spaces in the city centre.**
- ii. Took issue with details in the Officer's report regarding demand for disabled spaces, plus the equality impact assessments.**
- iii. Suggested that people with sight impairments would have safety concerns regarding cycle racks as they could be obstacles (street clutter).**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded:

- i. Parking spaces had not been removed to date. This decision was still to be taken by the Executive Councillor post scrutiny by Environment Committee.**
- ii. People could contact officers with questions or concerns regarding the committee report or equality impact assessment.**
- iii. Visually impaired people had responded positively to the bike rack consultation.**

2. Mr Hellowell raised the following points:

- i. Agreed that there was a need for appropriate cycle ways and parking areas.**
- ii. Raised concerns that cyclists cycled in pedestrian areas and parked anywhere, not just in designated areas eg chaining bikes to lamp posts. This raised safety concerns for visually/mobility impaired people.**
- iii. Asked for street clutter (eg advert boards) to be removed from shopping areas and pavements.**
- iv. Called for a bike ban in the city centre.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said bicycles had been banned from the city centre in the past, but the ban had been revoked. The County Council could be petitioned to reinstate the ban.

Matter for Decision

The project aims to provide one thousand additional secure cycle parking spaces in the heart of the city centre. This is planned to be achieved through the provision of:

- i. Localised on-street cycle parking throughout the city centre where space allows and the demand for cycle parking is high.
- ii. A third undercover secure cycle park, similar to those at Park St and Grand Arcade car parks. This report provides an appraisal of the on-street element of the project. Feasibility work is currently underway to look at the options for a third undercover secure cycle park.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Financial Recommendation

- i. Approved the commencement of the on-street cycle parking proposals, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan. The total estimated cost of the on-street proposal is £235,000 funded from the City Centre Cycle Parking Project capital allocation SC549.

Procurement Recommendations

Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of:

- ii. The construction of the proposed cycle parking locations as listed in table 1.0 and detailed in the package of drawings in Appendix C of the Officer's report; subject to the following sites being deferred pending further information (ie equality impact assessments and commuted sum) being presented to a future Environment Committee for further consideration:
 - Pease Hill 014-018/000/102.
 - Guildhall Street 014-018/000/103.
 - Kings Parade 014-018/000/004.
 - Jesus Lane 014-018/000/008.
 - Wheeler Street.

- iii. Consultation approved and the results to be presented to a future Environment Committee for the additional new sites included in table 1.0 namely:
- St Mary's Street.
 - East Road.
 - Peas Hill/Wheeler Street.

Subject to:

- The permission of the Director of Resources being sought prior to proceeding if the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract.
- The permission from the Executive Councillor being sought before proceeding if the value exceeds the estimated contract by more than 15%.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Expressed concern regarding the loss of city centre disabled parking spaces and the impact this would have on members of the public wishing to use them.
- ii. Suggested the city centre had some existing access issues for people with mobility and visual impairments. For example, street clutter and cycling in pedestrian areas. Increasing cycle parking provision could exacerbate these issues.
- iii. Expressed concern at the proposed increase of cycle parking provision in heritage areas.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment and Project Delivery & Environment Manager said the following:

- i. The needs of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists needed to be balanced.

- ii. Various organisations had been included in the parking provision consultation, including Camsight.
- iii. An old version of the equality impact assessment was included in the agenda pack. Details have since been updated. The new report could be circulated upon request.
- iv. The impact of advert boards on thoroughfares could be reviewed.
- v. Disabled parking bays could be kept on Peas Hill if cycle parking provision was reduced.
- vi. Eden Street was erroneously referred to as Elm Street on P108 of the agenda pack.

Councillors requested a change to recommendation (ii). Councillors O'Reilly and Saunders formally proposed to amend the following recommendation from the Officer's report (amendments shown as bold):

- ii. (Procurement) The construction of the proposed cycle parking locations as listed in table 1.0 and detailed in the package of drawings in Appendix C of the Officer's report; **subject to the following sites being deferred pending further information (ie equality impact assessments and commuted sum) being presented to a future Environment Committee for further consideration:**
 - **Pease Hill 014-018/000/102.**
 - **Guildhall Street 014-018/000/103.**
 - **Kings Parade 014-018/000/004.**
 - **Jesus Lane 014-018/000/008.**
 - **Wheeler Street.**

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations as amended.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/32/Env Re-Ordering Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

13/33/Env Cambridge 20mph Project – Phase 1 Consultation Report

Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Mr Taylor raised the following points:

- i. Asked for details about 20 mph enforcement.**
- ii. Noted a summary of responses was included in the Officer's report, rather than responses in full.**
- iii. Queried why the Chesterton Lane area would not be made 20 mph.**

The Cambridge 20 mph Project Officer said that the Association of Chief Police Officer guidance on 20 mph enforcement was being revised. Speed awareness courses may be a new option instead of points or a fine. Further details on the scheme were pending.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said:

- i. Signage was designed in consultation with the Police.**
- ii. The Minister, Police & Crime Commissioner plus Police all agreed that 20 mph speed limited should be enforced as per other limits such as 30 mph.**
- iii. Chesterton Road and Chesterton Lane residents had not responded to the 20 mph consultation in the same way as Victoria Road residents, so there was clearly not the same demand to be treated as a special case despite being an A road..**

2. Mr Hall raised the following points:

- i. The Cambridge Cycle Campaign supported the 20 mph project and enforcement of this speed limit.**
- ii. Expressed concern for the safety of cyclists using the road, plus pedestrians when cyclists were forced to ride on the pavement.**
- iii. Took issue with lack of police enforcement of the 20 mph limit.**

Councillor Kightley said the 20 mph project was a reoccurring theme at West/Central Area Committee. He hoped that Area Committees would update residents as 20 mph schemes came into force.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said the 20 mph project should help with bike safety issues.

Matter for Decision

To provide infrastructure (signs and lines) for a new 20 mph speed limit on the public highway in the north area of the city, and to undertake public consultation activities for a proposed similar limit in the east area of the city. The new 20mph infrastructure would include repeater signs mounted on existing lamp columns, and white coloured 20 mph roundel road markings. Entry into new 20mph limits would be via entry points highlighted by larger 20mph terminal signs, roundel road markings and on more main roads, patches of coloured road surface material.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Financial recommendation

- i. Approved the commencement of phase 1 of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan. The total cost of phase 1 is £158,700 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.

Procurement recommendations

- ii. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of:
 - Phase 1 Safety Audit - £4000.
 - Phase 1 traffic order making process including street notices - £8000.
 - Implementation of Phase 1 (in line with the roads recommended for inclusion by North Area Committee on 01/08/13, see list below) - £131,500.
 - Phase 1 post implementation automatic traffic count (ATC) monitoring - £3,700.
 - Phase 2 pre-consultation ATC monitoring - £3,500.
 - Phase 2 consultation and public engagement including exhibitions - £8,000.
- iii. Subject to:
 - The permission of the Director of Resources being sought prior to proceeding if the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract.
 - The permission from the Executive Councillor being sought before proceeding if the value exceeds the estimated contract by more than 15%.

Recommendations from North Area Committee

- iv. Inclusion of all unclassified roads in the north phase area.

- v. Inclusion of the following C class roads: Chesterton High Street, Green End Road, Arbury Road.
- vi. Exclusion of the following C class roads: Kings Hedges Road, Gilbert Road - For the provision of 20mph on Victoria Road (an A class road) to be investigated and progressed.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Cambridge 20 mph Project Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Cambridge 20 mph Project Officer said the following:

- i. Cost figures in the report were estimates. These could be revised once quotes on actual costs were received. It was anticipated that cost estimates were higher in the report than the final figures would be.
- ii. The north area was likely to be the most expensive phase of the project.
- iii. City and County Officers regularly liaised about the 20 mph project. The County Council were the Highways Authority, so the project would have to go to Cabinet to start the statutory process in October 2013.
- iv. The Cambridge 20 mph Project Officer had liaised with Brighton & Hove Officers to learn from their experience. He would also liaise with Islington BC officers at Councillor Tunnicliffe's suggestion.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/34/Env Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Draft Charging Schedule

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the report was to update members on the work being undertaken to prepare a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for Cambridge and seek approval that a Draft Charging Schedule is published for public consultation in November 2013.

Consultation took place on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule between 18 March and 29 April 2013. They have influenced a Draft Charging Schedule, which must be independently examined before it can be brought into effect.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Approved the publication of the Cambridge Draft Charging Schedule (the Draft Charging Schedule is included within the Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document which is attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report) for a six-week consultation period starting in November 2013.
- ii. Approved, for publication alongside the Draft Charging Schedule, a statement outlining how S106 policies will be varied following the adoption of CIL.
- iii. Approved, for publication alongside the Draft Charging Schedule, a draft Reg.123 List (Appendix B of the Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document) which illustrates the Council's intention with regard to what infrastructure items will or may be funded via CIL.
- iv. Approved, for consultation alongside the Draft Charging Schedule, a draft Instalment Policy (Appendix D of the Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document).
- v. Agreed that, once the period of consultation has closed and all comments collated, arrangements be made for the Draft Charging Schedule to be subject to independent examination in accordance with the appropriate Regulations.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Senior Planning Policy Officer said the following:

- i. Consultants had advised that it was not viable to claim CIL from hotels.
- ii. Developers appeared to have a lot of influence on national policy. A fourth version of the charging schedule was pending.
- iii. CIL was applied only to new build properties. Stepped increments for charges should not be required to provide a break for small businesses as they did not traditionally go into new build premises.
- iv. Undertook to clarify for Councillor Marchant-Daisley if interest was chargeable on the payment by instalments policy.
- v. The CIL process was separate to the Local plan one. It would be reviewed every three years.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/35/Env Rouse Ball Pavilion - Project Appraisal

Matter for Decision

Previous Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) bids in 2008, 2011 and 2012 have considered options to develop the Rouse Ball Pavilion into a valued community asset providing a café facility, meeting space, storage for operational use and new toilets.

Bids have also considered the location, and the merits of forging links with the Jesus Green swimming pool.

The building is in a poor state of repair, both externally and internally, and is currently providing little value to Jesus Green.

Developer contributions collected for community facilities and formal sport can be used to meet the costs of some work. A capital bid may be required and external funding opportunities will also be sought prior to any bid.

This project reflects on the previous consultation undertaken for the HLF bids, it also takes into consideration the previously developed, audience development plan and business case used to support the grant bids.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

- i. Instructed Officers to consultation on a range of options for the future of the Rouse Ball Pavilion on Jesus Green, to include the following:
 - The refurbishment of existing pavilion.
 - The demolition and rebuilding of the pavilion around the same location.
 - The demolition and rebuilding of a pavilion in a new location on Jesus Green.
 - The demolition and rebuilding of a pavilion in a location that would provide facilities for users of both the Green and the outdoor swimming pool and retain the kiosk in the current position.
- ii. Instructed officers to seek external funding to support options, and to prepare a project appraisal for a future Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/36/Env Riverside Moorings Consultation Findings and Options Appraisal

Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Ms Gilbert made the following points:

- i. The City Council had muddled two issues: A) Proposing to install permanent mooring infrastructure on the riverside. B) How to make this stretch of riverside safe.**
- ii. Suggested implementing option 3 from the Officer's report in the short term, and option 2 in the long term.**
- iii. Some stretches of Riverside are too narrow for pavements now. The option 2 Caveat "not where the river is narrowest" must be extended to include the further caveat "not where the highway is narrowest".**

2. Mr Brown made the following points:

- i. Suggested outside assistance (technical expertise) would be required to undertake the feasibility study.**
- ii. Suggested a strategic approach to look at the river as a whole should have been taken instead of looking at one area in particular. Cambridge is not seen as accessible to visitors.**
- iii. The Local Plan did not refer to river moorings in detail.**

The Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager referred to the Officer's report and said that funding had been set aside for adaption and changes to the riverside. Specialist advice would be sought where necessary.

3. Dr Eva made the following points:

- i. Expressed concern at the lack of progress on Riverside moorings.**
- ii. He had campaigned to get riverside railings painted for some time.**
- iii. The City and County Councils had argued over who was responsible for railings maintenance.**
- iv. Dr Eva felt the City Council had not undertaken maintenance in a timely fashion.**
- v. Requested details on a timetable for implementing work. The railings were merely one illustration of continuing problems caused by delay to moorings work.**

4. Mr Phillips made the following points:

- i. Suggested that Cambridge needed a marina.**
- ii. Requested a feasibility study be undertaken.**
- iii. Suggested specialist input was required to undertake riverside mooring work.**

- iv. **Asked for details on a timetable for implementing work (as per Dr Eva).**
- v. **Felt that people who moor on the riverside should pay to do so, as per other legal mooring areas. Boat owners undertaking maintenance work raised health and safety issues for other river users.**
- vi. **Asked for details on funding available to implement a marina feasibility study.**

5. Councillor Roberts made the following points:

- i. **Expressed concern that railings were in a poor of repair and needed re-painting.**
- ii. **Riverside moorings were an on-going issue.**
- iii. **Expressed support for option 2 in the Officer's report.**
- vii. **Supported Mr Phillip's point that boat owners undertaking maintenance work raised health and safety issues for other river users.**
- iv. **Supported Mr Phillip's point that Riverside needed a specific mooring area.**

In response to the comment that the railings were in a poor state, the Chair asked officers to clarify the responsibility for this aspect of maintenance. It was confirmed that this was a County Council highways issue.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out the results of the recent consultation (Spring 2013) on exploring options for the future management of the moorings at Riverside.

The City Council has asserted its ownership of, and registered its title to, the subsoil of Riverside. The registration of title provided an opportunity to consider management options for moorings at Riverside.

In early 2013, Officers carried out an assessment of the possible approaches that could be adopted at Riverside. The appraisal was intended to assist identification of suitable solutions for addressing the management of moorings, whilst minimising or mitigating any adverse effects of any solution.

The Council identified six possible options for the Riverside Wall moorings. None of these has been tested for legality, technical feasibility, or cost, as it was felt appropriate to put all options to consultation before going to the

expense of detailed feasibility appraisal on options that might actually prove unacceptable to the public interest.

The Council expressed a wish to consult with statutory and other bodies concerned with Riverside, and, with boat owners, local residents, and other stakeholders, to ensure that any final decision is informed by an appropriate range of views.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

- i. Instructed Officers to carry out feasibility work on options 2 & 3 (detailed at paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's report); and to consult on Executive Councillor approved solutions and to report back consultation findings to Environment Scrutiny Committee for further consideration and decision. A verbal update is required at a future Environment Scrutiny Committee regarding the Feasibility Study, Mooring Policy and Riverbank Policy.
- ii. Agreed not to pursue creating solutions for options 1, 4, 5 & 6 (detailed at paragraph 3.6) at this stage, or to consult on these options further. Agreed not to discount these options completely until the outcomes of further study of options 2 & 3 are known.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager said the following:

- i. The County Council were responsible for maintenance of Riverside railings.
- ii. A feasibility study would set out how the Riverside area could be made suitable for moorings. This may recommend a combination of options 2 and 3 from the Officer's report.
- iii. The feasibility study would set out how many boats would be displaced.
- iv. Noted Councillors and members of the public's comments that it had taken a long time to implement work on Riverside. It had taken some

time to clarify City and County Council responsibilities. The City Council had only owned the land for 3.5 years. It had only been in a position to take action during this time.

Councillors requested a change to recommendation (i). Councillor Owers formally proposed to amend the following recommendation from the Officer's report (amendments shown as bold):

- i. Instructed Officers to carry out feasibility work on options 2 & 3 (detailed at paragraph 3.6 of the Officer's report); and to consult on Executive Councillor approved solutions and to report back consultation findings to Environment Scrutiny Committee for further consideration and decision. **A verbal update is required at a future Environment Scrutiny Committee regarding the Feasibility Study, Mooring Policy and Riverbank Policy.**

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/37/Env Parker's Piece Lighting

Public Question

Ms Steele made the following points:

- i. **Students had campaigned for lighting on Parker's Piece for circa ten years.**
- ii. **Residents also supported installing lighting.**
- iii. **The City Council should do what it can to overcome gender based violence (eg rape). The lighting would help women in particular.**

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided details of the proposed project to install additional lighting columns on the two diagonal footpaths across Parker's Piece.

A consultation took place earlier in 2013, which was responded to by over one thousand members of the public. This informed the lighting measures being proposed.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

- i. Authorised the procurement of specialist lighting design and construction services for the Parker's Piece Lighting Project, in accordance with the City Council Contract Procedure Rules.
- ii. Agreed to take the decision to approve the final project appraisal and implementation of the Parker's Piece Lighting project, out of the Environment Scrutiny Committee cycle, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, subject to the final proposed project cost not exceeding £60,000.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager.

The Committee expressed support for lighting on Parker's Piece.

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager said the following:

- i. Environmental Improvement Project funding was required to implement the lighting as County Council Highway funding could not be rolled over from a previous financial year.
- ii. Lux light testing would be undertaken to review if four or six light columns were appropriate.
- iii. If the light scheme proceeds, the Council would have to make a business case to the County Council to put in an additional power supply sufficient for the skating rink (and may be for similar people who would prefer power to generators). The City Council would need to justify the need for a standing charge as the additional power would not always be required.

- iv. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager was liaising with the Urban Conservation Team to ensure lighting column designs were appropriate for the area, and reflected consultation comments.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/38/Env Parkers Piece Public Art Project

Matter for Decision

This project proposes to commission an artist to make a proposal for an artwork, which celebrates the 'Cambridge Rules' and acknowledges the important role that these rules played in establishing the Football Association Rules in 1863.

This commission will also signify the importance of Parker's Piece as the birthplace of football not only within the City of Cambridge, but both nationally and internationally.

The maximum budget for this commission is £115,000, which includes project management fees.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

Financial recommendation

- i. Approved the commencement of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan (PR034d). The total cost of the project is £115,000 funded from developer contributions.

Procurement recommendation

- ii. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of the 'Cambridge Rules' Public Art Commission. If the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract value by more than 15% the permission of the Executive Councillor and Director of Finance will be sought prior to proceeding.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Project Delivery & Environment Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. This was an important project and the city needed to attract high calibre artists.
- ii. Members of the public should like the piece of art when it is finally designed/made.

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery & Environment Manager said the following:

- i. High calibre artists would not apply to an open tender, therefore artists would be shortlisted for invitation to submit works of art for consideration.
- ii. Artists would be paid for the work submitted.
- iii. £115,000 was allocated as a budget for the project. £12,000 of this was for officer costs. InSite Arts were acting as consultants free of charge.
- iv. £9,000 had been spent on the art project to date. This would be paid from other funds and not be charged to the project budget.
- v. Officers and the Executive Councillor for Public Places would shortlist four pieces of art. The public would be consulted on these items. The Executive Councillor for Public Places would make the final decision at a future Environment Scrutiny Committee based on consultation feedback.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/39/Env Developer Contributions: 2nd Priority - Setting Round

Matter for Decision

Developer contributions are payments received by the council from property owners or developers to help address the impact of greater demand for facilities arising from development in the city. Alongside the council's approach to devolved decision-making for the local use of developer contributions, half the payments from major developments are assigned to a city-wide fund. This is for strategic projects to create or improve facilities that would benefit residents from more than one area of the city.

Following the first priority-setting round in late 2012/early 2013, the next round is now underway. This is planning ahead for the next set of projects to be taken forward once first round and on-going projects are completed.

The Officer's report asked the Executive Councillor to identify second round strategic priorities for the contribution types in the Public Places portfolio (informal open space, play provision for children & teenagers, public art and public realm).

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

- i. Allocated a further £27,000 of public art developer contributions from the city-wide fund to the 'Cambridge Rules' project on Parker's Piece.
- ii. Allocated £39,000 of public realm developer contributions from the citywide fund towards lighting for Parker's Piece.
- iii. Noted the consultation feedback and officer comments on other strategic project ideas for Public Places (Table 3 and Appendix C of the Officer's report).
- iv. Identified follow-up action needed to build on the progress so far in the second priority-setting round over the use of developer contributions, namely to return to North Area (for devolved decision-making) those informal open space contributions from North Area that had been assigned to the city-wide fund (in the region of £15,000-£25,000).

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Urban Growth Project Manager.

He said the report contained a typographical error on page 21 where PP7 listed 'Jesus Green' instead of 'Parker's Piece'.

In response to the report, the Committee felt there should be the option to return contributions that had been assigned to the city-wide fund for strategic priorities back to area committees on case-by-case basis, if area projects were in a position to go ahead and strategic projects were not. The Committee noted this would deplete the city-wide fund and so the option should be used with caution as returning funds to areas could stop strategic citywide projects going ahead.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment and Urban Growth Project Manager said the following:

- i. The use of developer contributions needed to be consistent with the tests set out in official regulations (such as the CIL Regulations).
- ii. Second round area committee short-listing reports have generated discussions about how to make best use of the devolved funding available. It has become clear that there is not enough funding to take forward all the suggestions and so priorities will have to be identified.
- iii. Area Committee Chairs and others have asked whether further funding would be available from appropriate categories in the city-wide fund to support local priority projects. If the relevant Executive Councillors wished to take up this option, the most appropriate way of doing so would be to return to an area committee those contributions from that same area which previously accrued to the city-wide fund (as part of the 50:50 split of developer contributions from major developments permitted by the Planning Committee).

Councillors requested a change to recommendations in the Officer's report. Councillor Kightley formally proposed to amend the following recommendation:

- iv. Identified follow-up action needed to build on the progress so far in the second priority-setting round over the use of developer contributions, namely to return to North Area (for devolved decision-making) those informal open space contributions from North Area that had been assigned to the city-wide fund (in the region of £15,000-£25,000).

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report and amended by (iv) above should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee endorsed recommendation (i) by 4 votes to 3 with 1 abstention.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (ii) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (iii) unanimously.

The Committee unanimously endorsed recommendation (iv) as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/40/Env Joint Materials Recycling Facility Procurement Process

Matter for Decision

Cambridge City Council currently has a contract for the bulking, sorting and onward processing/sale of recyclable materials, collected from blue bins. This contract expires at the end of November 2014.

The Council needs to procure a new contract before the current expiry date, various options have been analysed.

Officers consider that a joint procurement with the relevant RECAP partners is likely to result in an overall net saving for the partners and represents the best overall option.

Collaborative procurement is an important part of the Whole Systems Approach Programme agreed by the RECAP partners, which should provide gains for all partner authorities involved. 1.5 Work has commenced on market testing and putting together an Invitation to Tender with a view to contract award taking place in March 2014.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

- i. Approved the 'RECAP Partnership Charter', as attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report, including approval of the additional Schedule 2

- Governance Agreement relating to the operation of the Joint MRF contract, commitment to participating in the joint contract and the inclusion of kerbside recyclate materials in the contract.
- ii. Committed the Council to the appointment of a Contractor to deliver Joint MRF services for bulking, sorting and onward processing/sale of recyclable materials for all RECAP participating partners, unless all participating partners agree not to appoint.
 - iii. Agreed delegation of authority to the Director of Environment, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services plus the Chair and Spokes of ESC, to approve the final Invitation to Tender and to award the Contract for Cambridge City Council.
 - iv. Agreed that Peterborough City Council (as lead authority for the joint procurement exercise) will nominate, in collaboration with and on behalf of the participating RECAP partners, a preferred supplier for the contract of providing the services of bulking, sorting and onward processing/sale of recyclable materials. The contract would be awarded to the contractor who submits the Most Economically Advantageous Tender to the partners as a whole.
 - v. Agreed the approach to compliance with the Waste Framework Directive regarding source separation of recyclate, as agreed by the RECAP Board on 4th September 2013 and as attached at Appendix 2.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Refuse & Environment.

The Committee supported the proposal.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/41/Env Proposal for Collection of Commercial Food Waste for Composting

Public Questions

Mr Roberts asked a number of questions, as set out below:

- i. Queried how many customers had replied to the survey, and of these, how many had expressed an interest in the food waste collection.**

Officers have only received twenty seven responses so far. However from those who have responded, a high proportion advised they produce food waste, and more than half would be interested in the Council collecting food waste.

Going forward Officers will be contacting specific establishments such as colleges and restaurants to generate an interest in the service.

- ii. Queried how the daily tonnage of food waste had been calculated.**

Sections 3.7 and 3.8 in the Officer's report show an aspirational aim to establish a core service which provides an indication of the level of service, and one which will grow. Again this will relate to marketing the service and reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill.

- iii. Queried what work had been carried out to ascertain the capacity needed to facilitate the food waste collections.**

Officers see year on year reductions in commercial residual waste tonnage. This has been encouraged by the commercial recycling collection service which has increased year on year. A route optimisation exercise is yet to be completed for trade waste. A half vehicle resource would be sufficient to support a viable service.

- iv. Queried if the £30,000-£60,000 for the first 3 years was to offset the operating costs, disposal costs and bin purchase with a small surplus at the end of year three. Asked if this income would be lost from the general waste.**

It is anticipated that the growth in a food waste service will be greater than any reduction in refuse services, as new customers will be attracted to the business and existing customers review their service as they determine their needs. This was the case when officers introduced the commingled service. The base budget will not be altered until the service has become established; hence the operational costs which would have been covered by the residual collection charges which may be lost have been included.

The potential tonnage achievable with the available resource
50 bins x 80kg = 4 tonnes or 100 bins x 40kg = 4 tonnes etc.

Matter for Decision

In the Government's Review of Waste Policy 2011 it identified preventing and reducing food waste sent to landfill from commercial businesses as a priority.

Unlike household premises educational establishments and businesses are currently unable to have a segregated food waste collection service provided by the City Council.

The Council is currently undertaking a survey of existing commercial customers and it is anticipated that a high proportion of those responding will be interested in food waste collections. Officers are aware that a number of customers from the education sector have expressed an interest and it is therefore anticipated that food waste collections would be welcomed by many of Cambridge's business and the education sector. It is proposed to start a food waste service for businesses utilising existing resources with vehicles becoming multi use. Initially the scheme is expected to be self-financing and in the future some income forthcoming to secure the future sustainability of the service.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

- i. Approved a food waste collection service for businesses and educational establishments to begin in April 2014. At this stage this service would not require any capital investment as it is proposed to use existing vehicles which will become multi use. The scheme would initially be self-financing.
- ii. Approved that any net profit generated from the service be retained to support vehicle and bin R & R contributions for the first 3 years, at which point a review will be undertaken and a decision made as to the capital

required for the service as a more specialised vehicle may be required. If capital investment is not required the money will be returned to the general fund as a saving.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Refuse & Environment.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Refuse & Environment said the following:

- i. The survey to ascertain interest in food waste collections had been running for circa three months. Information had been published in this time to signpost the survey.
- ii. Officers have contacted restaurants etc to show how they could reduce food disposal costs through targeted food waste disposal instead of using general landfill.
- iii. Higher/further education establishments and other organisations would be approached as well as restaurants.
- iv. Cambridge BID was expected to support the food waste disposal service.
- v. Profits from the service would be ring fenced to grow it from scratch. Funding could be allocated to the general fund when the service has been established (as was normal council practice).

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

13/42/Env Scrap Metal Act 2013**Matter for Decision**

The Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 replaces the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 1964 and Part 1 of Vehicles (Crime) Act 2001 and introduces a new licensing regime for scrap metal and vehicle dismantling industries.

The City Council will have powers to grant or refuse licences and to revoke them if the dealer is considered to have become 'unsuitable'.

The Local Authority (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 state in section 2 that Schedule 1 sets out the functions that are not to be the responsibility of the executive authority. In that Schedule, under licensing and registration functions there is reference to the power to license scrap yards under section 1 Scrap Metal Dealers Act 1964.

The Scrap Metal Dealers Act 1964 is repealed by section 19 of the Scrap Metal Dealer's Act 2013. The 2013 Act comes into force on 1st October 2013. Reference to scrap metal dealers Act 1964 in Schedule 1 will cease to have any relevance after that date; it effectively disappears from the Schedule, and therefore automatically falls to the Executive function of the Council.

It is therefore necessary to bring this report to the Environment Scrutiny Committee for approval rather than Licensing Committee. A report will go to Licensing Committee for information.

It is likely that The Local Authority (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulation 2000 will be updated by December 2013 to allow this function to return to Licensing Committee, whereby a report will then be taken to Licensing Committee for approval.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

- i. Noted the powers conferred by the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013.
- ii. Approved the scheme of delegations as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report; and referred it to Civic Affairs Committee to amend the Constitution.
- iii. Approved the fee structure as set out in Appendix B; and for it to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Refuse & Environment.

The Committee unanimously resolved by to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 10.40 pm

CHAIR