

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

14 January 2014

4.00 - 10.03 pm

Present: Councillors Kightley (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Brierley, Gawthrope, O'Reilly, Roberts 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

Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces: Adrian Ash

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

Operations & Resources Manager: Jackie Hanson

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Waste Strategy Manager: Jen Robertson

Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson

Planning Policy Manager: Sara Saunders

Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager: Alistair Wilson

Principal Conservation and Design Officer: Christian Brady

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Conservation and Design Officer: Susan Smith

Accountant (Services): Richard Wesbroom

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present From Cambridgeshire County Council:

Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding: Dearbhla Lawson

Transport and Infrastructure Strategy Manager: Jeremy Smith

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

14/1/Env Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Reid. Councillor Brierley was present as the alternate.

14/2/Env Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillors Reiner	14/7/Env, 14/8/Env & 14/9/Env	Personal: Conservator of the River Cam
Councillors O'Reilly & Saunders	14/14/Env, 14/15/Env, 14/17/Env, 14/21/Env & 14/22/Env	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Saunders	14/17/Env	Personal: Centre 33 is a Mayor's charity for 2013/14.
Councillor Saunders	14/17/Env, 14/18/Env, 14/19/Env & 14/20/Env	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past Present & Future

14/3/Env Minutes

The minutes of meeting held on 8 October 2013 were approved and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Councillor Reiner asked for membership of Cam Conservators to be noted as a personal declaration for the moorings and riverside items.

- 13/28/Envc - Stourbridge Common River Bank Restoration.
- 13/36/Env - An Update on Moorings At Riverside.

14/4/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.

14/5/Env Decision Taken by Executive Councillor**14/5/Env Delegation to South Cambridgeshire District Council 1: Prosecute Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990**

The decision was noted.

14/5/Envb Delegation to South Cambridgeshire District Council 2: Enforcement Action Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990

The decision was noted.

14/5/Envc Reported Overspend on Replacement of Grand Arcade Car Park Management System

The decision was noted.

14/5/Envd Parker's Piece Lighting Project

The decision was noted.

14/5/Enve Splash Pad Projects and Revised use of Developer Contributions Funding

The decision was noted.

14/6/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.

14/7/Env Public Places Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets 2013/14 (Revised), 2014/15 (Estimate) and 2015/16 (Forecast)**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Public Places Portfolio, as included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2014/15 to be considered at Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

Review of Charges

- i. Approve the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A1, A2 and A3 of the Officer's report.
- ii. To delegate authority to the Director of Environment to set fees and charges in respect of Commemoration products and services, delivery of which will change throughout the year depending on demand and availability.

Capital

- iii. Seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2013/14, as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report, to fund re-phased capital spending.
- iv. Approve, where relevant, project appraisals (shown in Appendix D 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 Accountant (Services). The Officer referred to an addendum to the agenda report amending figures in Appendix B.

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.

14/8/Env Riverside Moorings Consultation Findings and Options Appraisal

Matter for Decision

The City Council has asserted its ownership of, and registered its title to, the subsoil of Riverside and in doing so this has afforded the opportunity to consider management options for moorings at Riverside.

In October 2013, Scrutiny Committee considered the results of the Spring 2013 consultation on exploring options for the future management of the moorings at Riverside.

Respondents to the consultation considered six possible options for the Riverside moorings.

None of the options had been tested for legality, technical feasibility, or cost, as it was felt appropriate to put all options to the consultation. This allowed due consideration without the expense of detailed appraisals on options that might actually prove unacceptable.

At the October Scrutiny Committee, The Executive Councillor recommended that:

- Officers carry out feasibility work on options 2 and 3.
- Option 2: To permit mooring on Riverside wall, but not where the river is narrowest.
- Option 3: A ban on mooring on Riverside wall, and relocating Riverside craft to other locations on the river.

This verbal report was requested by Scrutiny Committee and it is intended to detail work to date on progressing options 2 and 3.

A further more detailed report on the findings will be considered by Environment Scrutiny Committee in the latter part of 2014.

In the meantime Officers have not discounted options 1, 4, 5 and 6, and those options are:

- Option 1: Permit mooring on Riverside wall, integrating the area into the city's mooring policy.
- Option 4: Ban mooring on Riverside wall and give existing resident moorers notice to vacate.
- Option 5: Re-organise mooring so as to make Riverside a visitor mooring area only, opening up existing visitor moorings for residential use.
- Option 6: Do nothing; leave things as they are although City Council has already committed to do something.

In considering option 2 (permit mooring on Riverside wall, but not where the river is narrowest), Officers have met with the Cam Conservators and the County Council to consider adaptations and changes to Riverside.

The River Manager, County Officers and City Officers have discussed creating pontoons to be stationed below the existing gates and providing additional gates with ladder access points.

Pontoons would permit access to boats moored in a series. Access would be to the vessel bow or stern only.

This not ideal, however the Conservators cannot allow any further encroachment across the navigation by having pontoons running along the length of the wall with vessels moored to the outside.

The Conservators' existing mooring prohibitions would need to be recognised.

The insertion of pontoons would increase the spacing interval between boats. It is estimate a 50% reduction of current boat numbers at Riverside.

That said, it is important to note that not all boats at Riverside are occupied, and of the ones that are occupied, not all of them meet the City Council's policy requirement that boats moored in Cambridge be the sole residence of the person living on the boat. Only boats meeting City Council policy would be able to moor at Riverside.

The key design issues are:

- i. For the pontoon to be of sufficient size to be stable under load.
- ii. Finding a means of tethering the pontoons next to the wall to allow for the rise and fall of river levels.

The Conservators would levy an annual fee for any pontoon on the river. The going rate presently is £82 per square metre per annum.

The licences could be granted for a number of years with a rent view clause.

The Council could recover the fees through Mooring Licence.

The Conservators have expressed a wish that any new scheme would limit vessels to narrow-beam only (no wider than 2.15 metres).

The wide-beam vessel owners displaced would have to be considered in the management response to Option 3 (ban mooring on riverside wall, and relocate Riverside craft to other locations on the river).

The County Council have agreed in principle that the railings can be adapted to allow gates and ladders to be installed. Any change would require their written permission, a planning application and Environment Agency consent.

The County Council have offered to allow the City Council to access their Framework Agreement with Skanska to provide detailed feasibility.

The feasibility would indicate whether adaptations could be made to facilitate mooring at the riverside.

If it is possible to create moorings at Riverside, the next question is who will be allocated those additional spaces, given the long waiting list for residential moorings at Cambridge.

The exact costs remain unknown and this moment in time officers have not worked up a business case for the adaptations.

The next report to Scrutiny Committee will narrow down the options.

Environment Scrutiny Committee will also consider the financial implications of making changes at riverside and therefore a full worked up business case and justification is recommended, before any decision is taken.

The next steps are:

- Gain written consent from the Cam Conservators and the County Council including any conditions.
- Discuss the principles of pontoons with the Environment Agency (and obtain any written consent needed).
- Gain a fee proposal from Skanska regarding working up detailed solutions.
- Seek an early indication of planning consents needed.
- Consider business models to determine revenue, capital spend and repairs and renewals contributions needed.

With regards progress on option 3:

- If it is decided to ban mooring on Riverside wall, and relocate Riverside craft to other locations on the river, it is vital to have considered alternatives and the impact on those that currently moor at Riverside.
- To that end, officers will consider:
 - How to balance the rights of those on the waiting list against the needs of those currently mooring at Riverside, and the need for fair treatment.

- If mooring at Riverside is banned, whether it is possible to grant temporary grandfather rights to those currently moored at Riverside, to obviate and undue hardship.
- The timescales for implementations of any ban.

Scrutiny Considerations

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

In response to Members' questions the Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) said the following:

- i. The mooring terms of reference would determine the length of stay at a particular site. The criteria for selecting who can moor at different sites could be reviewed.
- ii. A response to concerns regarding crowding on the riverside and lack of amenities should be ready by the end of 2014. Any adaptations to riverside railings could impact on the highway, options to mitigate this will be reviewed.
- iii. Pontoons were the preferred method to access moored boats. Permanent bridges would reduce the amount of navigable river.
- iv. The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) undertook to confirm with Conservators of the River Cam if there was a requirement to ensure there was 18m of navigable width.
- v. Officers were looking at options to balance mooring and leisure use of the Cam, these would be presented to Environment Scrutiny Committee for consideration in future.

14/9/Env Changes to the River Moorings Policy

Public Question

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

1. Ms Tillson raised the following points:

- i. **Suggested it would cost £100 in mooring fees for people to visit Cambridge by boat.**
- ii. **There were a limited number of temporary moorings that could be used by visitors.**
- iii. **Took issue with the 48 hour limit on temporary moorings; and asked for longer.**
- iv. **Asked for all moorings to be treated as one legal area.**

The Executive Councillor for Public Places responded:

- i. The proposed changes to moorings policy being discussed by Environment Scrutiny Committee aimed to stop people abusing the temporary moorings by moving between them instead of using a permanent mooring.
- ii. She hoped the proposed changes to moorings policy had minimal negative impact on visitors.

2. Mr Fryer-Bovair raised the following points:

- i. Asked for details regarding the moorings list administration process.**
- ii. Asked if the council had considered charging an administration fee to people joining the moorings list.**
- iii. People needed forewarning regarding changing to moorings policy as it impacted on their lives ie where they lived.**

The Executive Councillor for Public Places responded:

- i. Officers reviewed contacts on the moorings list every six months to ensure it was up to date. This took a lot of officer time.
- ii. A fee was being considered as part of the policy change options proposed by officers.

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) said that named people on the moorings list were contacted when the list opened/closed. Details were also publicised on the city council website.

3. Mr Tidy raised the following points:

- i. Thanked officers for the work they undertook to manage the moorings policy.**
- ii. Took issue with closing the moorings list as a way to save officer time.**
- iii. Acknowledged that enforcement was a difficult balancing act, but suggested little visible enforcement action occurred at present.**

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) responded:

- i. Officers were looking at ways to make management of the moorings waiting list less laborious.
- ii. A robust policy needed to be in place prior to taking enforcement action. The Council currently took civil action when undertaking enforcement action, this was not high profile.

Mr Tidy made a supplementary point that if the council did not take legal action when enforcing policy, it's only other alternative was to remove people from the moorings waiting list. This sanction would be lost if the moorings list was closed.

4. Mr Hyde raised the following points:

- i. Referred to comments made by other speakers.**
- ii. Queried the definition of reasonable cause for not moving someone from a mooring.**

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) responded that reasons for not moving people on included mechanical breakdown and extenuating personal circumstances such as medical grounds.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report contained:

- i. Recommendations for amendments to, and the management of, the Council's River Moorings Policy.
- ii. Issues and options raised by stakeholders since January 2010, when the policy was last reviewed.
- iii. Areas for further consideration and scrutiny relating to fees and charges, the formulation of an enforcement policy and the subsequent management of moorings.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Public Places

Agreed to:

- i. Give delegated authority to Officers to periodically close and review the River Moorings Waiting list when the expected wait for a mooring position is in excess of 18 months.
- ii. Change the terms and conditions of the 48-hour visitor moorings, so that if a boat that moors at any City Council visitor mooring, the boat may not use any other visitor mooring in Cambridge within 7 days (without reasonable cause).
- iii. Instruct officers to review the River Moorings Licence pricing structure, fees and charges for 2014 and beyond, to include an equality impact assessment, for future consultation and consideration by Environment Scrutiny Committee. The recommendation is to include a review of the discounts offered for sole occupancy and student status (but not the

discounts offered for those receiving means tested benefits or pension credits).

- iv. Instruct officers to draft a River Moorings Policy document reflecting the Executive Councillor decisions to date, which would also include an enforcement policy. It is recommended that the document be the subject of consultation and further approval by Environment Scrutiny.

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 Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces).

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

- i. Availability of moorings has been an on-going issue. This was an important long term issue for consideration as it impacted on where people lived (permanent moorings). As was the lack of visitor/temporary moorings.
- ii. The Council needed a process in place to stop people abusing the moorings waiting list.
- iii. Moorings policy enforcement was an important issue.
- iv. Suggestions for policy considerations:
 - Swapping moorings permissions between boat owners already moored so they do not have to move between moorings.
 - Moorings that were accessible for people with sensory/mobility impairments.
 - Combining the narrow and broad beam moorings lists.
 - Clarify moorings markings for enforcement purposes.
 - Increasing the number of temporary moorings.

In response to Members' questions the Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) said the following:

- i. It was hard to determine if sufficient levels of temporary moorings were available for visitors as many permanent users abused the temporary moorings by using them.

- ii. Officers needed to clarify the definition of reasonable cause for evicting people from moorings prior to taking future enforcement action.
- iii. A moorings licence is not a tradable commodity. It is just a licence to moor on the riverbank; a specific site is not identified.
- iv. The moorings policy did not allow people to moor rented boats. If people sublet their boats, they breached the terms and conditions of their moorings licence.
- v. Officers would review the facilities at different moorings as they revised the River Moorings Policy, to make life more comfortable for river users.

The Committee resolved by 5 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.

14/10/Env Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets 2013/14 (Revised), 2014/15 (Estimate) and 2015/16 (Forecast)

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio, as included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2014/15 to be considered at Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

Review of Charges

- i. Approve the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A1 of the Officer's report.

Capital

- ii. Approve, where relevant, project appraisals (shown in Appendix D).
- iii. Seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2013/14, as detailed in Appendix C, to fund re-phased capital spending.

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 Accountant (Services). The Officer referred to an addendum to the agenda report amending figures in Appendix A.

Councillor Roberts referred to Appendix B P3/8 and asked for clarification regarding PPF3430 Public Realm Enforcement Apprenticeship. The Executive Councillor said the purpose of the PPF bid was to show the Council's commitment to apprenticeships. PPF3430 was a way to train someone how to support the Enforcement Team. If finances allowed, there might be employment for the newly qualified apprentice, but that is not guaranteed in the proposal. The Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces added that the apprentice role was part time, and aimed to help someone earn money whilst undertaking training. The aim was to train one candidate over 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.

14/11/Env Proposed Change to Subsidised Working with the County Council in Relation to Grass Cutting of Verges

Matter for Decision

Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have operated a reverse agency agreement for a number of years. This agreement allows for each Authority to provide various highway related elements for the other, which includes maintenance functions.

The County Council are faced with financial saving requirements, as part of the budget programme for 2014/15, it is proposed to review working with the County Council in relation to grass cutting of highway verges given these pressures.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services

Agreed the following principles to guide officer negotiations with Cambridgeshire County Council in relation to highway verge grass cutting:

- i. Continue to put the case to the County Council for the retention of current levels of resource to safeguard the amenity of the existing green verges within the city.
- ii. Ensure that the subsidised element of highway grass cutting which the City Council provides to the County Council continues to reflect the efficient use of resources and is affordable.

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 Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces.

In response to Councillor O'Reilly's question; the Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces said there were maintenance issues for letting grass grow longer in an attempt to reduce costs by mowing less frequently.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

14/12/Env Charging for the Second Green Bin Service**Matter for Decision**

Cambridge City Council needs to make savings of £6.3M over the next four years and has been looking at a whole range of options to reduce expenditure and increase income in order to meet this target.

The green bin service is used for the collection of garden waste and food waste from households in the city. Some flats do not have this service as a result of lack of space to store a bin or lack of material generated.

Under the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992, garden waste is classed as household waste for which a charge for collection may be made. This is not the case for other waste streams such as food waste. The collection of garden waste is not a statutory service, but is at the discretion of the Waste Collection Authority. The Council is intending to continue to offer a free garden and food waste service to residents but proposing to introduce a charge of £30 p.a. to be applied for the emptying of any second green bins containing garden waste only. Historical information obtained from collection crews has highlighted that two thousand households have second green bins so that they can have extra garden waste collected.

The Officer's report set out options to be offered to residents who do not want to take part in this paid for service for a second green bin.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services

Approved the introduction from 1 October 2014:

- i. A charge of £30 per annum for the emptying of a second 240 litre domestic green bin that a resident would like to either retain for extra garden waste or for a resident who would like to join the second green bin scheme.
- ii. A charge of £25 for the emptying of a second 140 litre domestic green bin that a resident would like to either retain for extra garden waste or for a resident who would like to join the second green bin scheme.

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 Waste Strategy Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Waste Strategy Manager said the following:

- i. Officers only expected a small amount of green waste to be put into other bins if a second green bin was not requested by residents.

- ii. Residents could swap their green bin for another size (larger and smaller) free of charge if the Executive Councillor approved the report recommendations.

The Waste Strategy Manager requested a change to recommendations 2.1 and 2.2. She formally proposed to amend the following recommendations from the Officer's report (amendments shown as struck through text):

- 2.1 A charge of £30 per annum for the emptying of a second 240 litre domestic green bin that a resident would like to either retain for extra garden waste or for a ~~new~~ resident who would like to join the second green bin scheme.
- 2.2 A charge of £25 for the emptying of a second 140 litre domestic green bin that a resident would like to either retain for extra garden waste or for a ~~new~~ resident who would like to join the second green bin scheme.

The Committee unanimously approved these amended recommendations.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 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.

14/13/Env Cessation of the Pest Control Service

Public Question

A member of the public asked a question, as set out below.

Ms Brennan raised the following points:

- i. **Pest control is an important service.**
- ii. **The Council Pest Control Service treated a variety of pest and sites.**
- iii. **The pest control service was free for residents.**
- iv. **Suggested a chargeable private service would reduce the number of reported cases and lead to less use of pest control services.**
- v. **Suggested that moving to a chargeable private service would not lead to justifiable cost savings for the council.**
- vi. **Pests do not respect boundaries. A lack of treatment in the city could spread to other areas.**

The Head of Refuse and Environment responded:

- i. The Pest Control Service was discretionary; cost savings were set out in the Officer's report.
- ii. The service would not cease until criteria in the Officer's report were met (if approved at committee today).
- iii. The council would provide an advisory service to residents if the pest control service was outsourced to the private sector.
- iv. Many local authorities had already withdrawn pest control services, whilst continuing to provide an advisory service to residents.
- v. The Council only paid for pest control on the Mill Road site, not on any others as the land owner was responsible.
- vi. The Council had a statutory duty to enforce pest control.

Ms Brennan asked a supplementary question to clarify if all on-costs were considered in the Officer's report.

The Head of Refuse and Environment said that officers would review on-costs in future if councillors decided to stop providing the pest control service today.

Matter for Decision

In the light of budget pressures at the City Council the Pest Control Service has been reviewed and options considered to reduce the costs of the Service. The Service safeguards public health by eradicating and preventing pests such as rats, mice, and bedbugs in residential and commercial premises. In some cases the City Council makes a charge but there is limited scope for additional income as there are a number of private companies that provide the service at a more competitive rate. The Service is discretionary and many Local Authorities, faced with budget pressures, have ceased the activity.

It has been concluded that the Service should be discontinued subject to financial assistance (reviewed annually) being made available to residents in receipt of benefit. This approach will ensure that the public health objectives of the City Council will be achieved whilst achieving a budget saving.

A variety of options have been considered when reviewing the Pest Control Service. Last year efforts were made to try and bring in some commercial contracts and reduce costs but due to the highly competitive market this was not successful.

Charging for treatment in both domestic and commercial premises has also been considered. Charges previously introduced for mice treatments, resulted in a decline in the number of treatments. Due to the overall cost of providing the Service the introduction of charges would not provide sufficient income to cover the Council's cost of the service.

Using a private contractor to undertake the work is unlikely to provide any savings with a lengthy procurement exercise which would incur additional management and contractual costs.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services

- i. Approved the cessation of the Pest Control Service with effect from July 2014.
- ii. Instructed officers, in consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokesperson, to develop a scheme prior to cessation of the Pest Control Service for those residents in the city that are suffering from financial hardship.

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 and Environment.

Labour Councillors said in response to the report that residents were concerned at the loss of the service and felt it should be protected. They suggested that using a private contractor would not lead to great cost savings.

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

- i. Government funding varies between different types of local authorities.
- ii. The level of pest control service varies between different local authorities as it is discretionary.
- iii. Environmental health is a statutory service. There are no expected changes to the Council's high quality Environmental Health Service if the Pest Control Service was withdrawn. Most Environmental Health Officers could identify pest problems without Pest Control Service input.
- iv. The proposal is to withdraw the Council's discretionary Pest Control Service and replace it with an advisory service that would also signpost

private pest control services. The Council would aim to continue working with residents and businesses. For example, if tenants required advice regarding landlord's responsibilities regarding pest control.

- v. Financial support for tenants on benefits was subject to review by the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.
- vi. The Council had tendered to undertake private work using its pest control service, but was unsuccessful when bidding in a competitive market.

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.

14/14/Env Jesus Green Shared Cycle and Foot Path Improvements

Public Question

A member of the public asked a question, as set out below.

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Supported the recommendations in the Officer's report as these will benefit walkers and cyclists by differentiating lanes.**
- ii. **Queried if the path camber would be flattened, and path width increased to 3.5m.**
- iii. **Suggested a diversionary route be set up whilst work is undertaken.**
- iv. **Asked if contractors would leave decorations along the path.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded:

- i. The camber would be flattened and path width increased to 3.5m.
- ii. The contractor undertaking work will be asked to set up a diversion and retain decorations along the path.

Matter for Decision

This project appraisal proposes the re-laying of an existing cycleway across Jesus Green. The footpath would be widened from 2.6 metres to 3.5 metres, and use specialist construction techniques to reduce the potential damage to trees. Lighting columns would also be aligned to one side of the cycle path, and new lanterns installed by the County Council.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Financial recommendation

- i. Approved the commencement of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan. The total cost of the project is estimated at £ 165,570.

Procurement recommendations

- ii. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of the construction of the proposed cycle way improvements, ground de-compaction and lighting works in accordance with the detailed drawings in Appendix A of the Officer's report. Officers have, using the Braintree Framework Agreement, identified a preferred contractor subject to the approval of the Officer's report.
- iii. Procurement 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

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.

14/15/Env Perne Road/Radegund Rd Roundabout

Public Question

A member of the public asked a question, as set out below.

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Expressed safety concerns that the roundabout was not fit for purpose. Cambridge Cycling Campaign can only support roundabouts that are fit for purpose.**
- ii. **Suggested a Dutch roundabout design as an alternative to the proposal.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said that roundabout plans had been considered through various iterations. A Dutch style design had not been selected as it was being trialled elsewhere by the Department for Transport.

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded:

- i. Department for Transport and County Council funding would be lost if work on the roundabout was delayed as funding was time limited.
- ii. There was scope to undertake further work on the project in future if Department for Transport standards change.

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following supplementary points:

- i. **The latest roundabout design proposal is new, whereas safety issues had existed for some time.**
- ii. **A shared use pavement was not a satisfactory option.**
- iii. **Suggested it would be difficult to change the roundabout design in future once work had started.**

Matter for Decision

The aim of the project is to improve the safety of the Perne Road/Radegund Road/Birdwood Road roundabout for cyclists and pedestrians. Following consultation and in response to the issues raised, Cambridgeshire County Council made a bid to the Department for Transport's Cycle Safety Fund and were awarded £240,000 to expand the scheme to include the provision of an offroad cycle route as well as the works to the roundabout itself.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate ChangeFinancial recommendation

Approved the commencement of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan. The total cost of the project is estimated at £410,000.

Procurement recommendations

Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of the works to Radegund Road/Perne Road roundabout subject to:

- i. The permission of the Director of Resources being sought prior to proceeding if the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract.
- ii. 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

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.

14/16/Env Planning & Climate Change Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets 2013/14 (Revised), 2014/15 (Estimate) and 2015/16 (Forecast)

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Planning and Climate Change Portfolio, as included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2014/15 to be considered at Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

Review of Charges

- i. Approve the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report.

Capital

- ii. Approve, where relevant, project appraisals as shown in Appendix D.
- iii. Seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2013/14, as detailed in Appendix C, to fund re-phased capital spending.

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 Accountant (Services).

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.

14/17/Env Sustainable City Grants 2014-15**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report made recommendations for 2014-15 Sustainable City grant funding to voluntary and not for profit organisations for an efficient and consistent approach across the authority.

The report also outlined plans to review Sustainable City grants.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Approved the recommendations for Sustainable City grants to voluntary and not-for-profit organisations in 2014-15 as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report, subject to confirmation of the Council's 2014-15 budget in February 2014 and, in some cases, to the provision of further information from applicants.
- ii. Approved the increase in delegated powers relating to the approval of sustainable city grant awards as follows:
 - Awards up to and including £5,000 to be approved by officers.
 - Awards from £5,001- £10,000 to be approved by the Executive Councillor inviting comments from the Chair and Spokes of the relevant scrutiny committee.

- Awards above £10,000 to be approved by the Executive Councillor following consideration by the relevant scrutiny committee.
- iii. Instructed Officers carry out a review of the Sustainable City grants as set out in section 3.8 of the Officer's report; and report back to Environment Committee in June/July 2014 with recommendations about future budgets and funding priorities and arrangements.

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 Operations & Resources Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Operations & Resources Manager said the following:

- i. The e-Luminate project (#10, Appendix 1, P73) could receive £4,500 from the arts and recreation budget, in addition to the Sustainable City Grant for sustainability funding. Officers would work with e-Luminate representatives to help them develop a business plan.
- ii. There was a typographical error in the Officer's report regarding Centre 33 (#8, Appendix 1, P72). Amendments shown as bold and struck through text: Project developed by 20 isolated young carers to ~~increase~~ **decrease** their reliance on taxis etc - supporting them to develop skills and confidence to use bikes safely. 8 interactive sessions building confidence in cycling, training skills and bike maintenance.

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.

14/18/Env Conservation Area Appraisal for The Kite

Public Question

A non-committee Member asked a question, as set out below.

Councillor Rosenstiel raised the following points:

- i. He had been a Cambridge resident for some time.
- ii. Referred to the Cambridge Townscape report from 1971 as a precursor to the Conservation Area.
- i. "Maids Causeway" was spelt without an apostrophe in the Appraisal document.
- ii. Suggested that Maids Causeway was missing from #16 of the Kite Conservation Area Character Appraisal report.
- iii. Took issue with report details and would take these up with officers post meeting. For example, why some buildings were included in the Buildings of Local Interest category, and some were not.
- iv. Asked the City Council to make the case to the County Council that street lights in Earl Street and Christchurch Street were heritage assets that deserved restoration.
- v. Suggested that New Square street lights were mismatched and asked City Council to make the case to the County Council to homogenise them (ie get them all to match).
- vi. Took issue with boundary markers.

The Senior Conservation & Design Officer said she would respond to Councillor Rosenstiel post meeting.

Matter for Decision

The City Council has an obligation under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to periodically review its Conservation Area designations and boundaries, to consider any new areas, and under Section 71 of the Act to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these areas.

The Kite Conservation Area is part of the Central Conservation Area which was designated in 1969. In 1995 it was decided to draw up Character Appraisals for the Central Conservation Area and it was divided into separate areas to do so. The Kite was the first to be written in 1996. In 2013 consultants drafted a review of the Kite Conservation Area Appraisal. This draft Appraisal review provides evidence to illustrate that the Kite Conservation Area still meets current national criteria in terms of special architectural and historic interest for Conservation Area designation.

A period of public consultation was held between 14th October and 11th November 2013. Responses are summarised in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

The Executive Councillor agreed:

- i. The draft Appraisal of the Kite Conservation Area listed in Appendix 2 of the Officer's report.
- ii. That owners/occupiers within the area of the proposed extension, as denoted in Appendix 3 of the Officer's report, be consulted on the proposal, and the Executive Councillor with Chair and Spokes approves the proposed extension subject to consideration of the representations received.

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 Principal Conservation and Design Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Urban Design & Conservation Manager plus Principal Conservation and Design Officer said the following:

- i. There was no control to protect nameplates or prevent paint removal unless a building was listed. Paint application could be controlled through Article 4. Article 4 had a broad remit and could cover features such as windows.
- ii. An item on the use of Article 4 Directions in conservation areas will be included in the update on the Pro-active Conservation report to Environment Scrutiny Committee 11 March 2014.

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.

14/19/Env Article 4 Directions - Public Houses and Buildings of Local Interest

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report sought a decision on the designation of Article 4 Directions in relation to the demolition of public houses in the City Council area. The report recommended the adoption of Article 4 Directions in the form attached at the appendix and which has the effect of withdrawing permitted development rights relating to the demolition of those public houses within the Cambridge City Council area that are not in a conservation area.

The Principal Conservation and Design Officer referred to an addendum to the Officer's report regarding use of Article 4 Directions: Public Houses and Building of Local Interest.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Authorised the making of Article 4 Directions withdrawing permitted development rights for the demolition of the public houses specified in Appendix 2 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted the need at a later date to confirm or not confirm with the Chair and Spokesperson the Article 4 Directions, taking into account representations made during the consultation period.
- iii. Agreed that the more vulnerable Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) outside conservation areas be brought forward for Article 4 Directions under delegated authority by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Planning & Climate Change and Environment Scrutiny Chair and Spokes.

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 Principal Conservation and Design Officer. The Officer referred to an addendum to Item 18 - Report regarding use of Article 4 Directions: Public Houses and Building of Local Interest.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said in response to the report that he was lobbying Central Government to encourage public

house protection. Ministers thought Article 4 provided sufficient protection, but stakeholders were not so convinced.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Conservation and Design Officer said the following:

- i. A report on the use of Article 4 Directions for BLIs would be presented to Environment Scrutiny Committee 8th July 2014
- ii. Buildings had to meet certain criteria to be added to the BLI/Article 4 list. Officers could discuss individual examples with Members post meeting.
- iii. Buildings owned by the Council were not included on the BLI list, if ownership changed, they could be in future.
- iv. The Local Plan provided the evidence base of pubs requiring protection.

Councillors agreed nem con to add the Blue Moon pub to the BLI list in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.

Councillors requested a change to recommendation 2.1b. Councillor Blencowe formally proposed to amend the following recommendation from the Officer's report (amendments shown as bold text):

- 2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended to:
- b) note the need at a later date to confirm or not confirm **with the Chair and Spokesperson** the Article 4 Directions, taking into account representations made during the consultation period.

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

The Committee unanimously resolved 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.

14/20/Env Article 4 Direction - Accordia Estate

Matter for Decision

Following a request from the Accordia Community Residents Association for measures to more closely control changes to the external appearance of

dwelling at Accordia via an Article 4 Direction, a report was considered by Environment Scrutiny Committee on June 11 2013. It was resolved that officers draft an Article 4 Direction and accompanying consultation process for consideration at a future Environment Scrutiny Committee.

The Officer's report presented a draft order and consultation requirements.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Authorised the making of a non-immediate Article 4 Direction for the Accordia Estate as shown in Appendix 1 attached to this report.
- ii. Noted the need at a later date to confirm or not confirm the Article 4 Direction in the form appended to this report, taking into account representations made during the representation period, and having consulted with the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.

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 Principal Conservation and Design Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Principal Conservation and Design Officer said the following:

- i. Accordia residents had been informally consulted on Article 4 proposals, formal consultation would occur after Environment Scrutiny Committee made a decision on how to take proposals forward (or let it lapse).
- ii. Accordia residents had responded positively to the Article 4 concept through officer engagement with resident organisations.

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

2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended:

- To note the need at a later date to confirm or not confirm the Article 4 Direction in the form appended to this report, taking into account

representations made during the representation period, **and having consulted with the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.**

The Committee unanimously approved these amended recommendations.

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.

14/21/Env Cycle Parking Project Appraisal

Public Question

A member of the public asked a question, as set out below.

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Generally supported the recommendations.**
- ii. **Asked that car parking spaces for disabled people in the Guildhall and Jesus Lane areas should not be replaced by bike racks.**
- iii. **Expressed disappointment that cycle parking was not proposed for Kings Parade.**
- iv. **Requested a strategic review of cycle parking for the east area of the city, specifically Romsey.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded that cycle parking was not proposed for Kings Parade as objections had been received via consultation, so the proposal was withdrawn as the objections could be overcome.

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:

- Localised on-street cycle parking throughout the city centre where space allows and the demand for cycle parking is high.
- Introduction of a third undercover secure cycle park, similar to those at Park St and Grand Arcade car parks.

The Officer's report provided an appraisal of the remaining on-street proposals for 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 detailed in this report, the funding for which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan. The total estimated cost of these on-street proposals is £115,000 funded from the City Centre Cycle Parking Project capital allocation SC549.

Procurement recommendations

- ii. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of the construction of the proposed cycle parking locations in accordance with the detailed drawings in Appendix B and C of this report relating to Peas Hill, Guildhall St, Jesus Lane, St Mary's St and East Road.
- iii. Procurement 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.

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

- i. Civil enforcement officers had recorded that only seven of nine disabled parking spaces were used in Jesus Lane, therefore bike parking was proposed in the area which would lead eight disabled parking spaces available.

- ii. The new Peas Hill street layout design aimed to mitigate the impact of illegal parking of disabled parking spaces by separating loading and parking areas. The design should also be an improvement on the current street layout eg more pavement space would be available in front of the café.
- iii. A variety of bike racks would be available across the city.
- iv. Undertook to clarify with County Council Highways Officers then advise Members why disabled parking spaces were not available in Guildhall Street. It was suggested that they may impact on traffic flow.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee endorsed recommendations (i), (ii) relating to Peas Hill, Guildhall St, St Mary's St and East Road and (iii) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (ii) relating to Jesus Lane by 4 votes to 0.

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.

14/22/Env Cambridge Local Plan 2014

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

1. Dr Pellew raised the following points:

- i. **Cambridge Past Present & Future (CPPF) welcomed the Local Plan in general, specifically the aims of remaining a compact city, and balancing the competing needs of growth plus protecting the green belt.**
- ii. **Queried some perceived contradictions between the Local Plan vision and details:**
 - **Supported the principle of developing brownfield sites before green belt (where possible) in policy #2.26 .**
 - **The Council should consider other sites to develop before the green belt.**
 - **Referred to eight urban locations proposed for development by CPPF in their representation as alternatives to green belt sites.**

- **Asked for a statement to be included in the Local Plan stating that green belt sites would not be developed before brownfield sites.**

The Head of Planning Services responded:

- i. Referred to a briefing note on CPPF's proposed brownfield sites in urban areas of Cambridge.
- ii. Sites in the Local Plan had been reviewed by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee and Environment Scrutiny Committee to a level above statutory requirements.
- iii. Sites needed to meet legal tests to be included in the Local Plan. CPPF proposed sites did not meet these criteria at present. If they were included in the Local Plan, it is likely they would be overruled by the Planning Inspector.
- iv. Officers had already looked at and discounted CPPF proposed sites.

Dr Pellew raised the following supplementary points:

- i. **A lot of land ownership issues could be resolved through public-private partnership to get sites ready for use. He suggested this option be investigated further.**
- ii. **Asked for a statement in the Local Plan to show that green belt sites are options of last resort to only be used after other sites had been investigated and discounted.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded that officers had discussed putting sites into a priority list for use. There was no legal basis for prioritising sites without appropriate planning reasons to do so.

2. Ms de Blois raised the following points:

- i. **Spoke as a Mill Road resident.**
- ii. **The character of the area was being eroded from mixed shop and housing use by changing to more retail development.**
- iii. **Queried how developments would affect the area.**
- iv. **There was a need to balance pedestrian and road traffic needs. Roads should be appropriate for the area.**
- v. **Requested that family housing be protected on Mill Road and the needs of inhabitants considered in future policies.**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer responded:

- i. Referred to representations by Ms de Blois, plus strategic level detail in the submission stage Local Plan and amendments shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.
- ii. Streetscape (ie operational level) detail would be covered in other documents.

As a supplementary point Ms de Blois said that the "wall" between public and private property realms was stronger in the past than now. This needed to be re-instated to protect the character of the Mill Road area.

3. Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Took issue with the Local Plan and suggested it did not reflect public representations.**
- ii. **Referred to the discussion at 17 December 2013 Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.**
- iii. **Felt that policies on sustainable transport were too weak.**
- iv. **Took issue with the s106 consultation.**
- v. **Suggested cyclists' needs were not being met.**
- vi. **Took issue with the Local Plan process.**
- vii. **Asked for planning issues to be looked at locally and not by Central Government.**

The Head of Planning Services responded:

- i. A clear public consultation had been undertaken.
- ii. The Local Plan process was paused as required by the Council Constitution to check the Plan was appropriate to go forward.
- iii. The role of Environment Scrutiny Committee was to look at representations when considering if the Local Plan should go forward.
- iv. The City Council Local Plan and County Council Transport Strategy would support each other.

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following supplementary points:

- i. **The City Council and County Council Transport Strategy were at different stages of development. Therefore it was difficult to discuss how they would mesh.**
- ii. **The Local Plan felt like it was led by Officers instead of publicly discussed by Councillors.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded

that Councillors had been given the opportunity to discuss the Local Plan at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

4. Councillor Herbert raised the following points:

- i. **The City Council had two Local Plans (2006 and 2014) which needed to join up with the County Council Transport Strategy.**
 - **Asked for reassurance that infrastructure is in place for Local Plan development sites. These will have to cope with current and future traffic levels to be sustainable.**
 - **There is no evidence base at present of strategic join up between the City Council Local Plan and County Council Transport Strategy.**
- ii. **Queried**
 - **If proposals made best use of funding.**
 - **What was on offer for the city centre.**
 - **If the County Council Transport Strategy would be available for debate at Council 13 February 2014.**

The Head of Transport, Infrastructure Policy & Funding responded:

- i. The Transport Strategy was in the final stages of development. It would be considered by Cabinet 4 March 2014.
- ii. The City Council Local Plan and County Council Transport Strategy used the same transport modelling to look at ways to make the city centre more accessible and reduce car numbers.
- iii. The City, South Cambridgeshire and County Councils were jointly working on the public realm.
- iv. Cycling and Walking Strategies are future operational level considerations.

Matter for Decision

The Council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee has over the last three years considered and commented on the evidence base and individual draft sections of the new Local Plan, prior to it being approved by Full Council for publication for the purposes of public consultation on 27 June 2013. That 'draft plan' is known as the 'Proposed Submission' Plan.

Consultation on that Plan has taken place (19 July – 30 September 2013) and 2,995 representations have been received and considered by officers. The Council now has to decide whether to continue to progress with the Plan, with or without amendments. If so, and if the amendments were not too extensive,

the council could agree to formally 'submit' the Plan to government for independent examination. If the amendments were extensive (e.g. significant rewording of policies, new sites added or existing ones deleted), then the council may decide to re-consult before 'submitting' the Plan for examination.

The purpose of the Officer's report was to present:

- A summary of the Key Issues raised during the consultation on the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document – see Appendix A;
- A Schedule of 'Proposed Changes' to the Plan – see Appendix B;
- An evidence report in respect of 'Duty to Cooperate' – see Appendix C.

The report also sets out the options available to the council in order to progress the Plan through its final preparation stages.

For this committee, the key recommendation is that the Plan should make its way to Council on 13 February 2014.

If Full Council approves the Plan, it will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination by an independent planning inspector.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Approved (prior to consideration at Council 13 February 2014) that:

- i. The Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document and Proposed Policies Map (as approved by Full Council on 27 June 2013) be 'submitted' for examination in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, together with the sustainability appraisal and associated evidence material in support of the Plan, and including the Key Issues (Appendix A) and Schedule of Proposed Changes (Appendix B).
- ii. The Duty to Cooperate Report (Appendix C), be agreed and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
- iii. In the interests of expediency, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to undertake appropriate negotiations and make further minor additions to the Schedule of Proposed Changes during the examination of the Local Plan (i.e. post 'submission') if in the opinion of the Head of Planning Services it is appropriate and necessary to do so to facilitate the smooth running of the Plan through the examination period, (except where changes would be of such significance as to substantially

alter the meaning of a policy or allocation). The exercise of this delegation to be reported back to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee through the course of the examination process.

- iv. The Head of Planning Services is authorised to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents required in the presentation of the Local Plan through the examination process and reflecting the council's agreed position on these matters and to take such other steps as are conducive or incidental to the submission and examination of the Local Plan.
- v. Any changes to Appendices A, B and/or C required by Environment Scrutiny Committee be agreed by the Chair and Spokes of Environment Scrutiny Committee and the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change.

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.

Members of the committee discussed the report section by section.

Councillor Kightley asked if a bus lane could be put in Madingley Road. The Transport and Infrastructure Strategy Manager said the character of Madingley Road and cost of work would affect the implementation of a bus lane. He offered to work up a proposal for future consideration.

Councillor Blencowe summarised the Local Plan process to date and how consultation fed into it. Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee had reviewed and commented on the Local Plan to date.

The Head of Planning Services said that Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee had commented on the County Council Transport Strategy in September 2013.

Councillor Saunders asked the City Council had been able to offer the County Council a site that could locate a school. The Head of Planning Services said The City Council did not have a suitable site in its Local Plan for a secondary school in the city, hence the County Council's objection to the City Council's Local Plan. The City Council was discussing how to overcome this with the County plus South Cambridgeshire Councils.

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.

The meeting ended at 10.03 pm

CHAIR