

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

17 October 2014

5.30 - 9.55 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrope (Chair), Perry (Vice-Chair), Moore, Pitt, Ratcliffe, Robertson, C. Smart and M. Smart

Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste & Public Health: Peter Roberts

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Kevin Blencowe

Officers:

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Specialist Services: Paul Necus

Project Manager: John Richards

Urban Design and Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson

Principal Conservation and Design Officer: Christian Brady

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers:

County Council Director of Strategy and Development: Bob Menzies

SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services: Mike Hill

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

14/54/ESC Apologies

No apologies were received.

14/55/ESC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

14/56/ESC Minutes

The minutes of 8 July 2014 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

14/57/ESC Public Questions

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

14/58/ESC Urgency Action taken by the Director of Environment

14/58/ESCa To Rescind the Notice of Redundancy Served on Pest Control Operatives

The decision was noted.

14/59/ESC Proposed Single Shared Waste Service

Public Question

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

1. Mr Roberts raised the following points on behalf of GMB members.

Asked for clarification:

- i. If garage staff were moving or not.**
- ii. How/when vehicle maintenance would be undertaken.**
- iii. If Waterbeach would be the location for all vehicles.**
- iv. How Councillors could make an informed decision without figures from other council services.**
- v. Details on financial implications in Appendix 1, specifically costs/savings that would arise from the shared service proposal.**
- vi. Stated shared services could be beneficial if done in a timely manner. An informed decision should be made on the business operation. The report raised more questions than answers. Suggested South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and the City Council should not tie themselves into a lease until the costs/benefits are clear.**

The Director of Environment responded:

- i. The Mill Road site had been allocated for housing, so the City Council Waste Service would have to move from the site regardless of whether services are shared with SCDC or not.**
- ii. The move to Waterbeach could lead to a change in service such as maintaining trucks. This proposal needed more work, and would be reported back to Environment Scrutiny Committee in future. Staff and trade unions would be consulted on proposals.**

- iii. Not all operational details (eg depot site functions) could be given at present, but would be addressed in future. There is a business case to make this change.
- iv. Staff would be consulted in future regarding shared service proposals. A key consideration was how staff could travel to the Waterbeach site.
- v. Truck 'rounds' would be reviewed in future for optimum efficiency. The Director of Environment, Head of Refuse & Environment and Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health attended a staff meeting and committed to work with staff to develop the best routes.
- vi. Bad weather needed to be factored into operational plans so crews could access the Waterbeach site.
- vii. Section 11 of the Officer's report set out planned savings, including the loss of one head of service.

The Head of Refuse & Environment said Appendix 1 of the Officers report set out income from various sources. City Council and SCDC income varied for paper waste recycling, but were similar for other services.

The SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services said SCDC spent five times more on fuel costs than the City Council. This would be factored into the budget for shared service operating costs so the city would not be affected.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health responded:

- i. Recognised a substantial change was proposed.
- ii. Things had gone well in the past where staff had fed into consultations to shape services.
- iii. Staff had raised issues for consideration regarding the current proposal for shared services. These would be considered.
- iv. The process to make savings needed to start now, but not in a way that negatively affected the service.

2. Mr Roberts said the shared service would reduce paper waste recycling income for the City Council as it worked in a different way to SCDC.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health responded that income was not guaranteed, so future assumptions could not be based upon historic data.

Mr Roberts said that people were not against the principle of a shared service, but it should be set up in the correct way. The Council would not want to pull out of a deal later when no savings were made.

3. Mr Watson raised the following points:

- i. There were general staff concerns regarding proposed service cost savings.**
- ii. Referred to a paper he circulated setting out estimated costs for him to travel to the Waterbeach site instead of the Mill Road one. He stated his transport costs would greatly increase when travelling to the new site, which would leave him financially worse off.**
- iii. Queried if increased staff travel costs had been factored into an equalities impact assessment.**
- iv. Queried how the proposed reduction in waste collection vehicles would lead to cost savings as this would cause longer rounds and working hours.**
- v. Queried if SCDC would save more costs than the City Council.**

The Head of Refuse & Environment responded:

- i. Financial impacts would be considered as part of organisational change policy. Individual 1-2-1 meetings would be held with staff to understand their circumstances.
- ii. Route optimisation would occur through using vehicles more effectively, rather than having artificial boundaries between SCDC and city service areas.
- iii. Any system introduction would lead to questions and concerns. SCDC and the City Council were talking to staff on how to introduce the shared service. This would lead to a lot of change.

The SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services said:

- i. It was important for managers to be aware of employee's personal details such as transport costs. Managers needed to be creative in finding solutions to reduce costs by working with frontline staff.
- ii. Overtime was paid to SCDC staff to compensate for long hours when services were redesigned in September 2014. These hours were reducing.
- iii. SCDC spent £3.9m per year on waste services, the City Council spent £2.6m. Each would put this amount of funding into the shared service budget and share savings.

The Director of Environment said £13,000 of premises costs would be saved through the move to Waterbeach through enhanced facilities, as the City Council would not have to maintain the Mill Road depot (proposal dependent on releasing the land for housing).

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health made the following points:

- i. Thanked staff for their comments.
- ii. Travel was an important future consideration. The Executive Councillor, Director of Environment plus Head of Refuse & Environment were discussing options to address concerns.
- iii. SCDC and City Waste service workers would be offered a good deal and could expect similar terms and conditions (these differed currently).

4. Mr Stevens queried if the garage and taxi certificate of compliance service would move to Waterbeach, or perhaps be outsourced.

The Head of Refuse & Environment responded:

- i. A business case on services would be presented to Councillors in future. This would include costs/savings for outsourcing all garage services.
- ii. Officers were looking at what the garage does now as part of a review of services that would/not be provided in future.
- iii. It was important to undertake the service review.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health reiterated the above points and said the issue would return in future for consideration by Environment Scrutiny Committee in more detail.

5. Mr Bannister raised the following points. Queried:

- i. **Why report details were late.**
- ii. **Fuel operation details.**
- iii. **How routes could be optimised when in-cab technology did not work.**
- iv. **A number of SCDC loaders were agency staff, how would this be addressed through shared services.**
- v. **Details about travel allowance. It would cease after 1 year, which was effectively a pay cut.**

The SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services said:

- i. All fleet vehicles would refuel at the same place in South Cambs.
- ii. In-cab technology would be reviewed in future.
- iii. Agency staff were used to cover service changes, most drivers/loaders were SCDC staff.
- iv. Operational details eg travel allowance would be addressed in future.

The Head of Refuse & Environment responded:

- i. Officer reports were issued 1 week pre-committee.
- ii. Staff could expect a standard 37 hour working week. Over time etc would be reviewed through consultation.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health reiterated it was important that staff fed into the shared service process, this would shape how it operated. This could be done through trade unions, Leading Hands or the Head of Refuse & Environment. The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health undertook to liaise with Mr Roberts in future.

Mr Bannister said that staff did not want a pay cut, and suggested existing staff be paid all monies, whereas new staff could be put on new conditions (if downgraded).

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health said staff and pay issues would be explored through trade unions and the Joint Staff Employer Forum. The Director of Environment said this was a crucial issue and a report on operational details would be brought to Environment Scrutiny Committee in future.

Environment Scrutiny Committee members thanked public speakers for attending and talking to the Committee.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out the work that had been done to assess the potential for a single shared waste service for South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. The report concluded that there were significant savings that can be achieved by creating a shared service with a Governance Board representing both Councils. The report recommended the creation of a single shared waste service at Waterbeach and that arrangements be made to consult with staff and unions on detailed proposals. A further report was requested on a range of matters including options for the appropriate long term delivery model for the single shared waste service, and

business cases for a shared trade waste service and also the possible re-location of the Cambridge City garage facility.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Agreed:

- i. The creation of a single shared waste service, wholly owned and run by the local authorities, with a single management structure and workforce, located at the Waterbeach Depot using a single pool of vehicles for Cambridge City & South Cambridgeshire DC.
- ii. The relocation of the Cambridge City Waste Service to share the Waterbeach Depot; and the creation of a shared Head of Service for Waste and a single management team to deliver the single shared waste service, and to undertake full consultation with the staff and unions to deliver these changes;
- iii. The creation of a Shared Waste Board to oversee the delivery of the Single Shared Waste Service, to oversee performance within the budget and policy framework set by both Councils, and to provide advice and recommendations on waste policy matters to both Councils, and to deliver the Councils' objectives.
- iv. To delegate the implementation of the proposals set out in (i), (ii) and (iii) above to the Cambridge City Director of Environment and South Cambridgeshire DC Director of Health & Environmental Services, in consultation with the South Cambridgeshire DC Cabinet Member, and the Cambridge City Executive Member, Chair of Executive Scrutiny and Opposition Spokespersons.
- v. To develop further single shared waste service efficiency and cost-saving proposals as set out in the Officer's report.
- vi. To develop options and proposals for alternative joint delivery models (beyond the Lead Authority model) to operate the single shared waste service and to report back to Councillors in July 2015.
- vii. To instruct officers to prepare a detailed implementation plan with financial implications to be agreed with the Shared Waste Board to inform the future budget setting work of the two Councils.

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 Director of Environment and SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services.

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

- i. Were reassured that operational matters would be pre-scrutinised before implementation.
- ii. City Council and SCDC staff should be on the same terms and conditions for the same job.
- iii. It was essential to find savings, these not costs should be shared equally with SCDC.
- iv. The City Council did not want staff annualised hours terms and conditions like SCDC.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment and SCDC Director of Health & Environmental Services said the following:

- i. Staff transport arrangements would be addressed through the Joint Staff Employer Forum.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health said this exercise was not a privatisation of the waste service. Reiterated staff travel issues would be reviewed in future.

- ii. No impact was expected on staff pensions. This would be confirmed with the Head of Human Resources.
- iii. Risks concerning the paper waste recycling service would be checked with SCDC in future. Details were set out in the SCDC Medium Term Strategy.
- iv. SCDC and City Council terms and conditions would be harmonised in future. Details would be reported back to Environment Scrutiny Committee in July 2015. Timetable details were set out in Appendix 3 of the Officer's report.

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health said the intention was to harmonise terms and conditions upwards ie the highest pay band in the relevant range.

- v. SCDC had a higher demand for waste services in summer rather than winter. This was when green bin waste crews were needed in rural

areas, so staff worked longer hours in summer than winter, but costs equalled out over the year ie salary was unaffected. SCDC used annualised hours, but the City Council did not. Each could operate differently using the shared service.

- vi. A single head of service would be empowered to deliver it.
- vii. The contract exit strategy would be set out in a Memorandum of Understanding.
- viii. Consultation mechanisms were in place for Garage and Waste Service staff.

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.

14/60/ESC Agenda and Meeting Report Packs

Committee members asked for reports to be published in one pack in future; not several. Members noted multiple packs were published as reports became available.

14/61/ESC Future of Park Street Car Park

Public Question

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

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Referred to the Cambridge Cycling Campaign representation.**
- ii. **Said that Park Street Cycle Park could be a success, this was an opportunity to install secure parking facilities and more space for bikes.**
- iii. **Took issue with the consultation process.**
- iv. **The cost of congestion should be considered.**

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport said bike and car parking would be included in the improvement work.

Matter for Decision

A report examining viable options for the future of Park Street multi-storey car park was presented to members in June 2012. It considered the outline business case for refurbishing the car park and examined the potential and implications of alternative redevelopment of the site.

The report found that due to the deteriorating structural condition of the car park, it could not be left in its current state.

The Executive Councillor's recommendations included an agreement to the principle of consulting the public and stakeholders about the options to refurbish, or to redevelop the Park Street car park. Authority was delegated to the Director of Environment in consultation with the Executive Councillor to carry out a public consultation exercise to determine the best option and report the results to the Council in due course.

A public consultation exercise was conducted between 18 August and 19 September 2014.

In light of the consultation feedback, a detailed appraisal of the alternative options should now be carried out. The appraisal should recommend an option to members that is consistent with the council's economic, financial environmental and planning objectives, so that the project can be incorporated into the council's future budget.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Noted and considered the feedback and analysis from the public and business consultation exercise.
- ii. Instructed officers to work up detailed financial evaluation of the options and taking account of the consultation feedback against the objectives set out in this report.
- iii. Instructed officers to report back to a future meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee to enable a decision to be made on the preferred option for inclusion in the Council's budget.

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 Specialist Services.

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

- i. The car park should be redeveloped.
- ii. Suggested that Stagecoach could be asked to re-instate Madingley Road bus stops.
- iii. Requested Park&Ride services be temporarily changed to operate late at night during refurbishment work to the car park so people could commute to the theatre etc was the car park was unavailable.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Specialist Services said the following:

- i. There was no firm commitment regarding the design at present, only that cycle parking facilities would be provided.
- ii. Consultation responses had been received from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign plus individual cyclists and businesses.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport said the consultation was open to all, it was up to people to respond.

- iii. Several options were set out in the Officer's report for Councillor consideration as it was prudent to make Councillors aware of all options.
- iv. Changes to bus services were a key consideration for discussion with the County Council. Other providers may be able to make alternative parking spaces available if Park Street was not.
- v. The City Council worked with Cambridge BID to interact with businesses.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations. He said the logistics for options needed to be looked at (eg traffic flow to the site) to ensure they were practicable.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

14/62/ESC 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.

14/63/ESC Keep Cambridge Moving Fund

Public Question

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

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. The A14 is dangerous and unsuitable for cycling. He asked for a parallel non-motorised route.**
- ii. The Prime Minister committed funding to cycle-proofing roads.**
- iii. Referred to the Highways Agency letter and said there were no details about non-motorised users. Asked if the City Council could request this be a condition of Department of Transport funding.**
- iv. Strongly support a fund for work.**

The County Council Director of Strategy and Development responded that a parallel non-motorised route was part of the scheme. The County Council informed the Highways Agency the scheme should include greater clarity on this. There was an intention to provide a path, its use was to be confirmed.

Matter for Decision

The City Council is in discussion with the Highways Agency about the impact of proposed improvements to the A14 on traffic flows, noise, air quality and vibration within Cambridge. When this information has been received, and analysed, options would be prepared to mitigate the impact of the scheme on residents within the city. In the meantime it was recommended to agree the principle of an investment by the City Council of £1.5 million over 25 years to mitigate these impacts.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Agreed the principle of an investment within the next 25 years by Cambridge City Council of £1.5 million into measures that mitigate the impact of trunk road improvements on the A14 in accordance with the approach set out in the Officer's report and that the Head of Finance was requested to consider the financial implications of this commitment in the forthcoming Budget Setting Report of the City Council.

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 Director of Environment.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment said the following:

- i. If recommendations were agreed in principle by Environment Scrutiny Committee and the Executive Councillor, a Budget Setting Report could then be put to Full Council.
- ii. Funding could be invested in and outside the city boundaries if it benefitted the city. For example, Park&Ride services.

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.

14/64/ESC Greater Cambridge City Deal Outline Transport Programme Phase 1

Public Question

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

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. **Welcomed the Officer's report and expected City Deal funding.**
- ii. **This was an opportunity for the city, which needed democratic input.**
- iii. **Cost efficient schemes were set out in the Officer's report.**
- iv. **The inner ring road and radial roads needed separate lanes for cars, bikes and pedestrians.**
- v. **Expressed concern that there was no space for separate cycle lanes in some proposals.**
- vi. **Asked for details about city centre cycle capacity improvements.**
- vii. **Bike links to villages around the city should be included in priorities to reduce congestion.**

The County Council Director of Strategy and Development responded:

- i. The scheme came from the Joint Transport Strategy for the city and South Cambridgeshire.

- ii. Consultation would be undertaken in future on the high level priorities set out in the Officer's report. Wherever bus priority measures were proposed, there was an intention to put in cycle facilities too.
- iii. Work had not yet been undertaken on developing designs.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's paper updated the Committee on the current position regarding the infrastructure programme to be delivered through the Greater Cambridge City Deal, work undertaken to date, and next steps.

The paper sought the Committee's views on the options before a final decision is made on the programme to be delivered from 2015-20 by the new Greater Cambridge Joint Committee.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Listened to the views of committee members on the projects in the outline City Deal infrastructure programme.

The Committee noted the work carried out to date and currently ongoing, and commented on the programme of transport schemes that could form the first five years' City Deal programme and future work around the City Deal programme.

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 Corporate Strategy.

The Leader of the Council made the following points:

- i. The City Deal had a 2 part governance arrangement.
- ii. The Shadow Board would be in place from November 2014, and the Assembly in January 2015.
- iii. Central Government was delaying governance arrangements. A report would be taken to Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee 20 October 2014.
- iv. The process needed to start now.
- v. There was a program to engage with cyclists, businesses and residents in future.

- vi. Priorities were set out in P39 of the Officer's report.

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

- i. Asked for trees to be considered whilst work was being undertaken, particularly in Milton Road.
- ii. Public transport and cycle facilities needed to be improved to reduce car usage.
- iii. Multi-modal transport needs should be addressed.
- iv. Suggested joint work between the City Deal and possible extended Park&Ride services during Park Street Car Park refurbishment.
- v. The City Deal should lead to transformative change. Preparatory work could be undertaken during tranche 1, so big projects could begin in tranche 2.
- vi. Congestion should be factored into transport modelling. There was no point having road etc access into the city if people could not travel around it.

In response to Members' questions the County Council Director of Strategy and Development said the following:

- i. Shared pavements were not ideal in the city due to the high use by pedestrians and bikes. This was acceptable in rural areas where there was lower use.
- ii. Providing real improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and buses, would only be achieved by restricting private car access, as had been done with the rising bollards in the city centre. Setting this would be a policy decision for councillors, not officers. This would then allow the space for street redevelopment work.

The Director of Environment said that air quality figures were available if desired. The city growth strategy was based on 60% non-car trips. The City Deal would feed into this programme.

The Leader of the Council made the following points:

- i. The Council would have to demonstrate the impact of £100m City Deal funding before it could get more from Central Government.
- ii. The focus was on getting people out of cars. Work on some radial routes may help access to the city.
- iii. Reshaping transport access would raise challenges. There would be feasibility studies and public consultation.

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.

14/65/ESC Joint Capital Cycleways Programme Review

Public Question

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

Mr Lucas-Smith raised the following points:

- i. Welcomed continuation of the programme.**
- ii. Referred to environmental and equality benefits.**
- iii. Requested proper protected space for cyclists, not shared use.**
- iv. Asked where £394,000 was spent on Newmarket Road.**

The Project Manager responded that the funding was spent on various improvements to Newmarket Road, such as the pedestrian crossing.

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report advised Environment Scrutiny Committee of the principal achievements of the Joint Cycleways Capital Programme since its inception in 2002, its extension to 2014-15 in 2011, and consideration of further extending the programme beyond 2014-15.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Noted the progress and achievements to date of the Cycleways Capital Programme (PR007).**
- ii. Agreed to consider an annual funding allocation to match that currently provided by the County Council each year, to be considered in the Budget Setting Report to extend the programme.**
- iii. Subject to the outcome of the capital bid recommendation (ii above), a report would be brought back to Environment Scrutiny Committee setting out how the extended Cycleways Joint Capital Programme is proposed to be managed.**

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 Manager.

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

- i. The County Council was the statutory authority responsible for highway maintenance, but the City Council could add value by adding funding to the shared programme. There were no guarantees that the County Council would fund the joint cycleways programme in future, but cycle facilities were viewed favourably as part of the programme.
- ii. The County Council funded highway and open space work. Highways Agency priorities were periodically reviewed, but some areas were not current priorities, such as Park Street.

The Committee felt the joint cycleways programme enabled the City Council to influence the County Council agenda.

The Executive Councillor said funding had reduced from £250k to £50k. Park Street could be included in recommendation (iii) after other options had been reviewed as other areas need work done sooner.

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.

14/66/ESC Pro-Active Conservation Work Programme 2014-15

Public Question

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

1. Professor Bullock raised the following points:

- i. **Asked for Barrow Road to be designated as a Conservation Area.**
- ii. **English Heritage viewed Barrow Road properties as worthy of conservation.**
- iii. **The architectural qualities/values of houses in Barrow Road were coming under threat as people changed house appearances, demolished or replaced them.**

- iv. **Much of the city was already protected by Conservation Areas.**
- v. **A Conservation Area was the only way to defend the qualities of the neighbourhood.**
- vi. **Barrow Road residents wanted to contribute to the costs of becoming a Conservation Area by providing:**
 - a. **Money**
 - b. **Expertise.**
 - c. **Research material.**
- vii. **Residents had subscribed a sum of money for a consultant to undertake a Conservation Area assessment.**

2. Mrs Bullock raised the following points:

- i. **Asked for Barrow Road to be designated as a Conservation Area. 85% of residents expressed this view.**
- ii. **Copies of resident's application had been provided to Officers.**
- iii. **Took issue with the amount of time taken by Officers to consider the application.**
- iv. **Stated urgent action was required to preserve Barrow Road as an architectural asset for the city.**
- v. **Circulated speaker notes which included copies of correspondence to date.**

The Urban Design and Conservation Manager responded:

- i. **Commended Professor and Mrs Bullock's care and wanting to protect their neighbourhood.**
- ii. **Agreed with the sentiment of what they were saying.**
- iii. **Was familiar with the funding and English Heritage consultation methods mentioned in the representations.**
- iv. **The Pro-Active Conservation Work Programme consultation was at a key stage for review by Environment Scrutiny Committee and Council. In order to include Barrow Road, Councillors would have to make a decision to change their current commitments, plus accept associated costs to reprioritise the programme. This was possible, but would incur costs.**

- 3. The Committee Manager read out a statement on behalf of Mrs Hargreaves: "Could Bentley Road be made a conservation area as it is a line of arts and craft houses. If they are not kept it will become a hotch pot".**

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report reviewed the work that had been completed as part of the Council's pro-active conservation work programme since the last report to committee in March 2014. The purpose of the report was to update members on the work that had been completed, what was outstanding, and what was proposed. The report also noted the spend to date on the programme as well as sought a steer from the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy on a request to designate Barrow Road a conservation area.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Agreed the pro-active conservation programme as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Agreed that existing commitments in the Council's Pro-Active Work Programme as set out in the Officer's report should have priority at this time.
- iii. Noted the request for the designation of Barrow Road as a conservation area, and to agree that such designation is not prioritised for the reasons set out in 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 Urban Design and Conservation Manager. He stated the report contained a typographical error listing the last report to committee in March 2013, it should read 2014.

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

- i. Wanted to protect Barrow Road.
- ii. The Council needed to balance cost savings with protecting its heritage as the Council received very limited funding from Central Government.
- iii. Pro-active work priorities for the Conservation Team at this time are to complete the update of the Historic Core Area Appraisal and to review the most vulnerable Buildings of Local Interest outside of conservation areas for potential Article 4 Directions.

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

- i. If the Pro-Active Conservation Work Programme was prioritised, the review of the most vulnerable Buildings of Local Interest outside of conservation areas for potential Article 4 Directions would be put on hold.
- ii. An initial review of Pro-Active Conservation Work was undertaken, the former Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change gave permission to proceed. Officers were following this process. Reconsideration of the matter as to whether or not to designate could be undertaken in 12 months once other work has progressed if the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport agreed.
- iii. Resources, rather than staffing numbers were the principal issue that affected timescales for work. Preparing a conservation area appraisal document/process correctly was a 4-6 month process.

The Director of Environment added that he would not advocate Neighbourhood Plans as a solution for Barrow Road protection. He reiterated a review of the situation of whether to proceed with designation could be undertaken in 1 year. If the Pro-Active Conservation Work Programme was re-prioritised now, the previous commitment would have to be taken out.

- iv. The Council could accept private funding and expertise from residents to undertake conservation work. The Urban Design and Conservation Manager re-iterated that reprioritising the conservation programme would impact on pre-existing commitments made in the past year with respect to pro-active conservation work.
- v. A Home Alteration Design Guide was a topic of interest to householders. A lot of insulation work etc was covered under permitted development even in Conservation Areas, unless Article 4 Directions already applied. Officers advised that English Heritage already provided such information but would review if details could be put on Conservation Team webpages in future.

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

The Committee unanimously endorsed recommendation (i).

The Committee unanimously endorsed recommendation (ii).

The Committee endorsed recommendation (iii) by 5 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations. He said that conservation and preservation work were separate issues. The Conservation Team were facing challenging priorities, which should remain unchanged.

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 9.55 pm

CHAIR