



# Public Document Pack

## Cambridge City Council

### ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**To:** **Scrutiny Committee Members:** Gawthroppe (Chair), Perry (Vice-Chair), Moore, Pitt, Ratcliffe, Robertson, C. Smart and M. Smart

**Alternates:** Councillors Sinnott and Tunnacliffe

**Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health:**  
Councillor Roberts

**Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport:** Councillor Blencowe

*Despatched: Tuesday, 7 October 2014*

**Date:** Friday, 17 October 2014

**Time:** 5.30 pm

**Venue:** Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall

**Contact:** James Goddard

**Direct Dial:** 01223 457013

### AGENDA

#### 1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

#### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests that they may have in an item shown on this agenda. If any member of the Committee is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they should seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.

#### 3 MINUTES (*Pages 7 - 30*)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2014 as a correct record. (*Pages 7 - 30*)

## **4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Please see information at the end of the agenda

## **5 URGENCY ACTION TAKEN BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT**

Record of Urgent Decision taken by the Director of Environment.

To note a decision taken by the Director of Environment since the last meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee.

- 5a To Rescind the Notice of Redundancy Served on Pest Control Operatives Director of Environment (*Pages 31 - 32*)

### **Items for Decision by the Executive Councillor, Without Debate**

These Items will already have received approval in principle from the Executive Councillor. The Executive Councillor will be asked to approve the recommendations as set out in the officer's report.

There will be no debate on these items, but members of the Scrutiny Committee and members of the public may ask questions or comment on the items if they comply with the Council's rules on Public Speaking set out below.

### **Items for Debate by the Committee and then Decision by the Executive Councillor**

These items will require the Executive Councillor to make a decision after hearing the views of the Scrutiny Committee.

There will be a full debate on these items, and members of the public may ask questions or comment on the items if they comply with the Council's rules on Public Speaking set out below.

|  |
|--|
| <b>Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health</b> |
|--|

### **Items for Debate by the Committee and then Decision by the Executive Councillor**

## **6 PROPOSED SINGLE SHARED WASTE SERVICE**

Report to follow

## Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

### Items for Debate by the Committee and then Decision by the Executive Councillor

**7 FUTURE OF PARK STREET CAR PARK**

Report to follow

**8 KEEP CAMBRIDGE MOVING FUND**

Report to follow

**9 GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL OUTLINE TRANSPORT PROGRAMME PHASE 1** *(Pages 33 - 42)*

**10 JOINT CAPITAL CYCLEWAYS PROGRAMME REVIEW** *(Pages 43 - 46)*

Appendix attached, report to follow (Pages 43 - 46)

**11 PRO-ACTIVE CONSERVATION WORK PROGRAMME 2014-15** *(Pages 47 - 58)*

# Information for the Public

**Location** The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2 and the Council Chamber) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

**Public Participation** Some meetings may have parts that will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Most meetings have an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions or make statements.

To ask a question or make a statement please notify the Committee Manager (details listed on the front of the agenda) prior to the deadline.

- For questions and/or statements regarding items on the published agenda, the deadline is the start of the meeting.
- For questions and/or statements regarding items NOT on the published agenda, the deadline is 10 a.m. the day before the meeting.

Speaking on Planning or Licensing Applications is subject to other rules. Guidance for speaking on these issues can be obtained from Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

Further information about speaking at a City Council meeting can be found at:

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/speaking-at-committee-meetings>

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**Filming, recording and photography**

The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision making. The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public.

Anyone who does not want to be recorded should let the Chair of the meeting know. Those recording meetings are strongly urged to respect the wish of any member of the public not to be recorded.

**Fire Alarm**

In the event of the fire alarm sounding please follow the instructions of Cambridge City Council staff.

**Facilities for disabled people**

Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.

A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request prior to the meeting.

For further assistance please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**Queries on reports**

If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or [democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**General Information**

Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>

**Mod.Gov  
App**

Modern.gov offer an app that can be used to ensure you always have the latest meeting papers for the committees you are interested in.

<http://www.moderngov.co.uk/our-solutions/tablet-app-paperless-meetings>

**ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

8 July 2014  
5.00 - 8.40 pm

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

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 Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

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

Project Delivery & Environment Manager: Andrew Preston

Senior Operations Manager: Bob Carter

Accountant (Services): Richard Wesbroom

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**Other Officers:**

WSP Consultant Neil Poulton

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/38/Env Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Pitt. Councillor Tunnacliffe was present as the alternate.

**14/39/Env Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interests were made.

**14/40/Env Minutes**

The minutes of meetings held on 11 March and 12 June 2014 were approved and signed as correct records.

**14/41/Env Public Questions**

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

Dr Morrison raised the following points:

- i. Spoke on behalf of many concerned residents who support a 20 mph speed limit on Victoria Road.
- ii. Expressed particular concern that Cambridgeshire County Council is likely to be against implementing the 20 mph speed limit because:
  - The County Council suggested there was not a clear majority of support for the proposal in the consultation.
  - It involves a departure from existing County Council policy.
  - Of a strong objection from the bus company, Stagecoach.
- iii. Dr Morrison made the following points in response to the County Council's perceived concerns:
  - The response to the short consultation was 56% in favour. The more significant result was that 71% of local residents were in support of the 20 mph speed limit. Victoria Road is hazardous. It has very narrow pavements, low kerbs, no cycle lanes and the pavements are an obstacle course on bin collection days.
  - In the 2013 Department of Transport Guidance on setting local speed limits, it is stated that traffic authorities can introduce 20 mph limits on major streets where there are significant numbers of journeys on foot and on bicycles and this outweighs the disadvantage of longer journey times for motorised traffic. Nowhere in this Government document is there any mention of precluding A or B roads from this policy. Dr Morrison suggested the County Council's policy was not consistent with the Government's most up-to-date guidance on speed limits.
  - Stagecoach objected on principle, not wishing any 'A' road to have a 20 mph limit and the County Council deemed this to be a strong objection. However, the Department of Transport Guidance requires the Council in setting 20 mph limits, not to deal in generalities, but to consider specific circumstances. Victoria Road is half a mile long; within it there are six bus stops, one major road junction with traffic lights and one pelican crossing. Therefore reducing the speed limit to 20 mph is unlikely to significantly add to journey times.

**The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport noted Dr Morrison's points.**

**14/42/Env Future Meeting Times for Environment Committee**



The Committee discussed future meeting start times. It was unanimously agreed to start at 5:30 pm in future.

### **14/43/Env Oral Report From the Executive Councillor and Proposals for 'Lead Councillors'**

The Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health gave a statement on his priorities:

- i. Reversal of the cessation of the Pest Control Service.
- ii. Protecting key front line services such as public realm enforcement.
- iii. Social and mixed housing.
- iv. Making Cambridge cleaner and greener. For example, roll out of cigarette and dog foul bins.
- v. Moving consideration of planning applications from Area Committees to the Central Planning Committee. Area Committees would be more community focussed in future.
- vi. Opening up information on council services to the public. For example, Dog Warden patrol times to be based on community feedback (through Area Committees) where there is greatest need.
- vii. To focus on restorative justice, to make this the first option before imposing fines. People will be given the option of community work instead of a fixed penalty notice for offences in future.
- viii. Mapping assets for Office and Councillor information.
- ix. Joint working with South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- x. Councillor Perry would be the Lead Councillor for Recycling. The purpose of the role is to:
  - Advise the Executive Councillor.
  - Increase levels of recycling.
  - Review council recycling provision for households and businesses, including options for improved communications and joint working with other councils and partners.

### **14/44/Env 2013/14 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Environment and Waste Portfolio**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report presents a summary of the 2013/14 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for services within the Environmental and Waste Services portfolio, compared to the final budget for the year.

It should be noted that outturn reports being presented in this Committee cycle reflect the reporting structures in place prior to the recent changes in Executive

portfolios. In light of those changes (together with the requirement to report outturn on the basis of portfolios in place during 2013/14) members of the committee were asked to consider the proposals to carry forward budgets and make their views known to The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources, for consideration at Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee prior to his recommendations to Council.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health**

- i. Agreed the carry forward requests totalling £57,400 as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report, to be recommended to Council for approval.
- ii. Agreed to seek approval from Council to carry forward capital resources to fund rephased net capital spending of £410,000 from 2013/14 into 2014/15 and future years where relevant, as detailed in Appendix D.

### **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).

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment plus Head of Refuse and Environment said variances in the final budget and outturn increase (P36 - 37 Appendix A & B of the Officer's report) showed there had been a significant over achievement of income from an increased number of contracts and income from various services (eg Trade Refuse), plus underspend in others (such as Street Cleaning). Therefore performance was higher than previously expected, particularly as the Trade Waste Team were in competition with the private sector.

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.

## **14/45/Env Proposed Shared Single Waste Service**

### **Matter for Decision**

A review is being carried out on the potential to create a single waste service, based at Waterbeach, to serve both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Officer's report considered the outline business case for co-location of the two waste services at Waterbeach and the creation of a Single Shared Waste Service. This update shows initial financial saving benefits from a combined domestic waste service, with further benefits likely to be delivered from co-location, a single trade waste service and joint vehicle and equipment procurement. Based on this, it was recommended that Councillors agreed to the preparation of a final business case proposal, to be reported back in October 2014 for a final decision.

A vital part of the approach to deliver the advantages above, would be the ability for the Single Shared Waste Service to be democratically accountable to both Councils. It is therefore proposed to establish a single Governance Board made up of the Executive and Cabinet Councillors from the District Council and the City Council. The Board would be responsible for setting the strategic vision of the service, agreeing the key operational performance targets and, crucially, ensuring the Service is accountable for the delivery of the performance targets. In turn there would be a mechanism to regularly report the work of the Board to members within each Council each quarter. It is further proposed to jointly appoint a single, Head of Service to run the single waste service, who will be responsible for operational decisions and operational delivery, accountable through line-management to the Board.

### **Public Questions**

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

#### **1. Mr Carter raised the following points. Queried:**

- i. If there had been assessment on the impact of vehicles travelling extra mileage to the proposed new shared waste site located outside the city boundary.**
- ii. If it would be cost effective to provide the shared service from the proposed new location (due to the extra mileage).**

#### **2. Mr Watson expressed concern regarding the financial impact on his family from having to move sites. It was expected that it would cost him more to travel to the proposed new site instead of the current one.**

- 3. Mr Roberts raised the following points on behalf of City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council GMB members. Queried:**
- i. Why the City Council was moving from a site that it owned (current waste service site) to a new one that it would have to lease.**
  - ii. If the site move would be cost effective.**
  - iii. If the reduction of two collection rounds was realistic given the rate of city growth, plus the service would also have to cover South Cambridgeshire residents too.**
  - iv. How Council tax would be charged/allocated as Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council charged different rates for the same service.**
  - v. Referred to Appendix 4 (P57 of the Officer's report). The City Council operated three rounds one week, and four the next.**
- 4. Mr Bannister queried why the City Council was undertaking a shared service with South Cambridgeshire District Council when the City Council waste service was profitable and the South Cambridgeshire service less so.**

The Director of Environment responded to questions 1 – 4 as follows:

- i. The proposed shared site would be based at Waterbeach, to serve both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- ii. The site was chosen as it was next to routes for the current disposal site, so should not lead to an increase in overall mileage.
- iii. The proposed site has capacity that can be extended, the current Mill Road one does not.
- iv. The City Council had committed to moving from the Mill Road site in its Local Plan, to provide a new site for housing. It was considered good practice not to locate a site near housing.
- v. Stated that if the Officer recommendations were agreed, he as Director of Environment would look into the impact on staff of the proposed shared service as part of the business case.
- vi. The intention of sharing services was to reduce costs. Cost issues and answers to these would be set out in the final business case.
- vii. If collection route issues and reductions to collection round numbers could be clarified, this should lead to cost savings, therefore there was a business case to share the service. If a business could not be proved, the proposal would not go ahead.
- viii. The City Council's income from trade waste was higher than South Cambridgeshire's, any settlement would have to be beneficial for both parties or the service would not be shared.

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

- i. The intention of setting up a shared waste service with South Cambridgeshire District Council was to provide a better service to the public.
- ii. Cambridge City Council did exceptionally well at recycling trade waste. It was hoped that South Cambridgeshire District Council would continue its good work and rise to the same level as Cambridge City Council.
- iii. The impact on staff of setting up a shared service would be reviewed as part of the business case process.
- iv. The Executive Councillor had liaised with Mr Roberts and welcomed feedback in future regarding staff issues and questions.

**5. Mr Roberts asked for reassurance the shared waste service was not an outsourcing exercise.**

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

- i. This was not a privatisation exercise. The intention was to make a statutory service more effective.
- ii. This was one way of sharing services with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

**6. Mr Carter asked if redundancies could be expected from the proposed shared waste service.**

The Head of Refuse and Environment responded:

- i. He could not say there would be no redundancies, but the emphasis would be on natural wastage and reducing vacancies.
- ii. The next stage of the process (if Officer recommendations were agreed by the Executive Councillor) would be to inform City and South Cambridgeshire staff of proposals through consultation on change management.

**7. Mr Bannister asked if workers or managers would be more affected by redundancies.**

The Director of Environment responded:

- i. Changes were subject to organisational change policy.
- ii. The shared service should lead to a slimmer management structure, so less managerial positions were likely through a slimmer structure.
- iii. The proposed Shared Waste Head of Service role will have a strategic Management function to it.

## **Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health**

- i. Agreed to work with officers at the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to prepare a final business case for co-location of current services and the creation of a Single Shared Waste Service based at Waterbeach and that this case is reported back to both authorities for a final decision in October 2014.
- ii. Agreed that the final model be explored for the Single Shared Waste Service comprising of a single management structure employed by one Council, with staff on separate terms and conditions linked to either the City Council or South Cambridgeshire District Council, leading to a single organisation wholly run and managed by 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.

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

- i. Residents appreciated the Waste Service as a valuable front line service.
- ii. The business case would look at:
  - Environmental and workforce impact.
  - Governance and scrutiny arrangements.
- iii. The City Council welcomed staff comments on the proposed shared service and would liaise with Trade Unions at joint forums to explore issues.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health said the following:

- i. It will be clarified in future which Councillors will be involved in decisions regarding the shared service. Both City and South Cambridgeshire Councillors would be involved. The Executive Councillor noted that City Liberal Democrat Councillors wished to be involved in the process.
- ii. The Executive Councillor undertook to regularly meet with Officers to keep staff informed on developments.

- iii. Initial details had been published as part of the Environment Scrutiny Committee report pack in order to meet legal publication deadlines. These would be further developed through the business case.
- iv. The business case would set out options for leasing the Waterbeach site, such as a long term lease that would reflect any investment in the site to get the best deal. If arrangements were not practicable, they would not go ahead.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Environment said City and South Cambridgeshire staff would have different terms and conditions in the shared waste service, to reflect discussions with trade unions and Human Resources. These would be protected through TUPE arrangements. It was acknowledged this may complicate arrangements as staff undertaking the same work could be on different terms and conditions.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

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.

### **14/46/Env New Environmental Initiatives (Education, Engagement and Enforcement)**

#### **Matter for Decision**

It was felt that Streets and Open Spaces is overdue for a review which would help performance and equip the service for the evolving future. Part of this review will incorporate the new environmental priorities identified in the Cambridge City Council Annual Statement, whereby the focus will be on Education, Engagement and Enforcement.

In Refuse and Environment there are also important changes identified within the Annual Statement which include the reintroduction of the Pest Control Team and bulky waste days.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health**

- i. Agreed to proceed with the recruitment of the Enforcement Officers and increase the Dog Warden role to a full time equivalent.

- ii. Agreed to implement the changes and environmental priorities identified within the Annual Statement and this report.
- iii. Agreed to request Officers to continue to investigate improved methods of Efficiency, Engagement, Education and Enforcement.

### **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.

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

- i. Welcomed the focus on education.
- ii. Felt restorative justice was an interesting idea. The punitive focus was less favoured as this could have long term criminal record implications.
- iii. Queried if people could volunteer to help clean up the city (as they do now), instead of only becoming involved as a result of enforcement action.
- iv. Queried how the impact of environmental measures would be evaluated as there was no process in place to do so now (as a benchmark). Also asked what measures would be used. For example, how to measure if streets and open spaces were becoming cleaner.
- v. Welcomed targeting services at key times when they were most needed.
- vi. It was important to have a clean city in order to attract people to live, work and visit; this affected the economy.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health said the following:

- i. The new initiatives would do more than just expand on previous ones.
- ii. The Executive Councillor was looking at ways to improve the service, such as amending Dog Warden patrol hours to focus on when people were most likely to be outside exercising their pets. Services would set their operating hours for best service provision.
- iii. The timing of Enforcement Officer patrols was key to getting the best impact. The Executive Councillor asked Councillors and Officers to feed into the reporting process to evaluate the impact of services so they could be targeted where needed.



- iv. A future workshop is proposed to get officer input on how to make services more efficient. Area Committee Chairs would also be consulted to get Councillor input.
- v. There were ways of measuring the impact of services. Information would be monitored and made available to Ward Councillors for use at Area Committees etc to decide how to target resources, hotspots for enforcement etc.
- vi. Area Committees would have the discretion to request when services would be made available as part of 'Ward Blitzes'.
- vii. Extra service capacity would enable Officers to target resources where needed, such as supporting recycling in areas of low take up.
- viii. Restorative justice would enable people to undertake community work instead of paying fines for offences. A range of powers would be available for Officers to use.

In response to Members' questions the Interim Head of Services, Streets and Open Spaces plus the Senior Operations Manager said the following:

- i. Officers were working with Keep Britain Tidy to address issues such as dog fouling in streets and open spaces.
- ii. An experiment to reduce dog fouling by putting up posters (with pictures of eyes and a caption saying "you are being watched") had some success. This experiment would be used at other locations across the city in future. This would be used together with other tools such as Dog Warden patrols and dog fouling bins that could be allocated to wards by Area Committees.

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.

### **14/47/Env Oral Report From the Executive Councillor and Proposals for 'Lead Councillors'**

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport gave a statement of his priorities:

- i. The Local Plan, the public examination of which had been delayed until November 2014.

- ii. Working with South Cambridgeshire District Council on shared planning functions and services.
- iii. The City Deal.
- iv. New neighbourhoods and growth areas.
- v. Improving planning enforcement to ensure building work matched applications and conditions.
- vi. Working with the County Council on transport and infrastructure growth, plus reducing congestion.
- vii. Councillor Martin Smart would be the Lead Councillor for Cycling. The purpose of the role is to:
  - Advise the Executive Councillor.
  - Lead on cycling-related projects including design for cyclists in new major planning applications and transport schemes.
  - Work with the City Council Cycling Officer plus County Council Cycling Champion on cycling matters.
  - Cycling would link into other portfolios such as health and transport.

### **14/48/Env 2013/14 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Planning and Climate Change Portfolio**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report presents a summary of the 2013/14 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for services within the Planning & Climate Change portfolio, compared to the final budget for the year.

It should be noted that outturn reports being presented in this Committee cycle reflect the reporting structures in place prior to the recent changes in Executive portfolios. In light of those changes (together with the requirement to report outturn on the basis of portfolios in place during 2013/14) members of this committee are asked to consider the proposals to carry forward budgets and make their views known to The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources, for consideration at Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee prior to his recommendations to Council.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport**

- i. Agreed the carry forward requests totalling £33,790 as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report, to be recommended to Council for approval.
- ii. Agreed to seek approval from Council to carry forward capital resources to fund rephased net capital spending of £484,000 from 2013/14 into 2014/15 and future years where relevant, as detailed in Appendix D.

**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).

In response to the report the Committee commented that Councillors would welcome briefings on financial programmes by Finance Officers.

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.

**14/49/Env Cambridge 20 mph Project - East Phase & Victoria Road****Matter for Decision**

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

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**Financial recommendations

- i. Approved commencement of the implementation of phase 2.
- ii. Approved implementation of Victoria Road work.
- iii. Approved consultation for phase 3 of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan.
  - o The total cost is estimated to be £222,200 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.
  - o There are no on-going revenue costs for the project.

### Procurement recommendations

- iv. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of:
- Phase 2 traffic order making process including street notices - £8000.
  - Implementation of Phase 2 (in line with the roads recommended for inclusion by East Area Committee on 10/04/14, see below, but limiting implementation on Cherry Hinton Road to section 1 at this stage) - £125,000
  - Commuted sum maintenance contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council for Phase 2 - £20,700
  - Implementation of Victoria Road (in line with the recommendation from North Area Committee on 08/05/14) - £8,500
  - Phase 2 post implementation automatic traffic count (ATC) monitoring - £4000
  - Phase 3 pre-consultation ATC monitoring - £8000
  - Phase 3 consultation and public engagement including exhibitions - £12,000

#### Subject to:

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

### Recommendations from East Area Committee

- v. Inclusion of all unclassified roads in the east phase area.
- vi. Inclusion of the following 'C' class roads:
- Cherry Hinton Road Section 1: Clifton Road to Perne Road.
  - Cherry Hinton Road Section 2: Perne Road to Walpole Road.
  - Remaining section of Mill Road.
  - Brookfields.
- vii. Exclusion of the following C class roads:
- Both sections of Coldham's Lane.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

## Scrutiny Considerations

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

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

- i. Welcomed the proposal to impose a 20 mph speed limit in appropriate areas.
- ii. Referred to Dr Morrison's comments in minute item 14/41/Env and said these reflected issues very well.
- iii. Suggested downgrading Victoria Road from an 'A' road if this would make it easier to impose a 20 mph limit.
- iv. The City Council wanted to send a strong message to the County Council regarding the need to change speed limits on certain roads, and enforce these.

Councillor Martin Smart expressed concern regarding going against County Council policy. The Project Delivery & Environment Manager said his report was based on County Officer feedback. County Officers would not be recommending imposing the 20 mph speed limit to County Councillors, who would make the final decision in public at the Highways and Community structure Committee. The County Council will review its 20 mph policy in future in light of national policy. The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport said the City Council was making recommendations for County Councillors to deliberate on, then make a decision based on the recommendations and the County Councils' ability to deliver.

Councillors requested a change to recommendation (i). Councillor Catherine Smart formally proposed to amend the following recommendation from the Officer's report by splitting the first bullet point into three:

*(Former text)* The Executive Councillor is asked to approve the commencement of the implementation of phase 2 and Victoria Rd and consultation for phase 3 of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan.

- The total cost is estimated to be £222,200 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.
- There are no on-going revenue costs for the project.

*(New text)* The Executive Councillor is asked to approve:

- i. The commencement of the implementation of phase 2.
- ii. Implementation of Victoria Road.

- iii. Consultation for phase 3 of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan.
  - The total cost is estimated to be £222,200 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.
  - There are no on-going revenue costs for the project.

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

At the request of the Committee the Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee endorsed (amended) recommendation (i) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed (amended) recommendation (ii) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed (amended) recommendation (iii) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (iv) unanimously.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (v), (vi) and (vii) unanimously.

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.

### **14/50/Env New Convention for Planning Committee Relating to Decisions Contrary to Officer Advice**

#### **Matter for Decision**

Planning Committee Members considered a report in January 2014 examining the council's performance with planning appeals and the recent appeal case relating to the redevelopment of 32 – 38 Station Road Cambridge.

The committee agreed a number of follow up actions including the holding of a facilitated member review session and the introduction of a new convention to be followed in the event that the committee is minded to refuse/approve major/significant planning applications against the advice of its officers. The review session was held on 14 April and was supported by external facilitators.

Planning Committee considered a further report in late April detailing how the new convention might be introduced and agreed by a majority that Environment Scrutiny Committee should be asked to look at this issue.

Environment Scrutiny Committee is asked to review the operation of the convention being proposed, to take account of the previous comments of Planning Committee and make a recommendation to Full Council that the convention is introduced.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

Recommended to Council:

- i. To approve an amendment to the constitution to include a new convention for the Planning Committee involving an adjourned decision making process for appropriate cases.
- ii. The convention process to be introduced for a 12 month trial period from September 2014. The convention to apply in the circumstances where the committee resolves that it is minded to refuse or approve major applications schemes contrary to the recommendation of its officers and be subject to the operational arrangements outlined in Appendix C.
- iii. To delegate to the Heads of Legal and Planning Services authority to amend the constitution to include the new convention, amend procedures, update guidance, provide training as necessary to ensure the smooth implementation of the new convention.
- iv. To request the Head of Planning Services to provide a review report to Environment Scrutiny Committee on cases where the convention has applied, after 12 months operation.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

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

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

- i. Suggested the wording of Appendix B paragraph 3.7 (P132) of the Officer's report should be reworded so that the Head of Planning Services would advise Chairs (or Vice Chairs in the Chair) to initiate the

- protocol if Councillors appeared to be minded to go against Officer recommendations.
- ii. Appendix C: References to “deferral” in the report should be changed to “adjourned” as proceedings would be put on hold then resumed from the same point at a future meeting, not restarted.
  - iii. Appendix C: Suggested that members of the public speak once, there was no need to hear their comments again when the committee reconvened after an adjournment, unless Council agreed a mechanism to allow public speakers to address the Planning Committee in exceptional circumstances.
  - iv. If the Planning Committee was quorate, it could consider applications. If a Member was not present when the application was first considered, they should not participate in the discussion/decision when a committee reconvened after an adjournment.

Officers undertook to revise text in the Officer’s report in light of the above comments; then include the amended text in the report to 24 July 2014 Council. The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport plus Environment Committee approved the above text changes nem con (recommendations in the Officer’s report were generally not affected; except (i) where “adjourned” replaced “deferred”).

In response to Members’ questions the Head of Planning Services said other local authorities generally allowed members of the public to address a planning committee once (on the same application). If the City Council were to give two opportunities, it would be a way of mitigating the risk of challenge to the process but would add to the time needed to consider planning applications. The protocol would have to operate with the same members taking the decision at the second meeting (i.e involving those who had heard the public speaking at the first meeting) to address this. There would be an opportunity for Councillors to review their decision after one year.

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.

### **14/51/Env Changes to the Consideration of Planning Applications at Area Committees**



**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report considered the issues inherent in moving to a single planning committee dealing with development management and enforcement decisions in the City, reverting to the way decisions were made prior to 2003. The report set out advantages and disadvantages of this change. A transition period would be necessary in the implementation of this change; 1 October 2014 was suggested as the start of any new arrangements. There should be a review of the issues arising with the operation of any new arrangement after 6 months.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

Recommended to Council:

- i. To rescind the delegation of powers to Area Committees to determine planning applications and enforcement matters set out in paragraph 11.3 of the terms of reference for Area Committees (section 11 of Part 3 of the Constitution) to come into effect from 1 October 2014.
- ii. To delegate responsibility for determining those applications and enforcement matters to the Planning Committee with effect from 1 October 2014.
- iii. To endorse the operating principles for the Planning Committee set out in paragraph 3.10 of the Officer's report and adopting the approach set out in option 1 of the report.
- iv. To delegate authority to the Heads of Corporate Strategy, Legal and Planning Services to make changes to the constitution, committee operating arrangements, publications, procedures and any other matters as necessary to secure the smooth implementation of this change, consulting with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Vice Chair and opposition spokes of Planning Committee as appropriate and necessary.

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

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

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

Liberal Democrat Councillors

- i. Took issue with details in the Officer's report, and the justification for it.
- ii. Were not in favour of the principle of changing consideration of planning applications from Area Committees to the Planning Committee.
- iii. Ward Councillors were best placed to consider domestic applications as they knew their local areas.
- iv. Councillors could act as advocates under the current Planning/Area Committee system.
- v. Suggested more councillors could attend evening than day time meetings.
- vi. Queried the impact of policy change on officer delegations.
- vii. Referred to the Labour press release on rejuvenating Area Committees and suggested this was not the best way.
- viii. Asked for a cost/benefit analysis of the proposal to change consideration of planning applications.

#### Labour Councillors

- i. Were in favour of the principle of changing consideration of planning applications from Area Committees to the Planning Committee.
- ii. Suggested councillors would prefer to consider planning application during business hours, and would make better decisions if applications were not considered late at night.
- iii. Queried if members of the public could be given guidance on how to present their case to committee (in a separate session) whilst Councillors were given training/briefings pre-10:00 am meeting start.
- iv. The intention was to replace Area Committee planning application sessions with ward specific community items.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 3 with 1 abstention to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation to adopt the approach set out in option 1 of the Officer's report.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

#### **14/52/Env A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme - Public Consultation Response**

#### **Matter for Decision**

As part of the proposals to improve the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon, the Highways Agency has recently undertaken preapplication consultation on the proposed improvement scheme.

Consultation started on 7 April and ended on 15 June 2014.

Due to the timescales of the consultation and gaps in some of the key information necessary to consider the Council's position on this scheme, the City Council has agreed with the Highways Agency that its response will be submitted as soon as practical after the close of consultation.

The Officer's report set out the background to the A14 improvements and outlined the details of the proposed scheme.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

- i. Agreed the Council's interim response to the Highways Agency consultation as set out in Appendix B of the Officer's report.
- ii. Agreed the Council's final response be submitted by the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Executive Councillor and Chair and Spokes of Environment Scrutiny Committee.
- iii. Agreed that, in the interests of expediency, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents, undertake appropriate negotiations and make further minor additions to the councils case at the examination of the A14 scheme if in the opinion of the Head of Planning Services it is appropriate and necessary to do so and to take such other necessary steps as are conducive or incidental to the presentation of the councils case at that examination. The exercise of this delegation to be reported back to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee at the end of the examination process.

### **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. She referred to paragraph 3.11 (P157) and said that a response was still pending from the Highways Agency.

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

- i. Councillors were unable to comment on the proposal without data from the Highways Agency. Suggested Officers seek this prior to drafting a response for consideration by Councillors.
- ii. Agreed the Council's final response should be submitted by the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Executive Councillor and Chair and Spokes of Environment Scrutiny Committee (as per the recommendation). Later report text only referred to consultation with the Chair and Executive Councillor.
- iii. The location of the crematorium was close to the highway, appropriate access and noise mitigation measures were required.
- iv. The A14 would benefit from investment/improvement.

In response to Members' request the WSP Consultant outlined the following summary of the A14 improvement scheme:

- i. It was hard to quantify the impact of the scheme on the city due to a lack of information from the Highways Agency.
- ii. Without information on the Highways Agency transport model it was difficult to evaluate:
  - Accuracy of the model.
  - The impact on some areas if others are congested.
  - Noise impact on the crematorium.
- iii. The current crematorium access from the A14 was not ideal.
- iv. Welcomed the new cycle scheme.

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.

### **14/53/Env Procurement of a Security Contract for the Car Parks and Mill Road Depot**

The Environment Scrutiny Committee resolved to exclude members of the public from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Matter for Decision**

Procurement of a Security Contract for the Car Parks and Mill Road Depot.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport**

Approved procurement of a Security Contract for the Car Parks and Mill Road Depot as per recommendations 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 Director of Environment.

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.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank

## CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL Officer Executive Decision - Record

### To rescind the Notice of Redundancy served on Pest Control operatives

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Decision(s) taken:</b>  | To rescind the Notice of Redundancy served on Pest Control operatives.   |
| <b>Decision of:</b>  | The Director of Environment, following consultation with the Leader, Leader of the Opposition, Opposition Spokesperson and Chief Executive.  |
| <b>Date of decision:</b>   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2014  |
| <b>Matter for Decision:</b>  | To rescind the Notice of Redundancy served on Pest Control operatives and to offer suitable alternative employment on their existing terms and conditions of employment (in effect their existing posts).  |
| <b>Any alternative options considered and rejected:</b>                        | None   |
| <b>Reason(s) for the decision including any background papers considered:</b>  | An urgent decision was necessary to withdraw the Notice of Redundancy served on operatives in advance of a meeting of the City Council on 12 June 2014 when a decision was expected to be taken on retaining the Pest Control Service with the City Council. The decision was urgent because a deadline within the Organisational Change Policy of the City Council was due to take effect on 3 June 2014 which could have had the impact of undermining the Council's ability to retain existing staff within the Pest Control Service. |
| <b>Conflicts of interest and dispensations granted by the Chief Executive:</b> | None.  |
| <b>Other Comments:</b>   | It was not possible to consult the Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee nor the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste Services as both these positions were vacant following recent elections.   |
| <b>Reference:</b>  | 14/URGENCY/ENV/01  |
| <b>Contact for further information:</b>  | Simon Payne, Director of Environment, 01223 458517   |

This page is intentionally left blank





To: The Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Report by: Andrew Limb, Head of Corporate Strategy

Relevant scrutiny committee: Environment 17/10/2014  
Scrutiny Committee

Wards affected: Abbey Arbury Castle Cherry Hinton Coleridge East Chesterton King's Hedges Market Newnham Petersfield Queen Edith's Romsey Trumpington West Chesterton

**GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME**  
**Not a Key Decision**

---

**1. Executive summary**

The purpose of this paper is to update 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.

This paper seeks 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.

**2. Recommendations**

The Executive Councillor is recommended:

- To listen to the views of committee members on the projects in the outline City Deal infrastructure programme.

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

**3. Background**

3.1 Since 1960, the Greater Cambridge area has been home to an ever-increasing cluster of technology, life sciences and services. The success to

date has been widely celebrated, but the potential for further economic growth is now threatened by a shortage of housing and significant transport congestion.

3.2 As a result of the research-led ecosystem and, crucially, an exceptional degree of connectivity in the cluster, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire now have one of the most dynamic and forward looking economies in the United Kingdom, and will lead economic growth in the wider economy. The growth in jobs and population that has helped fuel the economy is expected to continue if supply-side constraints in the local economy can be addressed. In the period between 2013 and 2031, some 44,000 jobs are expected to be created and around 33,000 new dwellings will be built in and around the city, including in the new town of Northstowe. Public examinations into draft local plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire are due start by the end of this year and adoption is anticipated to follow in 2015.

3.3 The transport network will need to support this growth and provide capacity to allow for the additional transport demands of new businesses, residents and workers. It must also help protect Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire's distinctive character, environment and quality of life. A transport strategy for the area has therefore been developed as a crucial counterpart to the Local Plans to ensure that these connections are made, that the planned growth is sustainable and that the essence of what makes the Cambridge area such a success can be maintained.

3.4 The Greater Cambridge City Deal that the three Councils, along with the University of Cambridge and the Local Enterprise Partnership, signed with Government in May this year is a key part of delivering the transport strategy and supporting the economic and housing growth. Up to £500m of new investment, subject to meeting certain triggers, will be made available to help deliver a radical change in the transport network of the area. It should be noted that this funding is in "nominal" terms, i.e. not adjusted for inflation, therefore will ultimately have less spending power than £500m.

## **THE VISION**

3.5 To achieve the growth that is planned in the Greater Cambridge area will require significant changes and enhancements to the transport system. With increasing employment and housing, the need for connectivity will increase and this is the key theme of the strategy. At the same time, the way that we travel will also need to change. For example, where capacity is a major issue, there will need to be less emphasis on the private car and more emphasis on public transport, cycling and walking.

3.6 These principles are embodied within the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The vision in the transport strategy is that more people will walk, cycle or use community or passenger transport as the more sustainable option when travelling. This will help to reduce car traffic and congestion on key routes and protect the area's distinctive character and environment while supporting continued growth of the area as an internationally important cluster for high tech industries and research and development.

3.7 There will be an extended network of dedicated passenger transport routes with fast and frequent links to and from key destinations. This will link up with community or local transport at hubs which will connect with some more rural parts of the area. An improved system of safe and direct cycle and walking routes will provide a viable alternative for journeys between key destinations. Information about sustainable travel options will be readily available and new technology will make this even easier to access. This enhanced accessibility will help to sustain and enhance the quality of life and well-being of residents.

3.8 Both the strategic and local road networks will operate efficiently and reliably, with most car traffic choosing to access the rural hubs or Park & Ride hubs. Accident clusters and congestion hotspots will be addressed and the impacts of congestion on the bus network will be reduced significantly. Although car trips to the city centre will still be possible, they will be channelled along routes away from buses and cyclists.

3.9 A frequent and reliable rail service with enhanced services and capacity to London, market towns and cities across the region will ensure that rail travel will continue to be a popular choice for a growing number of residents, commuters and visitors.

3.10 It is also expected that the need to access Cambridge at all will be much reduced through increased virtual working and better information to make informed choices. Through our investment in Connecting Cambridgeshire we are putting in place the digital infrastructure to allow people to work and carry out their business without having to travel so frequently.

3.11 To achieve this, a range of schemes such as the A14 improvement, the Addenbrooke's rail station, East West Rail and the Science Park rail station are planned and these will allow movement to and around Cambridge. Within Cambridge itself, it is expected that there will need to be further restrictions to travel within and on the ring road which in turn will free up movement on the radial routes. This, however, will increase journey reliability and increase capacity as more walking, cycling and public

transport use takes place with people having more choice as to how and where they travel.

3.12 The City Deal will help to achieve a part of this vision. This, however, represents only a part of the funding that will be needed to provide all of the changes that are required. Other funding will come from developers, the private sector, through the Enterprise Partnership and other government grants. In total, this funding will help to maintain economic growth in the area by allowing easy and reliable movement from homes to places of employment and in and between the major employment sites.

3.13 As an example of this strategy in practice, the combination of the Busway, improvements to the A14, capacity enhancements on the Cambridge to Kings Lynn rail line and the Science Park Station will fundamentally change access and the way that people travel to the north and east of Cambridge. It will open up the reach of Cambridge to a much larger pool of potential employees, providing economic benefits to the northern and eastern parts of the county and beyond. Journeys will be more reliable and there will be a wider range of travel modes to choose from and there will be a predominant use of public rather than private transport.

3.14 Changes of this nature require significant investment and whilst not to whole answer, the additional funding of up to £500m that will be made available through the City Deal will make a major contribution to this.

3.15 Drawn from the transport strategy, there are four key strands to proposed transport improvements through the City Deal.

- i. radial links to Cambridge such as the A10, A428 and A1307, principally connecting areas of population and growth sites with the City and its main employment locations;
- ii. orbital capacity around the City to distribute movement from wherever it originates to where it is destined;
- iii. links between key employment sites such as Science Parks to encourage agglomeration benefits by maintaining the connectivity that has been key to the Cambridge Phenomenon; and
- iv. improvements within the city centre.

3.16 Implementation of these measures as early as possible is desirable if the maximum benefit is to be secured. The City Deal is, however, a programme of at least 15 years and therefore, it will be necessary to identify priorities for early delivery, with other schemes being delivered over the remaining years, phased to support the growth delivery trajectories envisaged in the Local Plans.

## **DEVELOPING PRIORITY TRANSPORT SCHEMES**

3.17 As part of the City Deal the Greater Cambridge partners have committed to inform Government by the end of January 2015 of the programme for the first five years of the City Deal (i.e. 2015/16-2019/20). We have also committed to establish the governance framework by the end of 2014, which is subject of a report to the Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 October.

3.18 The starting point for this has been the long list of schemes that are drawn from the approved Transport Strategy and which has formed the basis of negotiation of the Deal with Government. This programme of transport infrastructure schemes was developed at the start of the discussions with Government around the City Deal, illustrating the type and scale of programme necessary to plug the strategic funding gap in the area and support ambitious growth plans and was drawn from the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was developed through joint working between the County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in support of the emerging Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans.

3.19 The overall programme of schemes has therefore been subject to considerable discussion and consultation. It is not, however, set in stone and will be subject to review throughout the City Deal period as circumstances change.

3.20 The programme has also been discussed with the Shadow City Deal Board over recent months as part of the development of the programme for the first five years of the Deal. This report seeks to inform members of the three councils how the work identifying the transport programme for the City Deal area is progressing and to seek views from Members on that work that can be considered as the final decisions on the programme are made.

3.21 Similar papers have been considered and are due to be considered at the following Member meetings:

- Joint Strategic Transport & Spatial Planning Group: 28 October
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet: 16 October
- Cambridgeshire County Council Economy and Environment Committee: 11 November

3.22 The final decision on the programme of investments is expected to be made by the City Deal Executive Board in January. This is of course subject to Members approving the establishment of the City Deal governance framework at Full Council.

3.23 It should be noted that the City Deal funding is supplementary to other existing and anticipated funding sources, and is not intended to replace sources such as developer contributions or Local Growth Fund in any way – indeed it is intended to address a strategic funding gap that we will be unable to fill without this additional funding.

### **Potential first five year programme**

3.24 In order to identify potential early deliverables and priorities, some high level technical assessment was undertaken earlier this year, with the support of a technical officer group comprising officers from the three Councils. This exercise was undertaken using the Department for Transport's Early Sifting and Assessment Tool (EAST), in line with the Assurance Framework that has been agreed with Government as part of the City Deal.

3.25 This exercise considered the programme and potential work packages at a high level in terms of their strategic, economic and financial cases, as well as deliverability, support for the early delivery of growth sites and connectivity between key destinations. The purpose was to develop a long list of schemes from the total proposed programme that could be subject to further assessment to inform the decision on the programme that will be made by the Executive Board in January.

3.26 The proposals that performed strongest in the EAST assessment in terms of being most deliverable in the first five years, delivering economic benefits and supporting the early growth sites are shaded in Table 1, below. The remainder of table 1 comprises the full list of schemes that has been submitted to Government as the City Deal programme. The estimated costs shown in Table 1 represent early estimates, which will be refined over time as more detailed information becomes available. It should be noted that the total package exceeds the £500m that could be available through the City Deal so there will need to be some prioritisation of schemes over the full Deal period, and other funding sources will be needed.

**Table 1 – City Deal programme and shortlisted schemes**

| <b>Programme area</b>                       | <b>Scheme</b>  | <b>Est. cost (£m)</b> |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| A428 corridor (Cambourne)                   | A428 to M11 segregated bus links   | 13.0                  |
|   | A428 corridor Park & Ride  | 11.5                  |
|   | Madingley Road bus priority  | 34.6                  |
|   | Bourn Airfield/Cambourne busway  | 28.8                  |
| A1307 corridor (Haverhill)                  | A1307 bus priority   | 36.0                  |
|   | Additional Park & Ride capacity – A1307  | 7.2                   |
| Pedestrian and cycle networks – City        | Chisholm Trail links (cycle links parallel to the railway line north of Cambridge station) | 3.0                   |
|   | Chisholm Trail bridge  | 4.5                   |
|   | City centre capacity improvements  | 7.2                   |
|   | Cross-city cycle improvements  | 15.5                  |
| Pedestrian and cycle networks – inter-urban | Bourn Airfield/Cambourne pedestrian/cycle route programme                                  | 8.4                   |
|   | Saffron Walden and Haverhill pedestrian/cycle route programme                              | 4.8                   |
|   | Cambridge to Royston cycle link  | 7.2                   |
|   | Waterbeach pedestrian/cycle route programme  | 14.4                  |
| Cambridge radials – Milton Road/Histon Road | Histon Road, Cambridge bus priority  | 4.3                   |
|   | Milton Road, Cambridge bus priority  | 23.0                  |
| Cambridge radials – Hills Road              | Project Cambridge, Hills Road  | 25.8                  |
| Cambridge radials – Newmarket Road          | Newmarket Road bus priority phase 1, Elizabeth Way to Abbey Stadium                        | 54.8                  |
|   | Newmarket Road bus priority phase 2, Abbey Stadium to Airport Way                          | 39.8                  |
|   | Newmarket Road bus priority phase 3, Airport Way Park & Ride                               | 17.3                  |
| A10 corridor south (Royston)                | Foxton level crossing and interchange  | 21.6                  |
|   | Hauxton Park & Ride  | 17.3                  |
|   | Hauxton-Trumpington busway   | 15.8                  |
| Cambridge Orbital                           | Ring road bus priority – Addenbrooke's to Newmarket Road                                   | 18.7                  |
|   | Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station busway                                    | 64.7                  |
|   | Western Orbital  | 23.0                  |

|                                 |   |              |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------|
| A10 corridor north (Waterbeach) | A10 dualling and junctions                    | 63.4         |
|                                 | A14/A10 Milton Interchange                    | 66.4         |
|                                 | Waterbeach Park & Ride                        | 11.5         |
|                                 | Waterbeach Barracks to North Cambridge busway | 46.1         |
|                                 | Waterbeach new station                        | 33.1         |
| <b>Total</b>                    |   | <b>752.7</b> |

3.27 The schemes highlighted in table 1 will link with key areas of development identified in the Local Plans but also provide greater accessibility to Cambridge from a wider area, for example Haverhill. They also need to be seen as part of the wider vision for how the transport network in the Greater Cambridge area will develop in the future are how they complement other schemes currently under way.

3.28 Specifically for the schemes highlighted in table 1, the intention is to form a spine of improved transport infrastructure linking the Science Park to the north of Cambridge with the Biomedical Campus in the south via improved orbital capacity, thus allowing easy movement between the two. Both clusters of employment will be provided with improved links to surrounding areas of population and growth areas. The City Deal can, however, only provide a part of the total required infrastructure and so these improvements need to be seen in the wider context of the Busway providing high quality links to the west including Northstowe where up to 10,000 houses are planned. The Busway is currently being extended to link into the Science Park Station that is expected to open in 2016.

3.29 Improving connectivity in this way will increase the potential for economic growth in the area and it is the achievement of increased economic growth that is one of the key triggers our area will be assessed against in order to unlock the full City Deal allocation.

3.30 The estimated cost of the schemes highlighted in Table 1 total £240m and so is greater than could be afforded in the first five years of the Deal – technical assessment on all of these schemes is therefore now underway to inform the final selection. It should be noted that the estimated costs shown in Table 1 should not be taken as final – as further details emerge about specific schemes these numbers will be revised to take into account the available information. This will focus particularly on the economic potential of the schemes, and will inform the Executive Board’s decision in January on the prioritised programme.

3.31 Detailed work on the remainder of the long-list will be undertaken in due course to inform future decisions around the overall City Deal programme, which will cover a 15-20 year period. This work, alongside the schemes that are currently being worked up but do not form part of the



years 1-5 programme, and any new schemes or projects emerging, will be considered for the years 6-10 and 11-15/20 programme.

3.32 While the combined officer recommendation will be to prioritise from the shaded list, the Executive Board Joint Committee may select schemes from the unshaded list, or other schemes if they believe those would deliver the City Deal objectives more effectively and increase likelihood of achieving the triggers to future funding.

### **Cambridge Access Study**

3.33 In addition to the work shown above, work is being undertaken on a Cambridge Access Study, for which a brief has been developed between the three Councils. This study will identify and develop a range of proposals for improvement capacity and access for Cambridge, improvement to the city centre, and innovative ways of managing the transport network. This is expected to inform the detail of some of the first phase projects, and may also bring forward ideas for further projects to improve the way people, goods and ideas move around Cambridge.

## **4. Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

There are no direct financial implications of the City Council from this report. The decisions that this report informs, to be taken by the new Greater Cambridge Executive Board joint committee in January (subject to the creation of that new joint committee being agreed in the three councils) will be to spend grant funding received from the Government rather than the Council's own funds.

£100m is expected to be available from 2015/16-2019/20 for investment in the infrastructure programme during that time – the availability of that funding is linked to the establishment of the proposed governance framework and the decision of a prioritised infrastructure programme for those years by the end of January 2015.

### **(b) Staffing Implications (if not covered in Consultations Section)**

No direct staffing implications. Officers from the three councils have worked on the draft programme, and will continue to do so.

### **(c) Equal Opportunities Implications**

An equalities impact assessment has not been carried out on the individual schemes to date. This is expected to happen closer to the point of final decisions on which schemes to prioritise.

The delivery of the investment programme would be expected to improve access to services and jobs for residents of Greater Cambridge.

#### (d) **Environmental Implications**

The different projects that are being considered may have different environmental implications. These will be considered as the details of the schemes are developed further.

#### (e) **Procurement**

This report does not commit to procurement. It is expected that the County Council will procure contracts to deliver the final set of projects once that is agreed.

#### (f) **Consultation and communication**

Public consultation and stakeholder engagement was carried out for the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, from which the long list is drawn, the consultation report for which is available online at the link shown under 'background documents' below.

All councillors from the three local authorities have been invited to joint member briefings on these proposals, scheduled to take place ahead of this committee meeting. Once the projects have been decided, there will be appropriate consultation ahead of implementation.

#### (g) **Community Safety**

No implications at this stage.

### **5. Background papers**

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

[Greater Cambridge City Deal](#)  
[Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.](#)

### **6. Appendices**

None.

### **7. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Andrew Limb  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 457004  
Author's Email: [andrew.limb@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.limb@cambridge.gov.uk)

## Cycleways Joint Capital Programme Examples:

## Appendix A

### Major Improvement Projects

**Riverside** improvement – roadspace re-allocation with environmental enhancement; securing improved access and routing for pedestrians and cyclists:



**The Tins path** – widened and resurfaced path with new bridge access from Brookfields:



**Downham's Lane** – widened and resurfaced path (planting to be completed Autumn 2014):



**Perne Road/Radegund Road roundabout** – junction narrowing to improve cycle safety both on and off-carriageway:



**Jesus Green path** – widened and resurfaced path with new lighting and Wi-Fi apparatus (still to be installed)



### Minor Improvement Projects

**No Entry exemptions** – many restricted streets opened up for two way cycling:



**Access improvements** – removal of barriers to improve access for all types of cycles:



**New, wider cattle grids** have been installed across open spaces to allow access by those with cargo bikes and trailers. Other minor schemes have included removal of barriers and dropped kerbs.

**Signage improvements** across the city:



This page is intentionally left blank



To: Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Kevin Blencowe  
Report by: Head of Planning Services  
Relevant scrutiny committee: Environment 17/10/14 Scrutiny Committee  
Wards affected: All

## **UPDATE ON PRO-ACTIVE CONSERVATION WORK Non-Key Decision**

### **1. Executive summary**

1.1 This report reviews the work that has been completed as part of the Council's pro-active conservation work programme since the last report to committee in March 2013. The purpose of the report is to update members on the work that has been completed, what is outstanding, and what is proposed. The report also notes the spend to date on the programme as well as seeks a steer from the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy on a request to designate Barrow Road a conservation area.

### **2. Recommendations**

2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended:

- a) To agree the pro-active conservation programme as set out in Appendix 1.
- b) To agree that existing commitments in the Council's Pro-Active Work Programme as set out in this report should have priority at this time.
- c) To note 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 report.

### **3. Background**

3.1 Beside the Conservation team's day to day work on Planning and Listed Building applications and involvement in pre-application

consultation, for the past several years a series of projects have been completed under the pro-active conservation work programme including reviews of several Conservation Areas and their boundaries, and various Suburbs and Approaches Studies. The following report details the work completed, the work being undertaken during 2014-15 and future work to follow. The information is presented in a table for ease of reference and is attached as Appendix 1.

- 3.2 Apart from the programme detailed in this report, the Conservation team undertakes a considerable amount of support to the Planning Service in the review of a wider variety of planning applications. The team provided consultation responses on 911 applications in the period between August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013, and September 31<sup>st</sup>, 2014, including 562 full Planning applications; 105 Listed Building applications; 31 formal pre-applications; 56 advertisement applications; and 148 discharge of condition applications. It is also providing advice on a number of substantial development schemes at pre-application prior to formal applications.
- 3.3 The original pro-active conservation work programme was set up in 2008-9. A look back at work completed since reveals the following achievements so far:
  - Completion of thirteen Conservation Area Appraisals (either updates or new documents), including appraisals for Trumpington, Mill Road and St. Matthews (now “Mill Road”), Storey’s Way, Conduit Head Road, Chesterton and Ferry Lane, West Cambridge, New Town and Glisson Road, Castle and Victoria, Riverside and Stourbridge Common, Brooklands Avenue (now includes Accordia), Newnham Croft, Southacre, and The Kite.
  - Completion of seven Suburbs and Approaches Studies, Huntington Road, Madingley Road, Barton Road, Newmarket Road, Long Road, Hills Road and Trumpington Road
  - Implementation of Article 4 Directions applying to public houses outside conservation areas and to the Accordia estate.
- 3.4 The project work for 2014-15 is focussing on updating the existing Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisals (most notably the largest of those being the Core Area Appraisal) and on document storage, including improvement of conservation information databases in digital format and related data collection. Supporting the Local Plan review will remain a high priority including Conservation Officer attendance at the examination of the Plan as required.



- 3.5 The available remaining budget to fund outstanding work currently stands at £13,756.41. There is a separate budget for historic wall painting signage restoration with an outstanding balance of £12,620.00. The outstanding and planned project work (separate from wall painting signage) is expected to cost £12,710, which provides for a small amount for statutory advertising costs or contingency within the available budget. The estimated costs of this work is set out in Appendix 1. Much of the originally programmed still outstanding work should be completed in 2015/16, after which time the original budget agreed in 2008-9 will have been spent and any future pro-active conservation work will need to be undertaken by the existing resources available in the Urban Design and Conservation Team.
- 3.6 There has been limited success to date in the restoration of historic wall painting signage, notwithstanding officers have contacted a number of building owners in the past year. Some building owners are reluctant to have such improvements fearing the improvements will limit their ability to make further changes. The next “tranche” of investigations is set out in Appendix 1.
- 3.7 Some flexibility may be necessary from time to time in respect of the final budget amounts allocated to individual projects, and so may require re-allocation of monies across projects. If this is required, officers will ensure the Executive Councillor is in agreement with doing so first, and minor variations in budget expenditure within the overall budget envelope will not normally be reported to Environment Scrutiny Committee.
- 3.8 In March of this year officers received a request to designate Barrow Road as a new conservation area. This request is considered in detail in Appendix 1. It should be noted that while many houses on Barrow Road exhibit architectural merit, surrounding streets are not as consistent in regards to their coherence of architecture. In balancing the request for a designation of Barrow Road, it must be noted that the 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, as requested by the Executive Councillor at the committee meeting in January of this year. This also needs to be balanced against the limited available budget to undertake already committed pro-active conservation work as well as the significant workload of almost 1,000 annual planning application responses prepared by the equivalent of three full-time conservation officers.

## **4. Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

Funding has been earmarked from the existing Pro-active Conservation Programme budget as noted.

### **(b) Staffing Implications**

Officers in the Urban Design and Conservation Team are leading the work. The Conservation section was reduced to a total of 3 full-time equivalents (FTE) as of the end of July 2014. Together with the very high number of requests for application comments which is driven by planning application submissions and pre-application enquiries, there is limited capacity for undertaking pro-active conservation work. Resources must therefore be targeted to matters of greatest heritage importance.

### **(c) Equalities and Poverty Implications**

There are no direct equality or diversity implications.

### **(d) Environmental Implications**

The environmental implications of the programme are considered to be positive as it supports the quality and continuity of the city's historic environment which contribute to economic success, quality of life and place in Cambridge to the benefit of residents, business and tourism alike.

### **(e) Procurement**

Specialist consultants have been procured to undertake some of the Conservation Area Appraisal work, and the budget accounts for this cost.

### **(f) Consultation and communication**

Consultation with residents and stakeholders is a key part of the Pro-active Conservation Programme. This relates in particular to the review of Conservation Area Appraisals. Officers consult on draft appraisals for example and inform those whose property will be impacted by a new Conservation Area designation and invite comment in reply. Relevant ward members are kept informed as and when area-based projects are undertaken and consulted upon.

(g) **Community Safety**

There are no direct community safety implications.

**5. Background papers**

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Report on 2013-14 Pro-active Conservation Programme

**6. Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Pro-active conservation work completed in 2013-14 and work currently being undertaken and planned.

**7. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

|                        |                                  |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Author's Name:         | Glen Richardson                  |
| Author's Phone Number: | X7374                            |
| Author's Email:        | Glen.Richardson@cambridge.gov.uk |

**Appendix 1 – Pro-active conservation work completed in 2013-14 and work currently being completed and planned**

| Project  | Progress to date  | Estimated Cost                                   |
|--|---|--|
| Local Plan Review  | The Urban Design & Conservation Team has been contributing to this work at all stages to date e.g. Issues and Options report, drafting of policies, and site specific assessments, and will continue to support the process at examination.   | Officer time                                     |
| Review of Roof Extensions Design Guide (guidance is related to Policy 3/14 in the 2006 Local Plan) | A draft policy on roof extensions comprises Policy 58 (d) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 draft submission and the Roof Extensions Design Guide is now included as Appendix E.   | Officer time                                     |
| Shopfront Design Guide – review (referred to in Policy 3/15 of the 2006 Local Plan)                | Policy on roof extensions comprises Policy 64 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 draft submission and the Shopfront Design Guide is now included as Appendix H.   | Officer time                                     |
| Improved use Information Technology (IT) for Cataloguing Listed Building information               | <p>The English Heritage data set of listed buildings in Cambridge has now been reconciled with the Council’s GIS data base, providing more accurate, up to date information on these heritage assets within the city.</p> <p>Work has started on digitising a large number of historic photos to be available for reference regarding changes to historic buildings and places in the city.</p> <p>The use of a Listed Buildings module within the Uniform system to make heritage assets information more accessible is being implemented. It will include hyperlinks to the List descriptions and may be developed for access to the historic photos.</p> | <p>c.£500</p> <p>c.£500</p>                      |
| Buildings of Local Interest (BLIs) (Policy 4/12 / Draft Policy 62 & Appendix G)                    | The mapping and database for the existing list have now been reconciled so that they appear as planning “constraints” consistently. Resulting from this exercise, a set of minor amendments to the list of BLI’s (eg. to address details) is pending. Additionally, a number of additions to the list via for instance, recommendations in the Conservation Area Appraisals, require consideration. This is intended to be undertaken in 2015.  | Officer time and £2000 for a temporary contract. |
| Historic core public realm   | This work relates to policy as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Draft   | Officer time                                     |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| audit & project definition              | Submission. Policy 9 (The City Centre) requires the preparation of City Centre Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Discussions have already started with Cambridgeshire County Council on the scoping of this work and will be progressed in detail in 2015-16. The SPD will help support the City Deal projects in and around the historic core to be progressed with partners.   | and funding from others sources, including City Deal   |
| Conservation Area reviews (Policy 4/11) | <p>Three appraisals were updated and approved in 2013, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brooklands Avenue (2002)</li> <li>2. Newnham Croft (1999)</li> <li>3. Southacre (2000)</li> </ol> <p>The Kite Conservation Area Appraisal was approved earlier in 2014 following re-consultation on, and omission of, a suggested boundary change at East Road.</p> <p>The Historic Core Area Appraisal (2006) is currently being reviewed and updated by officers with the support of a heritage consultant. The draft document is intended to be consulted on in 2015.</p> <p>For information, the following represents all other Conservation Area Appraisals and their dates of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic Core (2006)</li> <li>Storeys Way (2007)</li> <li>De Freville Avenue (2009)</li> <li>Chesterton and Ferry Lane (2009)</li> <li>Conduit Head Road (2009)</li> <li>Trumpington (2010)</li> <li>Mill Road (2011)</li> <li>West Cambridge (2011)</li> <li>Castle and Victoria (2012)</li> <li>Riverside and Stourbridge (2012)</li> <li>New Town and Glisson Road (2012)</li> <li>Brooklands Avenue (2013)</li> <li>Newnham Croft (2013)</li> </ul> | <p>Consultant fees paid and appraisals complete</p> <p>Paid &amp; complete</p> <p>£4,210 remaining to pay consultant</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>Southacre (2013)<br/>The Kite (2014)</p> <p>On completion of the Historic Core appraisal and boundary rationalisation, the next tranche of Appraisal reviews on the basis of government guidance that appraisals should be kept up to date and not be more than five years old, would start with Storeys Way. Given limited resources, this work would constitute rapid updates to represent any significant changes rather than being in-depth reviews.</p>   | <p>Cost: Officer time</p>   |
| <p>Conservation area approved boundary changes.</p>            | <p>Boundary Rationalisation. A priority is to rationalise the boundaries of the Historic Core Conservation Area to reflect the minor changes already approved to boundaries in the reviews of adjoining conservation areas (eg at Brooklands Avenue Conservation Area, at Newnham Croft Conservation Area and at West Cambridge Conservation Area). To do so requires the boundary changes to be collated and advertised. Target date during 2015.</p>  | <p>Officer time + cost of statutory advertisements</p>                |
| <p>Sub-division of the Central Core Conservation Area.</p>     | <p>Additionally, as the Central Conservation Area has been extended over the years, and several large extensions have been appraised individually (such as the Mill Road area and Riverside &amp; Stourbridge Common), the boundaries of the “central” area have become difficult to understand. It has therefore been intended that the various appraisal areas should be designated as conservation areas in their own right as distinct from the historic core central conservation area. This will require precise checking of mapping and careful drafting of the statutory advertisements required. It will result in separate conservation areas for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mill Road area</li> <li>Riverside &amp; Stourbridge Common</li> <li>Castle &amp; Victoria Road</li> <li>New Town &amp; Glisson Road</li> </ul> <p>Target date 2015.</p> | <p>Temporary resource @ £1,000 + cost of statutory advertisements</p> |
| <p>Barrow Road – Request for conservation area designation</p> | <p>In March 2014 the then Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport received a request from residents of Barrow Road asking the Council to consider the designation of Barrow Road as a Conservation Area. By letter of the 26<sup>th</sup> of March the Executive Councillor responded to residents by stating that officers would</p>   | <p>Anticipated cost of consultant to carry out draft</p>              |

Page 8 of 11

undertake an initial investigation of the potential for such a designation in the summer of 2014 and thereafter seek a steer from the Executive Councillor whether or not to proceed with formal designation. One of the chief concerns of residents was that without the road being designated as a Conservation Area, houses are vulnerable to demolition without the benefit of planning permission (demolition of buildings in a Conservation Area must be approved via planning permission granted by the Council but those outside do not require planning permission). In the case of 14 Barrow Road the owner sought and gained permission for a replacement dwelling but did not require planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling.

Officers have undertaken a brief review of the potential for such designation against established guidance. Areas may be designated a Conservation Area if they have attributes of either architectural or historic significance. The review also considered potential designation of Bentley Road and Newton Road as part of a new Conservation Area.

Barrow Road does have relevant attributes such as cohesion of architectural treatment based on Arts and Crafts features and a notable street layout incorporating mature trees and gas lighting adding to the quality of the character of buildings and the public realm. These attributes, however, do not on their own infer that the Council must designate the area as a Conservation Area as such a designation needs to be considered within the context of the wider city and the relative quality of buildings and their settings both inside and outside existing Conservation Areas. Consideration could be given to whether Barrow Road alone could constitute a meaningful conservation area and whether parts of the adjoining area are of the necessary special architectural or historic interest to make a conservation area viable together with Barrow Road. The close at the south eastern extremity of Barrow Road does not share the attributes referred to above with the greater part of the road – in particular, the houses are much later. Similarly, Porson Road to the south, is not sufficiently consistent with Barrow Road to form part of a conservation area with it. Part of the northern side of Bentley Road does not share the characteristics of Barrow Road. Newton Road has houses of a similar period.

appraisal is £2000 (funding would have to be reallocated from other work set out in this appendix).

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>The houses of Barrow Road, and to an extent Bentley Road immediately north, do however have some group value in terms of their character and quality given that most are relatively unaltered and include original features.</p> <p>On the basis of this brief review of Barrow Road and surrounding streets, any conservation area in this location would be limited in extent, and possibly then only to Barrow Road.</p> <p>As noted earlier in this report, there are existing commitments and priorities for the Council's Conservation Team as set out in this report that mean that undertaking a detailed study and designation of Barrow Road is not necessarily a priority and that committed work needs to be progressed first.</p>  |  |
| <p>Article 4 Directions</p> <p>Page 56</p> | <p>Two reports were tabled at the January 2014 Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting, one proposing Article 4 Directions for most Public Houses outside conservation areas to prohibit demolition and one to cover key architectural characteristics of dwellings on the Accordia Estate on Brooklands Avenue. Both reports were agreed by the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change. Article 4 Directions have now been served, consultation taken place, and the Directions confirmed and advertised.</p> <p>BLI Article 4 – at the meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 14 January 2014 the following resolution was agreed:</p> <p><i>“...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 &amp; Climate Change and Environment Scrutiny Chair and Spokes”.</i></p> <p>The more vulnerable Buildings of Local Interest are considered to be those outside conservation areas (ie those not subject to control of demolition) and particularly</p> | <p>Complete.</p> <p>£2,500 expected consultant costs and advert costs + officer time</p> |



|                                      |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                      | <p>houses on large plots on the city approaches and former institutional buildings. The initial tranche of these buildings will be proposed for detailed consideration in late 2015, following a review of the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Conservation Area Article 4 – at the meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee on June 11, 2013, the following resolution was agreed:</p> <p><i>That the City Council Conservation team's Pro-active Conservation programme include a phased programme (one per year starting post 2013/14) of introducing focussed Article 4 Directions for Conservation Areas where adopted appraisals have evidenced harm to these area's character or appearance or where specific requests are brought to the attention of the Executive Councillor for Planning &amp; Climate Change.</i></p> <p>The proposed initial programme will focus on the following areas in the years noted:</p> <p>Mill Road (residential areas) 2015/16<br/>Riverside &amp; Stourbridge Common 2016/17<br/>Castle &amp; Victoria Road 2017/18</p> | <p>£2,000<br/>expected<br/>consultant<br/>costs and<br/>advert cost +<br/>officer time</p>                                      |
| Wall Painting<br>Signage/Advertising | <p>A report was taken to the 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 Environment Scrutiny Committee and the Executive Councillor agreed to continue with a pilot project of selected locations. One pilot project has now been completed e.g. on Green Street above the rear of the current TKMax store. However several building owners approached in 2013 did not wish such signage to be renewed, therefore officers are pursuing the next priority locations. Officers have contacted three other owners of possible sites (67a Norfolk Street; 36 Sidney Street; and at The Eagle, Bene't Street) and are awaiting responses. Cllr Herbert has had a meeting regarding 105 Cherry Hinton Road.</p>  | <p>Balance<br/>currently<br/>£12,620<br/>(As an<br/>example,<br/>signage on<br/>Green Street<br/>cost £2,372<br/>excl. VAT)</p> |

This page is intentionally left blank