

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

17 January 2017

5.30 - 7.15 pm

Present: Councillors Sargeant (in the Chair), Adey, Bick, Ratcliffe and Smart

Executive Councillors: Roberts (Executive Councilor for Environmental Services and City Centre) and Blencowe (Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport)

Officers:

Strategic Director: David Edwards

Head of Commercial Services: James Elms

Commercial Operations Manager: Sean Cleary

Fleet Manager: David Cox

Principal Accountant (Services): Chris Humphris

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Others Present:

Councillor Gillespie

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/1/Env Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Gehring, Gawthrop and Perry.

Councillors Adey and Smart were present as alternates.

The Committee Manager took the Chair whilst the Environment Scrutiny Committee elected a Chair for the meeting.

Councillor Ratcliffe proposed, and Councillor Smart seconded, the nomination of Councillor Sargeant as Chair.

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) that Councillor Sargeant be Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Councillor Sargeant assumed the Chair from the Committee Manager at this point.

17/2/Env Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

17/3/Env Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

There were no minutes from the 4 October 2016 meeting as this was cancelled.

17/4/Env Public Questions

There were no public questions.

17/5/Env Decision Taken by Executive Councillor

17/5/Env Environmental and Cycling Improvements – Water Street & Fen Road

The decision was noted.

17/6/Env Planning, Policy and Transport Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2017/18 to 2021/22

Matter for Decision

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the Planning Policy and Transport portfolio that were included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Review of Charges:

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

Revenue:

- ii. Noted the revenue budget proposals as shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Capital:

- iii. Noted the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Principal Accountant (Services).

The Commercial Operations Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Organisations representing retailers in the Grand Arcade and Grafton Centre had responded to the fees and charges consultation (P29 agenda pack). This could be noted in the next iteration of documents to clarify who had responded.
- ii. Consultation responses had been invited from:
 - a. Contacts on database of retailers.
 - b. The public via press adverts.
 - c. Internal communication contacts.

The Head of Commercial Services said it was a public consultation of residents and businesses.

- iii. Undertook to clarify after the meeting if city centre churches had been approached in the consultation.
- iv. The rationale to change parking fees and charges was to encourage a modal shift from private cars to walking and public transport. Fees could be raised on Sunday plus reduced on Monday and Tuesday to manage demand and even it out over the week (if changes were implemented). Retail demand varied over days of the week; peak demand was Wednesday to Friday, lowest demand levels were Monday and Tuesday. It was hoped that changes to fees/charges would encourage people to use parking more evenly over the week, not just at times of peak demand (with associated troughs).

The Principal Accountant (Services) said the budget assumption was to increase fees and charges by 2%. After that changes were based on individual judgement.

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

The Committee endorsed recommendation (i) by 3 votes to 2.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (ii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (iii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/7/Env Grand Arcade Deck Coating and Drainage Repairs/Replacement

Matter for Decision

The Executive Councillor was asked to approve a project to procure and award a contract, subject to budget approval, to replace the worn deck coating on the outside exposed parking decks and review and upgrade the drainage system at the Grand Arcade car park.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- i. Approved carrying out the procurement and contract award for a project to review and upgrade the drainage system and replace the worn deck coating at the Grand Arcade car parks.
 - a. Drainage system improvements and new deck coating work to be funded as part of an overall capital bid of £1.6 million; to meet these and other proposed works at the multi storey car parks in 2017/18.
 - b. Subject to: If the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract value by more than 10% then the permission of the Executive Councillor and Strategic Director would be sought prior to proceeding.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Commercial Operations Manager. Work would be undertaken in Summer 2017.

The Commercial Operations Manager updated his report by correcting a typographical error on P33. The figure should be £1.6m not “capital bid of £1.4 million”.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/8/Env Grand Arcade and Queen Anne Terrace Car Parks Sprinkler System Replacement**Matter for Decision**

The Executive Councillor was asked to approve a project to procure and award a contract, subject to budget approval, to replace the sprinkler systems located in the underground levels of the Grand Arcade annex and the basement of the Queen Anne Terrace car park.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Approved carrying out the procurement and contract award for a project to replace the sprinkler systems in the underground parking levels at the Grand Arcade and Queen Anne Terrace car parks. Funding for these works as part of an overall capital bid of £1.4 million. So as to meet these and other proposed works at the multi storey car parks in 2017/18.

- Subject to: If the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract value by more than 10% then the permission of the Executive Councillor and Strategic Director will be sought prior to proceeding.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Commercial Operations Manager.

The Commercial Operations Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The sprinkler system needed to be replaced now for the car park to continue to be fully operational. If work was not undertaken the basement would have to be closed due to fire risk.
- ii. There were frequent intermittent instances when different parts of the sprinkler system were inoperative. This increased costs, so investment funding was needed to protect the Council's reputation and income stream.
- iii. Car park usage would be reviewed after 2019 for maintenance planning reasons.
- iv. The proposed replacement system would be 'dry', the old one was water based and so more affected by cold weather (freezing). A key contract requirement was to have a more freeze/thaw resistant system than the present one.

The Committee endorsed the recommendation by 3 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/9/Env Environmental Services and City Centre Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals for 2017/18 to 2021/22**Matter for Decision**

The report detailed the budget proposals relating to the Environmental Services and City Centre portfolio that were included in the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

Review of Charges:

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

Revenue:

- ii. Noted the revenue budget proposals as shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Capital:

- iii. Noted the capital budget proposals as shown in Appendix C of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Principal Accountant (Services).

Councillor Gillespie addressed the Committee as a non-voting attendee, to make the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Welcomed the bid for electric charging points.
- ii. Expressed concern regarding charges imposed on market traders for stall hire. Referred to discussions at Community Services Scrutiny Committee in 2016 and concerns raised by stall holders who did not understand the need for fee increases.
- iii. Expressed specific concerns regarding:
 - a. Fee increases were unfair.
 - b. Rubbish left over night in the market square by passers-by and impact on stall holders.
 - c. The number of empty stalls and impact on City Council income from fees.
 - d. Practicability of a night market if the day one had issues.
- iv. The 2016 fee restructure made more desirable stalls cost more.
- v. Asked the Executive Councillor to liaise with stall holders in person.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre responded:

- i. The City Centre Manager - Markets & Street Trading Development had contacted 204 stall holders. Only 3 of these responded, and they raised issues as per Councillor Gillespie's.

- ii. The intention was to level out fees, so not all stallholders would be affected.
- iii. Responses to specific concerns:
 - a. The market was not a statutory council function.
 - b. 70% of £30,000 funding allocated to the market was allocated for cleaning. 30% was for re-investing on the market eg preventing grease from food stalls affecting others.
 - c. Recategorisation of market fees did not affect the majority of Monday – Saturday stall holders. The aim was to align Sunday premium stall fees with other days of the week.
 - d. The proposals equalled out fees across different markets so they were all consistent.

Opposition Councillors made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Took issue with the need to increase fee/charges.
- ii. Queried why the universal 2% increase in council charges had not been included in the Officer's report.
- iii. Asked for consultation details to help scrutinise the report (as per requests on other reports earlier in the meeting).
- iv. Queried the number of empty stalls on the market.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre responded:

- i. People were able to contact the City Centre Manager - Markets & Street Trading Development with any questions or comments.
- ii. Would note there were good practice ways to contact people such as a regular forum with stakeholders.
- iii. The market continued to be viable, footfall had increased over the last 2 years.
- iv. It was the City Centre Manager - Markets & Street Trading Development's responsibility to balance the range of stalls. There were a high number of applications and he sometimes turned away some applicants if there were too many of one type.
- v. Undertook to follow up issues raised post meeting.

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

The Committee endorsed recommendation (i) by 3 votes to 2.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (ii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Committee endorsed recommendation (iii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/10/Env Fleet Replacements 2017/18

Matter for Decision

Capital projects with a value of greater than £300,000 required Executive Councillor approval before further consideration for funding as part of the Budget Setting Report (BSR).

This project related to the Fleet replacements 2017/18.

The Capital Programme Board have reviewed this project and consider it properly planned and ready for implementation, subject to Executive Councillor and funding approval.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

- i. Approved the Fleet Replacements 2017/18 project, as detailed in the attached appendices, which has been properly planned and ready for implementation.
- ii. Delegated to the Director of Commercial Services to call-off and award a specific contract or specific contracts from appropriate framework agreements of The Procurement Partnership Limited (TPPL), Crown Commercial Service (CCS) or Eastern Shires Purchasing Organization (ESPO) for the purchase of vehicles as set out in the Project Control Document.

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 Fleet Manager.

Councillor Bick made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The availability, functionality and cost of vehicles would determine the choice of vehicle selected.
- ii. Agreed with the details of the report, but the vehicle selection decision was of sufficient importance to require public scrutiny. He proposed to make an amendment to the Officer's recommendation requiring this.

The Fleet Manager said the following in response to Councillor Bick's questions:

- i. It was hard to get data on electric vehicles as they were new to the market.
- ii. Changing the criteria would impact on the number of vehicles required and so affect costs.
- iii. Joint procurement by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council would be undertaken between April 2017 and March 2018. The City Council were interested in a mix of electric and non-electric vehicles. SCDC were interested in non-electric vehicles.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre responded:

- i. The number of electric vehicles in the fleet had increased from 0 to 9 over the last 3 years.
- ii. The City Council was on the cusp of turning a corner in comparison with other authorities as it proposed to implement charging points.
- iii. Electric vehicles would be used where appropriate, along with non-electric ones.
- iv. How many vehicles to use and where to generate savings were under consideration.
- v. Suggested that general details about vehicle selection criteria and other background information could be brought to the next committee (March proposed).
- vi. The fleet would be reviewed each year regarding carrying capacity and running costs.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Bick formally proposed to add the following recommendations from the Officer's report:

- New (2): To request a report via this committee, seeking the Executive Councillor's approval of the criteria against which vehicles will either be electric or otherwise, together with a reasoned recommendation following

the application of these criteria to each of the vehicles to be replaced, such to occur prior to procurement taking place.

The additional recommendation was lost by 3 votes to 2.

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 7.15 pm

CHAIR