



Cambridge City Council
Environment Scrutiny Committee

Date: Tuesday, 3 October 2017

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457013

Agenda

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 Minutes (Pages 3 - 18)
- 4 Public Questions

Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

- 5 Procurement of a Security Contract for the Car Parks (Pages 19 - 32) and Mill/Cowley Road Depot

The report contains exempt information during which the public is likely to be excluded from the meeting subject to determination by the Scrutiny Committee following consideration of a public interest test. This exclusion would be made under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

- 6 Cycleways Capital Programme (Pages 33 - 52)
- 7 Withdrawal of Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (Pages 53 - 58)

Environment Scrutiny Committee Members: Gawthrope (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Bick, Ratcliffe, Sargeant, Sheil and Tunnacliffe

Alternates: Abbott, Adey and Sinnott

Executive Councillor: Blencowe (Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport)

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457013

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

27 June 2017

5.30 - 7.45 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrop (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Bick, Ratcliffe, Sargeant, Sheil, Tunnacliffe and Blencowe (Executive Councillor)

Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste: R Moore

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Kevin Blencowe

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne McBride

Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service: Jane Hunt

Team Manager (Commercial & Licensing): Karen O'Conner

Principal Accountant (Services): Chris Humphris

Parking Services, Commercial Operations Manager: Sean Cleary

Principal Conservation and Design Officer: Christian Brady

Senior Conservation & Design Officer: Susan Smith

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

Others present:

Councillor Robert

Councillor O'Connell

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**17/13/Env Apologies**

No apologies were received.

17/14/Env Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Ratcliffe	17/24/ENV	Personal: Council representative to the River Cam Conservators
Councillor Tunnacliffe	17/24/ENV	Personal: Council representative to the River Cam Conservators

17/15/Env Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 January and 25 May 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/16/Env Public Questions

There were no public questions.

17/17/Env Decision Taken by Executive Councillor**17/17/Env** Planning Application Fees-The Government's Offer

The Committee noted the decision of the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport taken on 10 March 2017 regarding Planning Application Fees.

17/18/Env Business Regulation Plan 2017/18 and Out-Turn Report**Matter for Decision**

To consider the Business Regulation Plan 2017/18

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Approved the Executive Summary of the Business Regulation Plan 2016-17, and by implication the full 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 Team Manager (Commercial & Licensing).

The report outlined Cambridge City Council's responsibilities for enforcing food hygiene and health and safety enforcement in its area, and was required to produce an annual plan clarifying how this would be achieved. The Business Regulation Plan needed to clearly define the objectives permitting the Council

to fulfil its responsibilities for the year, and confirm that it had committed sufficient resources to facilitate this work.

There was no debate on the item.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

None were declared.

17/19/Env Annual Report on Single Shared Waste Service (SSWS)

Matter for Decision

To note the shared waste draft annual report 2016/17.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

Noted the 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 Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service which provided a background to the creation of the service in 2014 and how had it had since developed.

The Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service acknowledged there were crews who were on different terms and conditions. It had been said that the terms and conditions of South Cambridgeshire District Council had more advantages for staff and City Council were welcome to transfer over.

The Committee and the Executive Councillor noted the report.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/20/Env Shared Waste Service ABCD (Alternative Bin Collection Day) initial project review

Matter for Decision

To consider the shared waste draft annual report 2016/17 and to present further analysis to the Shared Waste Board in three months.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

- i. Agreed to present further analysis to the Waste Board in three months, (costs, wider lessons learnt feedback, webaspex modelling review results, summary of complaints and commendations).
- ii. Agreed that the learning points below, which represent a selection of those logged to date, are adopted or avoided in future change projects.

Adopt:

- Varied and bespoke approaches to resident communications –this worked very well.
- Standardised project management approach from the start.
- Alternative approaches to crew consultation – maps were not suitable for all. Take more crew members off rounds to support the work.
- ‘Walk through’ week 1 to pre-empt some of the logistical issues that could have been foreseen.
- Wider stakeholder group eg housing, colleges, which may have picked up flats issues and challenged our assumptions.
- Involve a 3CICT and Northgate rep from the start.
- We took on extra resources to support changes; we supported our crews and residents this way and would do it again.

Avoid:

- Testing the current software integration now (not possible before go-live but not ideal afterwards).
- Doing day changes before software changes (necessary as these may not happen for another year, but not ideal).
- Missing the learning loop on missed individual bins; involve the regular crews from the start.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Chair of Committee advised that he had given permission to Councillors Roberts and O' Connell to take part in the discussion on this item.

The Committee received a report from the Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service which outlined the harmonisation of domestic bin rounds to ensure they were efficient and would help to achieve savings of £700k over three years. The collection arrangements in South Cambridgeshire District Council (SDCC) and Cambridge City Council (CCC) were different but the new rounds made the boundary invisible to the refuse vehicles; this meant that 82% of residents had experienced a change in day and / or sequence of bin collections which started on 27th February 2017.

Both the Interim Head of Single Shared Waste and Strategic Director reiterated that both Councils were sorry to any resident who had been inconvenienced during the changes. The service would continue to work hard to achieve the normal standard of service expected and learn from this change.

In response to the Member's questions the Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service and Strategic Director said the following:

- i. Problems identified in the first few weeks included:
 - a) Missing 'collect and return' or 'assisted collection' addresses. When missed, their re-collection was prioritised. An A- Z of those addresses had been collated to supplement the digital information available in cabs.
 - b) Collection from flats had been a major problem.
- ii. Flats were considered separate services and there were entire rounds dedicated to the servicing of flats. The service recognised that these dwellings had different needs to that of an individual property which had been taken into account during planning.
- iii. Flats posed particular problems such as:
 - a) Restricted access, such as vehicles parked in the wrong place or building work taking place for the entire block.
 - b) There were different ways to access bin stores, from key fobs to electronic codes meaning the right means of access was not always possible.
 - c) An Officer had been with engaging with management companies/agents on the service but some had chosen not to engage.
 - d) If residents in a block of flats had received a letter concerning contamination it would not have been a 'blanket mail', but contamination had been spotted and all residents would be advised.
- iv. Trumpington ward was a particular area where difficulties had been experienced; changes had not been made immediately due to issues with the data software used by Waste Services. Once the software had been changed, alterations to the round would be made. Until this time additional vehicles and crews had been sent out to try to negate these complications.
- v. Acknowledged there been issues in the north of the City but changes had been made early on.
- vi. As some routes had changed and some crews were entirely new, it meant for the first four weeks of weight and round duration data could not be relied upon or used as the basis for any significant changes.
- vii. Circumstances beyond the Councils' control (such as the closure of the A10) meant that the crews had to play catch up from the start of the week.

- viii. New crews and new rounds meant that the collection had not been as efficient as it could have been in the first instance. This was normal for this type of operational change.
- ix. The crews had worked incredibly hard to learn the rounds but mistakes had been made and streets missed; this was a result of some rounds being too big, and some human error. Both the Strategic Director and the Interim Head of Single Shared Waste Service were confident the situation was improving all the time and reiterated the crews were doing a fantastic job.
- x. Merging two different data sets had created problems nevertheless there had been no issue with the quality of data.
 - i. Confident in the figures shown in the Officer's report as shown on page 99 of the agenda pack.
 - ii. Agency costs had increased but there had always been agency workers on the books which brings flexibility to the service and also helps long term recruitment.
 - iii. Currently two systems for complaints as residents should complain to their Council. The complaint would be sent to the Single Shared Waste Service.
 - iv. It was possible to extract data to track the type of complaints received.
 - v. Agreed that the record of complaints could be shared with the Committee.
 - vi. Staff members had a right to comment on the service and would encourage individuals to talk to the management team first. A series of staff 'drop in' sessions had been arranged to encourage this communication. To publicly complain first could have a negative impact on those colleagues who were working hard to provide a good quality service.
 - vii. It was thought there was currently a two to three week lead time for delivery of a new bin.
 - viii. It was important to plan for the right level of risk to the service and now the vehicle use was maximised the impact of any fleet problem could be bigger. The service was working with its contractors to ensure spaces were readily available.
 - ix. An early warning system was in place concerning traffic congestion / road closure to alert all crews.

The Committee endorsed the recommendations by 5 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.

17/21/Env 2016/17 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Environmental Services & City Centre portfolio

Matter for Decision

To consider the requests to carry forward funding arising from certain budget underspends into 2017/18 were identified.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

Resolved to request that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the following at the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 3 July 2017.

To carry forward requests of £394k capital resources from 2016/17 to 2017/18 to fund re-phased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Principal Accountant (Services) The Officer's report presented a summary of the 2016/17 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for services within the Environmental Services and

City Centre portfolio, compared to the final budget for the year. The position for revenue and capital was reported and variances from budgets were highlighted, together with explanations. Requests to carry forward funding arising from certain budget underspends into 2017/18 were identified

The Chair thanked the Officer for a comprehensive report. There were no further comments.

The Committee resolved (unanimously) to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/22/Env 2016/17 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Planning Policy & Transport

Matter for Decision

To consider the 2016/17 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for the services within the Planning Policy portfolio.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

Resolved to request that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the following at the Strategy and Resources Committee on 3 July 2017.

- i. Carry forward request for £11,230 revenue funding from 2016/17 to 2017/18, as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's Report.
- ii. Carry forward requests of £3,096k capital resources from 2016/17 to 2017/18 to fund re-phased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Principal Accountant (Services) which presented a summary of the 2016/17 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for services within the Environmental Services and City Centre, compared to the final budget for the year. The position for revenue and capital was reported and variances from budgets highlighted, together with explanations. Requests to carry forward funding arising from certain budget underspends into 2017/18 where relevant were identified.

The Principal Accountant said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The underspend of £47,111 on the taxi card service had been consumer lead.
- ii. A review of the taxi card service was being undertaken in the current financial year (2017/18) but could not advise if the eligibility of those who qualified for a card would be looked at however would report back to the Committee on the matter.

The Executive Councillor noted an underspend had been reported the previous year on the taxi card service. He concluded that the users were there but could not be sure why the service was not being used.

The Committee resolved (unanimously) 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.

17/23/Env Provision of Civil Parking Enforcement Services for the City Council**Matter for Decision**

To consider the authorisation of Officers to negotiate and agree the terms and conditions of a new agency agreement between Cambridge City Council and

Cambridgeshire County Council for the management of Civil Enforcement in Cambridge.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

- i. Resolved to delegate authority to the Parking Services Commercial Operations Manager in consultation with the Executive Councillor, Head of Finance and the Head of Legal Practice, to negotiate and agree the terms and conditions of a new agency agreement between Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, to enforce parking restrictions in City Council car parks and parking spaces covered by the City of Cambridge (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2017.
- ii. The delegated enforcement would include the recovery of penalty charges for a period of up to 5 years from 1 July 2017.

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 Parking Services, Commercial Operations Manager, which outlined the powers Cambridgeshire County Council had to enforce restrictions in the off-street car parking that belonged to the City Council.

Since 2010, the County Council had enforced the City Council's parking restrictions in relation to its off-street parking as the Council's agent. It was intended to renew this arrangement and therefore to enable the County Council to operate those powers as its agent for the City under a new Agency agreement.

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

- i. To ensure a quality service from the County Council the new agreement proposed that quarterly meetings between the two local authorities would become monthly.
- ii. City Council Car Parking Attendants independently observed the Enforcement Officers when present on site.

- iii. Checks on parking bays for the disabled and blue badges were carried out on a regular basis by the Parking Enforcement Team.
- iv. Surplus and deficits shown in the yearly accounts were measured by the actual cost.

The Committee resolved (unanimously) to endorse the recommendations.

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.

17/24/Env Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal

Matter for Decision

To consider the approval of the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

Approved the Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal incorporating the amendments asset set out in the Officer's report appendices.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Principal Conservation and Design Officer which followed an initial report to the portfolio holder and Environment Scrutiny Committee, followed by public consultation on the review of the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal carried out in February/March 2016.

Resident's groups, Colleges, public bodies, and other organisations had been consulted over a six week period and the resultant detailed comments were

set-out by respondent in appendix 1 of the Officer's report together with Officer responses and proposed amendments to the appraisal.

The Principal Conservation and Design Officer and Strategic Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The work on the city's open spaces was not solely a conservation issue but covered such topics as bio-diversity, ecology and the range of uses of the open spaces which should also be taken into account.
- ii. The Community Services Scrutiny Committee would consider a Streets and Open Spaces Service Review and Development Strategy in July which would take into account open spaces in the city.
- iii. Officers would be working with a variety of outside bodies and members of the public on the planned review of public parks where conservation and preservation of the parks would be considered.
- iv. The Conservation Area Appraisal should be seen as being alongside the Local Plan which also made reference to the city's open spaces.
- v. Believed that the Conservation Area Appraisal should be kept separate due to size and level of detail of the document.
- vi. Reference had been made in the Conservation Area Appraisal to the city's open spaces and referenced Parkers Piece, Christ Pieces, Coe-Fen and Jesus Green as examples.
- vii. Acknowledged the importance of the river which the Local Plan already referred to and acknowledged there were river related stake holders who needed to be consulted on a Conservation Area Management Plan.
- viii. Expected work to be undertaken on the Conservation Area Management Plan and the Spaces and Movement Strategy later in the year.
- ix. The Spaces and Movement Strategy document would be an integral part when looking at parks and open spaces that would take planning into consideration.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Tunnacliffe seconded an additional recommendation:

- ii. Given the public affection for the City's open spaces, to request individual conservation appraisal of the City's major public open spaces to be subsequently incorporated into this and other applicable conservation area appraisals.

The additional recommendation was lost by 2 votes to 5.

The Committee resolved (unanimously) to endorse the original recommendations as set out in the Officer's report.

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.

17/25/Env 3C Building Control 2017/18 Business Plan

Matter for Decision

To consider the Business Plan 2017/18, for the Shared Building Control Service.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Approved the Business Plan 2017-18, for the Shared Building Control Service.

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 Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

The report noted that the principles of the business plan had been approved at the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 13 July 2015.

There was no debate for this item.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

None were declared.

The meeting ended at 7.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment



Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.

The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer on 01223 457174 or email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Static and Mobile Security Services

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

To provide a static and mobile security service for city council car parks and Cowley Road sites.

3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

Visitors

Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):
Car park customers

4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)

Existing

5. Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Business Transformation

Service: Commercial Services

6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

Estates & Facilities

7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

When answering this question, please think about:

- The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- Complaints information.
- Performance information.
- Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- Inspection results.
- Comparisons with other organisations.
- The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- The relevant premises involved.
- Your communications.
- National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

The car park static guard answers customers intercom calls when they require assistance and the mobile guard patrols the car parks to ensure the welfare and safety of all customers and to deal with anti-social behaviour.
This is of particular benefit to our more vulnerable customers

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

The car park static guard answers customers intercom calls when they require assistance and the mobile guard patrols the car parks to ensure the welfare and safety of all customers and to deal with anti-social behaviour.

This is of particular benefit to our more vulnerable customers

(c) Gender

This project has no impact on any person's gender

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

This project has no impact on pregnancy or maternity

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

This project has no impact on anyone who is transgender

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

This project has no impact on marriage or civil partnership

(g) Race or Ethnicity

This project has no impact on race or ethnicity

(h) Religion or Belief

The security service will provide additional resources in the management of busy religious festival such as festival of Eid

(i) Sexual Orientation

This project has no impact on anyone's sexual orientation

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):

There are no factors in this project which could lead to inequality.

8. If you have any additional comments please add them here

The living wage will be applied to this project, meaning that staff working onsite will be paid at least the living wage.

9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.
- If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete question 8 to explain why that is the case.
- If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council's website.
Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: Jake Smith

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:

Sean Cleary

Date of completion: 31/08/17

Date of next review of the assessment:

Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment title:

Date of completion:

Equality Group	Age
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Disability
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Gender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Pregnancy and Maternity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Transgender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Marriage and Civil Partnership
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Race or Ethnicity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Religion or Belief
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Sexual Orientation
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Other factors that may lead to inequality	
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

This page is intentionally left blank

Project / Proposal Name or Reference:

Date:

Your Name:

Static and Mobile Security Services		31-Aug-17	Jake Smith	
1. IMPACT ON CARBON EMISSIONS				
HOW WILL THIS PROJECT/PROPOSAL AFFECT:	CONSIDERATIONS <i>See guidance below on determining whether negative or positive impacts are High, Medium or Low</i>	IMPACT? <i>Use drop down list</i>	GUIDANCE IF NEGATIVE RATING HAS BEEN AWARDED	NOTE HERE HOW YOU PLAN TO MANAGE AND REDUCE ANY NEGATIVE IMPACTS
1 ENERGY USE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * More energy will be consumed (by CCC or others) = Negative Impact * No extra energy use is involved = Nil Impact * Energy use will be reduced or renewable energy will be used = Positive Impact 	Nil	Consider: - Energy efficiency measures - Renewable energy - Reducing demand for energy	
2 WASTE GENERATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * More waste will be generated (by CCC or others) = Negative Impact * No waste will be generated = Nil Impact * Less waste will be generated OR amount of waste that is reused/ recycled will be increased = Positive Impact 	Nil	Consider: - Use of recycled goods - Recycling facilities - Reducing/ reusing resources	
3 USE OF TRANSPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * CCC or others will need to travel more OR transport goods more often/ further = Negative Impact * No extra transport will be necessary = Nil Impact * The use of transport and/or of fossil fuel-based transport will be reduced = Positive Impact 	Nil	Consider: - Use of public transport - Reducing need to travel or transport goods - Alternative fuels	
2. IMPACT ON RESILIENCE TO THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE				
HOW WILL THIS PROJECT/PROPOSAL AFFECT THE ABILITY OF CAMBRIDGE CITY TO WITHSTAND:	CONSIDERATIONS <i>See guidance below on determining whether negative or positive impacts are High, Medium or Low</i>	IMPACT? <i>Use drop down list</i>	GUIDANCE IF NEGATIVE RATING HAS BEEN AWARDED	NOTE HERE HOW YOU PLAN TO MANAGE AND REDUCE ANY NEGATIVE IMPACTS
4 HEATWAVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of or reduced shade (e.g. from trees or buildings) & natural ventilation = Negative Impact * No impact on existing levels of shade & ventilation = Nil Impact * Increased/ improved shade & natural ventilation = Positive Impact 	Nil	Greater need for cooling, shade and hydration methods	
5 DROUGHT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Water use will increase and/or no provision made for water management = Negative Impact * Levels of water use will not be changed = Nil Impact * Provision made for water management, water resources will be protected = Positive Impact 	Nil	Greater need for water management and perhaps reserve supplies	
6 FLOODING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Levels of surface water run-off will increase, no management of flood risk = Negative Impact * Levels of surface water run-off & flood risk are not affected = Nil Impact * Sustainable drainage measures incorporated, positive steps to reduce & manage flood risk = Positive Impact 	Nil	Consider flood defence mechanisms or alternative arrangements (business continuity)	
7 HIGH WINDS / STORMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Exposure to higher wind speeds is increased or is not managed = Negative Impact * No change to existing level of exposure to higher wind speeds = Nil Impact * Exposure to higher wind speeds is being actively managed & reduced = Positive Impact 	Nil	Greater need for stabilisation measures, robust structures resilient to high winds	
8 FOOD SECURITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Opportunities & resources for local food production are reduced = Negative Impact * No change to opportunities & resources for local food production = Nil Impact * Opportunities & resources for local food production are increased/ enhanced = Positive Impact 	Nil	Source food locally as it reduces vulnerability to food shortages and boosts the local economy	
Weighing up the negative and positive impacts of your project, what is the overall rating you are assigning to your project?:		Net Nil	<i>This overall rating is what you need to include in your report/ budget proposal, together with your explanation given below.</i>	

Guidance on Assessing the Degree of Negative and Positive Impacts:

Note: Not all of the considerations/ criteria listed below will necessarily be relevant to your project

Low Impact (L)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * No publicity * Relevant risks to the Council or community are Low or none * No impact on service or corporate performance * No capital assets; or capital assets with lifetime of less than 3 years
Medium Impact (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Local publicity (good or bad) * Relevant risks to the Council or community are Medium * Affects delivery of corporate commitments * Affects service performance (e.g.: energy use; amount of waste; distance travelled) by more than 10% * Capital assets with a lifetime of more than 3 years
High Impact (H)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * National publicity (good or bad) * Relevant risks to the Council or community are Significant or High * Affects delivery of regulatory commitments * Affects corporate performance by more than 10% * Capital assets with a lifetime of more than 6 years

In the box below please explain how the overall rating given to your project/ proposal has been derived. (Summarise the project's environmental impacts) Please also highlight any negative environmental impacts your project may have (if any) and how you plan to mitigate these:

This contract is a continuation of one already in use, and therefore there will be no additional impact on the climate

This page is intentionally left blank



Item

Cycleways Capital Programme

To:

Environment Scrutiny Committee 3 October 2017

Report by:

Joel Carre, Head of Environmental Services

Tel: 01223 458201 Email: joel.carre@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

Clr Kevin Blencowe, Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

Key Decision: No

1. Executive Summary

1.1 This report outlines the principle achievements of the Cycleways Capital Programme since it was last considered by Environment Scrutiny Committee in October 2014; along with forward investment proposals for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 years.

2. Recommendations

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

1. Note progress and achievements of the Cycleways Capital Programme (PV007).
2. Support forward expenditure of capital funds up to 2019 as outlined in this report.

3. Background

- 3.1. The City Council works jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council on developing and promoting cycling. The work includes the introduction of new facilities and the improvement of existing facilities used by cyclists. A jointly funded programme commenced in 2002 to which the County and City Councils contributed 50:50 to an annual budget of £50,000 per annum over the period 2002-05. This was subsequently increased to a combined annual budget of £100,000 from 2005, and further supplemented by the City Council with a one-off allocation from savings of £250,000 in 2009.
- 3.2 The initial programme focus was on radial routes in and out of the city, although the completion of improvements to the Madingley Road corridor was deferred due to complexities around future bus priority work. A prioritisation method for schemes was agreed by the (then) Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) in April 2006. Scheme suggestions were considered and approved by AJC on a rolling basis up to its disbanding in 2012 (priorities have since been determined by the Members Cycling & Pedestrian Steering Group) and further supported by Environment Scrutiny Committee. Approved schemes included The Tins, Downham's Lane and Radegund Road/ Perne Road roundabout improvements.
- 3.3 On 11 January 2011, Environment Scrutiny Committee approved an extension to the programme to 2014-15 in order to enable these projects to be completed. This included the carry forward of then unspent cycleway programme budget (£138,000), plus a further allocation of £50,000 per annum for four years to match funding available from the County Council, giving a total programme budget of £538,000.
- 3.4 Environment Scrutiny Committee considered a programme update on 17 October 2014 that set out proposals for further forward spending by the Council of up to £50,000 per year; subject to annual budget setting. This included the completion of schemes already committed; including Radegund Road/ Perne Road roundabout, Jesus Green path widening, a contribution towards Fen Road and Water Street (Chesterton) traffic calming, and the improvement of Green Dragon bridge; alongside a programme of more minor improvements.

4. Review of Principal Achievements

- 4.1 Whilst the County Council has continued to fund improvements to cycling facilities in Cambridge in recent years (via programmes including the Cycling Ambition Grant, and Greater Cambridge Partnership/ City Deal), there have been no direct contributions to the jointly funded cycleways programme in Cambridge since 2014-15. The City Council has, however, continued to make capital provision of £50,000 per annum available to the programme (PV007 – 39023), with a provisional allocation up to 2018-19 year (subject to annual budget setting).
- 4.2 The table below identifies the principal programme achievements over the period 2002-17; via a cumulative programme of investment totalling over £1.8 million. The schemes detailed in 3.4 have all now been delivered; however the spend at Green Dragon bridge has been much lower than anticipated in 2014 (it proved premature to invest significantly in improvements when the County Council anticipates replacing the bridge within 10 years). In addition to the major schemes completed, smaller schemes such as the installation of kerbs flush with carriageway surfacing, signage improvements and provision of contra-flow cycling in one-way streets have also contributed to the improvement and extension of the City cycle route network.

Individual projects within the programme delivered 2002-17:	Spend (£000)
Newmarket Road corridor cycle improvements	394
Coe Fen National Cycle Network route; £106k of this was funded through a Growth Area Delivery Grant	213
Coton Footpath	151
Madingley Road (part)	150
Riverside improvement	140
New Bit path	125
Re-signage of Cycle network & accompanying publicity map	73
Victoria Avenue Toucan crossings (£50k project undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as their matched funding for 2005-06)	50
Chesterton Hall Crescent cycle route	34
The Tins Path – contribution to Cycle Cambridge scheme	30

Individual projects within the programme delivered 2002-17:	Spend (£000)
Downham's Lane	78
Perne Road/ Radegund Road roundabout (additional to department for Transport funding)	110
Jesus Green paths	215
Fen Road and Water Street, Chesterton	30
Green Dragon bridge	14
One-way streets	25
Small schemes	27
Total Spend (2002-17)	1,848

5. Further Programme Plans

5.1 It is now appropriate to consider priorities for new schemes, with some £362,000 (including committed, and re-phased, monies) available in year 2017-18, and a further £50,000 expected in 2018-19 (subject to annual budget setting). A proportion of monies re-phased are County Council credits received in previous years. The city-wide scheme priority list has been updated and is included at **Appendix A**. Future programme priorities were considered, and supported, by the Members Cycling & Pedestrian Steering Group at meetings in February and June 2017.

a) Maids Causeway and Four Lamps Roundabout

5.2 Cambridgeshire County Council has approximately £100,000 available during 2017-18 to improve the crossing point of Maids Causeway adjacent to Midsummer Common and Four Lamps roundabout. The proposal is to narrow the road, remove the central splitter island and introduce a formal controlled crossing arrangement. Outline plans are under development and officers have discussed with the Steering Group, and Executive Councillor, the potential of a City Council contribution towards this work; since the location also forms a high priority in this Council's own forward priority programme.

5.3 The County Council plans are, however, likely to fall short of City Council aspirations to review, and improve, the layout at Four Lamps roundabout; which remains more suited to a principal traffic route rather

than its current usage by predominantly public service vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians (the Cambridge Core traffic scheme phase 2 closure of Emmanuel Road removed the majority of through traffic). There is significant scope to narrow the roundabout circulatory area and traffic entry points to assist crossing and further reduce traffic speeds. This would improve the environment, and safety, significantly for these other users.

- 5.4 Officers have been discussing with the County Council how to best align these aspirations and it seems a phased approach may be needed, extending in to 2018-19, when a more comprehensive improvement at the roundabout is likely to be deliverable. Detailed costs at this stage have yet to be established, but it is provisionally estimated that a City Council contribution of between £100,000 and £150,000 is likely to be needed to achieve both aspects. This has been provisionally discussed with the Executive Councillor, who was supportive (in principle) of Cycleways funding of this provisional level being committed to this work.

b) **Davy Road**

- 5.5 Davy Road is a route to school for primary and secondary aged children and is also well used by people travelling between the centre of the city, Cherry Hinton area and villages beyond. Given its proximity to the city centre and railway station it is, however, heavily used by commuters seeking somewhere to park. Whilst it is not intended to deter use of the popular adjacent Coleridge Recreation Ground, unrestricted parking on both sides narrows the width of the road which can feel unpleasant and unsafe for cyclists. A scheme to better manage parking in the area has had some early consideration with the County Council as part of their ongoing review of residents parking in Cambridge.

c) **'Snakey Path'**

- 5.6 'Snakey path' (running between Burnside and Daws Lane) is regularly used by both cyclists and pedestrians and forms an important route to local schools, Cherry Hinton High Street and Cherry Hinton Hall. However, it is very narrow and difficult for users to pass each other. Although constrained by land uses on either side (including a watercourse to the north) there appears scope for limited widening

through negotiation with landowners and other interests, and suitable investment to provide an improved path, lighting, fencing and other improvements.

- 5.7 It is suggested that a provisional level of funding (£10,000 per annum) continues to be made available for further minor improvement work; including to access barriers, route signage, dropped kerbs, one-way streets access and minor path surfacing. This area of the programme has been particularly effective in recent years at tackling blockages and other restrictions in the city cycle route network (particularly with increased usage of trailer and cargo bikes) and presents excellent value for money.
- 5.8 The following table provides a breakdown of the recommended forecast spend by project of the remaining programme budget (including staffing costs and other professional fees). Actual costs will inevitably vary (since these are provisional estimates), so a £35,000 (10%) allowance is suggested as a contingency. Due to staff resource constraints and other difficulties, the completion of this work is expected to extend in to 2018-19 year:

Project	Likely costs 2017-18 (£000)	Re-phased to 2018-19 (£000)	Total (£000)
Maids Causeway and Four Lamps Roundabout	50	100	150
Snakey Path	25	125	150
Davy Road	-	10	10
Minor schemes	10	10	20
Cycle parking	10	10	20
(Contingency)		35	35
Anticipated Total Spend	95	290	385

6. Cycle Parking

- 6.1 There is significant demand for improvements to cycle parking across Cambridge, both in the city centre and other shopping areas, transport interchanges, recreational facilities, community buildings and residential areas. Following a representation to East Area Committee, the Members Cycling & Pedestrian Steering Group supported an audit of

facilities at community and other public buildings – which should help inform future investment priorities.

- 6.2 Within the city centre a separate capital budget (PV549 – 38180) was made available in 2013 to achieve an additional 1,000 secure cycle parking spaces. Nearing 700 of these have, or are in the process of, being achieved on-street and on Council owned land. The remainder were intended via an expansion of the Grand Arcade Cycle park, but this project has proven problematic and is not yet ready to be delivered. Nevertheless, plans are in place to improve facilities in Free School Lane, on Jesus Green adjacent to the pool, at Queen Anne Terrace car park and Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre, and on East Road adjacent to the Espresso Library café, during 2017.
- 6.3 Further enhancements to cycle parking facilities will be considered as opportunities arise in conjunction with partner organisations. The refurbishment of Holy Trinity Church when complete will enable on-street racks to be re-established in Sidney Street. Although significantly under-utilised, the 230 or so spaces within the ground floor of Park Street car park will need to be re-located when the site is redeveloped in 2019. Officers will investigate any opportunities that become available.

7. Proposed Way Forward

- 7.1 It is recommended that the projects identified in para 5.8 form the programme of City Council investment in cycling facilities in Cambridge up to the current commitment to 2019. Schemes will be developed and delivered (subject to funding availability via annual budget setting, positive consultation support (including Traffic Orders), staff and other professional service availability, and Project Appraisal) by the Council's in-house Streets and Open Spaces service. Update reports on progress will be brought before Area Committees, Scrutiny Committee and the appropriate Executive Councillor, as the need arises.

8. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

This is a jointly funded capital programme between the City and County Councils for investment in cycling related improvements in Cambridge City. The majority of the programme's projects are on the public highway or hard-

surfaced definitive footpaths, which are both the maintenance responsibility of the County Council. As a result, the programme has no significant revenue implications for the City Council.

(b) Staffing Implications

Both the City and County Council have strengthened their staffing capacity to develop and deliver public realm improvements in recent years. Any extension of the existing programme budget can be managed and delivered without the requirement for additional staffing resource.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

Walking and cycling are particularly easy and affordable modes of transport for shorter trips around the city and do not discriminate between any particular user groups. All schemes are designed to accommodate those less able and/or mobile. The overall impact of investment in such facilities is therefore considered to be positive. An Equalities Impact Assessment is included as **Appendix B**.

(d) Environmental Implications

Despite the development of cleaner engines, motorised traffic is believed to be a significant contributor towards global greenhouse gases that are affecting a change in climate. Higher levels of walking and cycling have the potential to reduce motorised traffic levels. Cambridge already experiences much higher levels of cycling than the UK generally, and the investment in cycling facilities in Cambridge is aimed at maintaining and increasing those levels further. The overall impact of the programme on the environment for Cambridge is therefore rated as +M (positive; Medium).

(e) Procurement Implications

Improvement to cycle facilities within Cambridge are, dependent on their nature, scope, scale and complexity either delivered in-house utilising existing resources within the Streets & Open Spaces service, or via existing framework contract arrangements (such as with Skanska for highways related services). Other schemes may best be procured and constructed via individual competitive tender processes.

(f) Community Safety Implications

More sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling promote face to face contact and reduce social exclusion and are thus considered to have a positive impact on community safety.

5. Consultation and communication considerations

Professional and public stakeholder engagement and consultation will take place, as appropriate, to help shape the recommended projects.

9. Background papers

Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

(a) Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting 17th October 2014 – Cycleways Joint Capital Programme Review

10. Appendices

Appendix A - Prioritised List of Schemes

Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment

11. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact John Richards, Senior Engineer, tel: 01223 458525, email: john.richards@cambridge.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

CYCLEWAYS CAPITAL PROGRAMME

DRAFT PRIORITISED SCHEME LIST FOR FUNDING

Scheme	Description	Comments/ Risks	Request from?	Possible Additional funding sources	Score (max. 45)
Four Lamps roundabout and Maids Causeway/ Short Street crossings	Narrow approaches to the roundabout and improve pedestrian and cycle crossings, particularly the strategic route across to Midsummer Common from King Street.	Vehicle capacity unlikely to be an difficulty – since Cambridge Core traffic scheme reduced majority of through traffic. Existing strategic cycle route crossing very poor. Poor environment for pedestrians.	Cycling and Walking Liaison Group – particularly Camsight members	County Council (Section 106 receipts)	29
Snakey Path	Widening sections were feasible to allow pedestrians and cyclists to pass one another safely.	Some land in City Council ownership but some private. Will require negotiation and agreement (particularly allotments, St Bedes school, Peterhouse College.	Users – general complaints	County Council (Greenways)	27
Solar stud way-marking	Provision of edge way-markers on paths through open spaces across city, particularly where alignment meanders or there are other hazards.	Popular with some but unpopular with others, given impact upon open space and biodiversity. Requires careful management and development, on a case by case basis. Greatest priority is likely to be on paths that avoid use of busy and dangerous routes.	Users (consultation on New Bit path widening and response to trial on Lammas Land)	County Council LHI/ EIP	20
Davy Road	Reduce/ remove on-street vehicle parking to provide cycle lanes.	The current situation feels unsafe for cyclists as the available carriageway width leads to cars trying to overtake cyclists, often at speed, where there is not enough space.	Officers	EIP/ County Council/ GCP (ex City Deal) - tackling peak time	20

APPENDIX A

		This forms part of a route to school for a number of children who are going to the secondary or primary school on Radegund Road or to St. Bedes.		congestion; on-street parking controls.	
Grantchester meadows access	Needs sympathetic hard surfacing treatment.	Access to the meadows path is badly potholed and difficult to use for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly when wet. Land owned by St Catharine's College. Reluctance to hard surface area by some residents; and some reservation from councillors about value to Council.	Resident/ Officers	Landowner/ County Council	18
Bateman Street	Preventing drivers, mainly deliveries and contractors, parking within mandatory contra-flow cycle lane.	Consideration of double yellow lines with advisory lanes or use of 'wands' or other separation means.	Cycle commuter	County Council LHI	17
Storey's Way	Re-design of traffic pinch point to improve safety for cyclists.	The location is on an already well-used route to the University west Cambridge site, and sits on the edge of the new North-West Cambridge development. There is concern that opening of the Ridgeway will increase numbers needing to negotiate this awkward manoeuvre.	Residents	County Council LHI	16
Daws Lane	Construct hard surfaced cycle path on rough access route running parallel to narrow hard surfaced public footpath connecting Cherry Hinton to the Hall and Snakey Path.	Land owned by College – would need to get license to undertake work and permissive agreement, or adoption, if possible.	Residents/ cycle commuters		16
Wadloes Road to Ditton	Construct hard surfaced path across City Council housing land	May be an issue with tree roots.	Resident		16

APPENDIX A

Meadows path	where there is well used unofficial route providing a more direct link. Sign path from Newmarket Road.				
<p>Minor schemes Eg. Dropped kerbs/ route signage/ removal of obstructions/ cycle parking</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>Route signage improvements – for example Parkside to Grafton Centre via Mud lane, and Toll Hill (bridge over railway on Tins path) - signage encouraging use of bells to warn other cyclists and pedestrians on unsighted approach.</p> <p>Cycle parking improvements – for example community buildings, Molewood Close, Newmarket Road.</p> <p>Dropped access kerbs, and other barriers - for example to/ from East Road/ Elizabeth Way roundabout and underpasses.</p>	<p>Historically, £10,000 of annual Cycleways funding has been allocated to various minor improvement work across the city cycle route network; filling the gaps between more major scheme proposals emerging from developers, County and City Councils.</p> <p>It is suggested these proposals are agreed, and signed off, directly by the Executive Councillor following local member and user consultation, and consideration by the Members Cycling and Pedestrian Steering Group.</p>	<p>Residents' Associations; Residents, Cambridge Cycling Campaign, Users</p>		

* Scores may alter once more details of measures proposed emerge; including a measure of effectiveness, practicality and cost.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment



Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.

The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer on 01223 457174 or email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Cycleways (Joint) Capital Programme

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

The City Council works in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council to improve cycle routes and facilities used by cyclists in Cambridge in order to maintain, and build upon, our high levels of cycle use in the city.

3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

- Residents
- Visitors
- Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):

4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)

- New
- Revised
- Existing

5. Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Environment

Service: Streets and Open Spaces

6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

No

Yes (please give details):

Cambridge City Council S&OS, Planning, Urban Design and Conservation teams
Cambridgeshire County Council (as Highway Authority)
City and County Councillors
User group representatives; for example CamCycle (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)

7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

When answering this question, please think about:

- The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- Complaints information.
- Performance information.
- Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- Inspection results.
- Comparisons with other organisations.
- The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- The relevant premises involved.
- Your communications.
- National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

Positive. Encouraging more people to walk, and cycle, through the improvement of routes and other infrastructure, has significant health benefits for all ages. These travel modes are low cost, easy to learn, and enable independence, and accessibility, for younger and older people who may not have ready access to other means of transport.

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

Positive. Cycling, and walking, are particularly easy and affordable modes of transport for shorter trips around the city and do not discriminate between any particular characteristic groups. Some people, who have difficulty walking any distance, find that cycling provides increased mobility. All new and improved infrastructure schemes are designed to accommodate those less able and/ or mobile – with specialist cycles available for people with particular mobility needs.

(c) Gender

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups. Specialist cycles available for people with particular needs

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups. Specialist cycles available for people with particular needs.

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups.

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups.

(g) Race or Ethnicity

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups.

(h) Religion or Belief

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups.

(i) Sexual Orientation

Neutral - no specific impact anticipated. Cycling and walking are easily accessible modes of transport for all characteristic groups.

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):

Positive. Cycling and walking are easily affordable modes of transport and do not discriminate between any particular user groups. They provide access, and independence, for those who are on relatively low incomes.

8. If you have any additional comments please add them here

None

9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.
- If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete question 8 to explain why that is the case.
- If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council's website.
Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: John Richards

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:
N/A

Date of completion: 6th September 2017

Date of next review of the assessment: N/A

This page is intentionally left blank



To: Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Kevin Blencowe

Report by: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

Relevant scrutiny committee: Environment Scrutiny Committee 3/10/2017

Wards affected: All

Withdrawal of Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule Non-Key Decision

1. Executive summary

1.1 The proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) draft charging schedule was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in March 2014 in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended). The charging schedule was to be examined by the same Planning Inspector as has been examining the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans and was to take place following the conclusion of the local plan examinations.

Report Page 12 Since the draft charging schedule was submitted, there have been a number of factors which would have a detrimental effect on the likely success of the CIL examination and future operation of the proposed CIL. These factors can be summarised as follows:

1. Proposed modifications in relation to Local Plan site allocations;
2. Infrastructure evidence and its relevance;
3. Viability evidence and its relevance;
4. The emergence of the Combined Authority;
5. Government approach to further amendments of the CIL Regulations; and
6. Emerging joint planning service with South Cambridgeshire Council

- 1.3 In particular, given the time that it has taken to complete the local plan examination hearings, it is considered that the draft charging schedule submitted for public examination in March 2014 is no longer fit for purpose due to a number of factors as highlighted throughout this report. As such, it is recommended that the Council should formally withdraw the draft charging schedule from examination and reassess its CIL position following the Government's Autumn 2017 Budget Statement, recognising the closer working opportunities with South Cambridgeshire District Council and, in particular, the emerging Shared Planning Service.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 This report is being submitted to the Environment Scrutiny Committee for prior consideration and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

- 2.2 The Executive Councillor is recommended:

To approve the activation of Regulation 18 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (amended) and withdraw the Council's submitted CIL draft charging schedule.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Planning Act 2008 gave way to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations that were introduced in 2010 as the Governments preferred mechanism for securing infrastructure contributions from new developments. In order to be brought into operation, local planning authorities had to have the draft CIL charging schedule independently examined and approved by a Planning Inspector.

Report Page No: 2

- 3.2 The public consultation on the preliminary draft charging schedule took place between 18 March and 29 April 2013.
- 3.3 Cabinet approved the draft charging schedule for consultation on 8 October 2013 and gave authorisation to submit this (and associated evidence including the Regulation 123 infrastructure list) for public examination.
- 3.4 The public consultation on the draft charging schedule took place between 28 October and 9 December 2013.
- 3.5 The draft charging schedule was submitted to PINS for independent examination on 28 March 2014. The examination was to follow the

Cambridge Local Plan examination with the same planning inspector being assigned to both.

- 3.6 To inform the charging schedule the Council required infrastructure evidence to demonstrate the extent of a funding gap (to justify the principle of a CIL charge being introduced) and viability evidence (to support the rates and types of development that are proposed being charged a CIL).
- 3.7 The infrastructure evidence was prepared by Peter Brett Associates for both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council dated August 2012 and which was updated August 2013.
- 3.8 The viability evidence was prepared by Dixon Searle Partnership for Cambridge City Council (although DSP were separately appointed by South Cambridgeshire District) dated February 2013.
- 3.9 In November 2015 both the infrastructure evidence and viability evidence was updated for both Councils as required by the Inspector in the light of the ongoing examination of the local plans.
- 3.10 The CIL approach that has been proposed by Cambridge City Council (and which requires review) can be summarised as follows:

- I. CIL would be charged on all new residential developments (recognising that the Regulations include mandatory exemptions for charitable developments, affordable housing and self-build). The rate across Cambridge City Council's area would be £125 per square metre including two local plan allocations joint with South Cambridgeshire District Council being (a) Cambridge East (land North of Cherry Hinton) and (b) Northern Fringe East.

Report Page No: II. CIL would also be charged on all new retail and student accommodation across Cambridge City Council's area at a rate of £75 and £125, respectively.

- III. The onsite and offsite infrastructure needs arising from strategic developments would be secured via a section 106 agreement in the traditional manner.
- IV. In addition to CIL payments the Council would be able to continue to secure Section 106 contributions on sites where they satisfy the applicable tests (as per the draft Regulation 123 list and emerging local plan policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy). Furthermore primary education contributions may also still be secured via a section 106 contribution (as per the draft Regulation 123 list).

- 3.11 Since the draft charging schedule was submitted for examination proposed Modifications have emerged through the examination of the Local Plan that would be required by the Planning Inspector to make the Plan “sound”. These Modifications, if included in the final adopted Local Plan, would have an impact on the CIL strategy in both the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire local planning authorities
- 3.12 The infrastructure evidence originally prepared in March-April 2013 and updated in October-December 2013 has since been updated in respect of the local plan examination in November 2015 following a suspension of the local plan examination. Arguably this update cannot be used in respect of a CIL examination unless the draft charging schedule was withdrawn and re-consulted upon with the up to date evidence.
- 3.13 The viability evidence originally prepared in February 2013 has also since been updated in respect of the local plan examination in November 2015, following a suspension of the local plan examination. Again arguably this updated evidence cannot be relied upon in respect of a CIL examination unless the draft charging schedule was withdrawn and re-consulted upon. If the CIL examination was to progress without this evidence being first updated there is a risk that the evidence would not be considered sufficiently up to date and the Inspector would require the schedules to be withdrawn and up-to-date schedules be consulted on and submitted..
- 3.14 A Mayor has been appointed for the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority which may have a number of different influences including transport infrastructure, growth strategy and governance. Although as a factor this is less relevant than those listed above, it may be appropriate to have regard to this in the formulation of a CIL strategy for Cambridge.

Report Page No: 4

- 3.15 In the Housing White Paper (‘Fixing our Broken Housing Market’ – February 2017) the Government acknowledged that the independent review of CIL, and its relationship with Section 106 planning obligations, found that the current system is not as fast, simple, certain or transparent as originally intended. The Government has stated that it will examine the options for reforming the system of developer contributions including ensuring direct benefit for communities, and will respond to the independent review and make an announcement at the Autumn Budget 2017. The implications of this announcement could have a significant impact on the form and content of a CIL charging strategy in the City.
- 3.16 Lastly Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are implementing a Greater Cambridge Shared Planning

Service. Under such circumstances it would be vital to have a co-ordinated approach and align (more closely) the charging schedules and ensure that the Regulation 123 infrastructure list for the 2 Authorities mirror one another to ensure consistency when securing section 106 contributions from new development in addition to CIL.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

Withdrawal of the CIL draft Charging Schedule would negate the impending costs involved with the examination. However, and depending upon the government announcements concerning the future of CIL, there could be a requirement to undertake a review of the viability and infrastructure evidence ahead of consultation of a new charging schedule. However any additional costs associated with this work could be kept to a minimum through closer working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and may result in the setting of higher CIL rates on the basis of upward market movements over the previous 3 years.

(b) Staffing Implications

There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report. Any further work to oversee consultants updating the evidence base and potentially undertaking consultation on a new CIL proposal can be met from within existing resources.

(c) Equalities and Poverty Implications

There are no direct adverse equality or diversity impacts resulting from the recommendations in this report.

Report Page 57 of 57

(d) Environmental Implications

The environmental implications of the recommendation are considered to be neutral as it is considered that the CIL proposal, as submitted for examination, would result in further delays to update the evidence before it could be implemented.

(e) Procurement

There are no direct procurement implications as a result of the recommendation.

(f) Consultation and communication

There are no direct consultation implications. It will, however, be necessary to notify statutory bodies and those on the Council's planning policy consultation list of the decision should the recommendation be approved.

g) Community Safety

There are no direct community safety implications.

5. Background papers

There are no background papers for this report.

6. Appendices

There are no appendices for this report.

7. Inspection of papers

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

Author's Name:	Ian Poole & Bruce Waller
Author's Phone Number:	X7442 & X7171
Author's Email:	Ian.Poole@cambridge.gov.uk & Bruce.Waller@cambridge.gov