

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 17 January 2019
5.00 - 7.40 pm

Present: Councillors Smart (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Barnett, Gillespie, Martinelli, Massey, McGerty, O'Connell and Sheil

Executive Councillors: Moore (Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre), Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities) and Thornburrow (Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces)

Others Councillor Present:

Councillor Cantrill

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Culture and Community Manager: Jane Wilson

Community, Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Environmental Health Manager: Yvonne O'Donnell

Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Johnston

Equality and Anti-Poverty Officer: Helen Crowther

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/1/EnC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Thittala.

19/2/EnC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor O'Connell	19/8/EnC	Personal: Former Council appointed Trustee of Cambridge Live.
Councillor O'Connell	19/10/EnC	Personal:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Council appointed Observer on The Junction. ii. Member of Trumpington Residents Association. iii. Partner is the trustee of The Kite Trust.
Councillor Gillespie	19/10/EnC	Personal: Works for University of Cambridge, who was a grant applicant.
Councillor Thornburrow	19/10/EnC	Personal: Director of Cambridge Sustainable Food, who was a grant applicant.

19/3/EnC Minutes

A change was made to the title used to describe a public speaker under 18/27/EnC. Subject to this change, the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

See minute item 19/9/EnC below.

19/4/EnC Public Questions

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

Question submitted before committee.

I'm a member of the Cambridge based advocacy group, CleanWheels. Our group have been liaising with officers at the City Council, County Council and University on the intention to revamp the current Car Club offer available within the City and proximate villages. (See minutes of last scrutiny meeting)

The process of developing the tender document has missed a number of deadlines during 2018 and we are told that the document will be issued to prospective suppliers this month. Could I ask that members of the Committee reassure themselves that appropriate resources have been allocated to this development and that they have satisfied themselves that the criteria for appointment of the new supplier/re-appointment of

ZipCar is suitably weighted to ensure that it supports CCC's stated Climate Change goals and that the new supplier is contracted to deliver a strong and ongoing communications programme to deliver a sustainable offer to residents.

Evidence from other Cities inc Norwich & Oxford suggests that Cambridge is currently under-performing by a factor of up to 5 in terms of available vehicles, improvements can also be made in reducing emissions by specifying the vehicle fleet and as a result provides access for many more people to latest technology without facing significant expenditure which will exclude access for some.

Response provided before committee by Sean Cleary, Commercial Operations Manager.

Cambridge City Council has been working closely with Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge University (the partners) to improve the current Car Club offer. Due to the collaborative nature of the project some self-imposed deadlines were extended during 2018 in order to ensure that all partners are satisfied that their requirements have been met in the tender documentation, the emphasis is on quality. There was no formal external deadlines.

The Project Team includes representatives from the partners plus Cambridge Greater Partnership and has been led by City council officers from:

- Environmental Health
- Procurement
- Commercial Services

with resources also being drawn from:

- Community Services
- Housing
- Property Services
- Streets & Open Spaces
- Estates & Facilities

The tender and subsequent contract aim to have a positive effect on the City and its climate, to help achieve this the partners engaged with the market via a supplier event in August 2018. Car Club suppliers were invited to engage with the partners directly to understand the partners overall goals, these include improving the city's air quality and promoting

sustainable transport. Additionally the partners were able to understand the nature of the market and its limitations, all of which have helped to inform the partners detailed specification.

The specification and evaluation process has taken into account the Council's climate change goals and incentivising a modal shift towards more sustainable transport methods.

The Project Team has increased the number of potential bays available to the scheme by over 300%. This allows more vehicles to be provided making the use of the Car Club more attractive, increasing consumer confidence and the accessibility to car club vehicles. The greater the uptake in Car Club usage the greater the number of vehicles that could be removed from the city's streets and the positive effect that will have on air quality.

It is anticipated that the structure of the tender will attract a high number of replies and increase the quality of tender submissions. This increase in quality will help the Council achieve its wider goals of improving the city's air quality, reducing congestion and promoting sustainable methods of travel.

As we are still currently in the pre-tender stage of the procurement officers need to be mindful not to engage in contract discussions with potential providers during the procurement progression so as to ensure that we do not breach the requirements of a transparent, fair and proportionate process.

Supplementary question submitted before committee:

Many thanks for forwarding Sean's comprehensive response that is reassuringly complete as an update.

As follow up from research conducted by CleanWheels elsewhere, I would like to make the following comments that Sean may wish to respond to:

A flourishing car club appears to develop when there is a clustering of bays (3 or more) within a 10 min walk and with each bay offering a different vehicle to meet needs- van/small & larger cars.

Promotion of a revitalised Car Club is vital to ensure awareness is built and residents are incentivised to make the leap from personal ownership and migrate to a pay as you go model. Ensuring that a future supplier is contracted to deliver on this is critical.

The evidence from elsewhere suggests that journeys do not decline and indeed it widens access to vehicle usage. Its vital that a future supplier is contracted to introduce latest technology for emission reduction/zero emissions to improved air quality.

Sean's note indicates that the project is still at pre-tender stage, taking note of your last paragraph, are you able to provide a timetable that the team are working to.

I've copied Cllrs Moore & Gillespie as the minutes of the previous Scrutiny Committee indicated that they would ensure there's appropriate review of this project that should revitalise the Car Club offer within the City and proximate villages.

Supplementary question asked at committee:

- i. Queried if the Council had sufficiently scrutinised the car club contract.
- ii. The City Council had a duty of care to ensure the contract was as effective as it could be.
- iii. Successful car clubs in Norwich and Oxford had more cars than Cambridge. These reduced the number of private cars on the road.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre said:

- i. The Council was in the process of procurement. This was taking longer than expected.
- ii. She would look at the process after today's meeting.

The public speaker referred to 4 October 2018 committee minutes and said he understood that Councillors Moore and Gillespie would liaise on issues.

The Executive Councillor said some information was restricted regarding the contract process and collaboration between the City Council and University of Cambridge. She was happy for a report to come back to committee in future if required.

19/5/EnC Fixed Penalty Notices Review 2018/19

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the Officer's report was to:

- a. Inform the Executive Councillor and Scrutiny Committee Members of the revised fixed penalty notice (FPN) levels for environmental crimes, namely commercial waste receptacles, flyposting, graffiti, that came into force under The Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalties) (England) Regulations 2017 (The 2017 Regulations) on the 1 April 2018; the revised FPN levels for community protection notices under the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (The 2014 Regulations); and the revised FPN levels for domestic waste offences as amended by the Deregulation Act 2015 (The 2015 Regulations).
- b. Seek authority to revise the current fixed penalty for offences related to commercial waste receptacles, flyposting, graffiti, community protection notice and domestic waste offences to the new legal maximum FPN level; and to give a discount of 40% (i.e. discounted fine value) for early payment provided payment is made within 10 days of the date the FPN was issued.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces

Agreed to adopt the new legal maximum fixed penalty notice (FPN) level for offences related to commercial waste receptacles, flyposting, graffiti, community protection notice and domestic waste offences and to give a discount of 40% (i.e. discounted fine value), for early payment provided payment is made within 10 days of the date the FPN was issued, as detailed in the following table.

Offence	Maximum new fine level	Proposed discounted fine level	Summary of proposed fine amendment
Commercial waste receptacles	£110	£66	Increase of £10 to maximum fine level and £6 to discounted fine level
Flyposting	£150	£90	Increase of £75 to maximum fine level and setting of a discounted fine level
Graffiti	£150	£90	
Community protection notices	£100	£60	Increase of £40 to maximum fine level and £10 to discounted fine level
Domestic waste offences	£80	£48	Setting of a maximum and

Matter for Decision

Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 provides that in respect of the charges for Hackney Carriages, the Council “may fix the rates or fares within the district as well for time as distance, and all other charges in connection with the hire of a vehicle...by means of a table”.

The existing Table of Fares came into effect on the 13th January 2018.

On 29th August 2018 Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd (CCLT) requested a Fare Increase of 2.74%. Subsequent discussions with CCLT confirmed they would be willing to use the current Consumer Price Index when determining the fare increase.

The correspondence received made a further request regarding fare increase; that Cambridge City Council undertakes an automatic annual review of Hackney Carriage Fares, on a set date, without a request to do so being submitted.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and City Centre

- i. Considered the fare charge increase requested and determined it was appropriate to consult on the proposed fares in Appendix C with the increase taking effect from 1 April 2019.
- ii. Agreed to implement an automatic annual fare review in line with the Consumer Price Index at that time and delegated this annual review and implementation to the Head of Environmental Services on condition that:
 - a. The consultation takes place in early March each year with the adopted fares coming into effect from 1st April each year.
 - b. The rate of fare increase be based on the Consumer Price Index rate published by the Bank of England on 1 March each year, and then rounded to a practical figure.
 - c. Any future request for an increase greater than Consumer Price Index be decided by the Executive Councillor.

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 Environmental Health Manager.

The Environmental Health Manager said future tariffs would rise in-line with the Bank of England Consumer Price Index. If there was a change to this process, and the Consumer Price Index was not to be used, this would be reported back to the committee.

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.

19/7/EnC Charter For Cleaner Air

Matter for Decision

A new charter for cleaner air has been launched by Oxford City Council, Greenpeace UK, and Friends of the Earth, calling on the United Kingdom (UK) Government to place the health of communities first.

The Charter for Cleaner Air, was created by Oxford City Council with the support of the UK100 Clean Air, Clean Cities Network, of which the Cambridge City Council is a member. It is the first formal cooperation with Greenpeace UK and Friends of the Earth (EWNI) (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) to be led by a local authority.

The purpose of the Charter is to maintain pressure on central government to take steps to reduce illegal levels of air pollution and to recognise the crucial role local authorities play in this area by providing them with adequate funding, powers and new legislation to be able to fulfil their role and deliver local air quality action plans and other actions.

The City Council was recommended to sign up to the Charter to make clear to government that air quality remains an area of concern that needs central policy and funding support to deliver effectively at a local level. The Charter provided a reasoned set of steps Government could take to support local authorities working to deliver cleaner air.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental Services

and City Centre

To sign up to the Oxford Charter for Cleaner Air on behalf of Cambridge City Council.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Environmental Quality & Growth Manager.

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

- i. Welcomed the report.
- ii. Central Government should be lobbied to take action and have more ambitious clean air targets.
- iii. The Council should look for where pollution could come from in future to monitor air quality changes.

The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The National Clean Air Strategy was launched 14 January 2019. It picked up some points from the Charter for Clean Air, but did not commit to meet them, only work towards them.
- ii. Cities coming together put pressure on Central Government to do more in future.
- iii. The Council was monitoring where pollution could come from in future. For example taxi emissions and the area around Cambridge Railway station. This would provide an evidence base to Central Government to tackle air quality in future.
- iv. Principles were fixed in the Charter for Clean Air. If another city (eg Oxford) changed their principles, Cambridge would not need to change too.

The Executive Councillor said:

- i. The National Clean Air Strategy was not as hard hitting as she would like.
- ii. The Charter for Clean Air was needed to lobby Central Government to take more action.

- iii. The Charter had been adopted by Labour controlled councils so far. Hopefully others would follow in future.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/8/EnC To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Communities: Outcome of Cambridge Live Review

Scrutiny Considerations

Councillor McGerty proposed and Councillor Martinelli seconded the following motion. This was in effect a proposal on what they believed should happen, as there was no decision to be made or to amend.

“Committee welcomes the emergency protection provided to the Cambridge Live programme and its customers, given the projected financial losses which jeopardised its future solvency, by returning it in-house to the council.

Recognising the substantial potential public cost of this rescue and the need to decide whether Cambridge Live should in future continue in-house or be re-launched as an independent organisation (as is successful in many other places), it is important to properly understand what went wrong in Cambridge Live and in the Council’s relationship with it, both as its founding sponsor and major partner and customer.

We therefore request officers to recommend terms of reference for a cross party members’ Inquiry addressing these issues.”

Councillor Cantrill addressed the Committee and said:

- i. Cambridge Live made an important contribution to cultural provision to the city.
- ii. The City Council externalised Cambridge Live to allow it to provide cultural activities more flexibly, and to access funding sources not directly under council control.
- iii. Residents supported the Cambridge Live cultural offer but did not think the council should subsidise it.

- iv. The City Council had decided to bring Cambridge Live back under its control.
- v. The City Council should prioritise on-going Cambridge Live activities and protect jobs.
- vi. The City Council was committing £750,000 as a one-off payment to Cambridge Live, which was a significant sum. Councillor Cantrill queried how much more funding would be committed in future.
- vii. The City Council's (financial) circumstances had materially changed over four years (since Cambridge Live was externalised). It had fewer staff and resources.
- viii. It was critical to learn lessons that led to this position as the City Council had a number of arms-length organisations providing services (eg housing).

The Chief Executive made the following points:

- i. The City Council decided to bring Cambridge Live back in-house through an urgent decision in December 2018.
- ii. The priority at the moment was to stabilise the organisation and manage the transition well. This would take resources.
- iii. A decision would be taken in future on what to do in the long term. A report would be brought back to Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee.
- iv. It was not the right time for a member led enquiry as there were insufficient officer resources to support such an enquiry, on top of everything else.

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

- i. The issue was what the Council wanted to do with Cambridge Live in future and investigate why issues arose.
- ii. Members had sought reassurance in June 2018 that Cambridge Live would not need additional funding in addition to £500,000 allocated at that time.
- iii. Taking Cambridge Live in-house did not ensure problems would go away in future.
- iv. Forward looking scrutiny was required. Opposition Councillors had been asked to support Cambridge Live with significant funding but were given little information on why this was needed.
- v. Councillors accepted that Officers were working hard to stabilise Cambridge Live. They were happy for the motion to be amended so that the Councillor led enquiry happened at some point in future.

Labour Councillors made the following comments in response to the motion:

- i. The City Council had to step in to support Cambridge Live.
- ii. The £500,000 awarded to Cambridge Live in 2018 was unspent. It was awarded on condition, which was not fulfilled, so the money was not released. This was now available to help set up the in-house service.
- iii. The Council would review what happened to date, but at a suitable point in future after stabilising Cambridge Live.
- iv. Information would become available once Cambridge Live transferred back to the council. This should improve transparency in future, but issues may take longer to resolve.
- v. Officers had provided as much information as they could for the committee to scrutinise.

In response to Members' questions, officers said the following:

- i. Head of Community Services: £750,000 had been allocated to Cambridge Live. £500,000 was intact and unspent. £250,000 would be earmarked for one-off costs associated with the transfer and additional funds to fully address the balance sheet issues at the point of transfer.
- ii. Culture and Community Manager: Cambridge Live accountancy information had been received. This had been used to put together a business plan that only used funding already allocated. The plan had been checked by Pricewaterhouse Coopers.

The Executive Councillor said:

- i. She welcomed stakeholders' positivity in wanting to keep the Cambridge Live cultural offer for the city.
- ii. The Council had planned to outsource the city cultural offer through Cambridge Live. The Council had not expected that the service would have to be brought back in-house to ensure it continues.
- iii. Supported the Chief Executive's view that it was not appropriate to hold a Member led review now.
- iv. Liberal Democrat and Labour were working together in a non-political way to support Cambridge Live.
- v. Was unable to guarantee the amount of funding that would need to be budgeted in future, but £750,000 was the total sum needed by the Council to address the transfer.

The motion was lost by 4 votes to 5.

The record of decision was noted.

19/9/EnC Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy

Matter for Decision

The Council's Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy sets out the Council's commitment to promoting equality and diversity, including through its role as an employer and a provider of services to the public. A revised and updated version of the policy was presented for approval at the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee on 4 October 2018. The Officer's report provided feedback from consultation carried out related to the impacts of the changes, and identified how the Policy would be applied in practice at service level.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

The Executive Councillor approved the approach to implementing the revised Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy, as set out in section 6.0 of the officer's report, subject to amendments that:

- It is not the Council's intention to allow non-disabled people to access the disabled changing facilities at any City Council-owned leisure centres (as referred to in 6.12 of the Officer's report).
- The planned facilities audit will also explore options for greater privacy for non-disabled people when getting changed at Kings Hedges Learner Pool and Cherry Hinton Village Centre, where existing female and male changing rooms are open plan.

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 Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer who set out how the Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy would be applied at a service level based on consultation feedback. The Officer clarified that the report presents the council's current approach to applying the Policy related to single sex services and facilities, based on the evidence that is currently available. The approach to applying the Policy would be kept under review. Any requests to apply the service and employment exceptions in the Equality Act 2010 would be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account any new evidence or adverse impacts identified to other protected characteristic groups.

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

- i. The Council had a good equalities policy but questioned the writing style. Opposition Councillors expressed concern that the council had presented its policies using incorrect terminology. They took issue with some phraseology in both the committee report and the prefix used for a public speaker in the 4 October 2018 Scrutiny Committee minutes. In relation to the report, they challenged the use of the terms 'women' and 'men', instead of 'cis women' and 'cis men', and 'transsexual women' and 'transsexual men'. Opposition Councillors queried how transgender people could have faith in the council if it could not get its terminology correct.

All Committee Members supported the principle that council terminology should be correct to avoid causing offence or a sense of exclusion.

The Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer said it was not the intention to offend transgender people. The committee report used terminology of the Equality Act 2010 because the report sets out how the Council in practice will meet its legal commitments reflected in the Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy. The Equalities Impact Assessment at Appendix B referred to 'cis women', 'cis men' and 'transgender people' in acknowledgement that these are terms used by organisations the council consulted with that support equalities groups.

The Chief Executive undertook to write to the member of the public on behalf of the City Council to apologise for the mistake in the minute of the last meeting.

The Executive Councillor also apologised and said there was no intention to cause offence. Council terminology would be reviewed in future and she would ask officers to develop an updated style guide to ensure correct terminology was used.

- ii. Supported the proposal for cubicles (for privacy) in male showers that were currently open plan in Abbey Leisure Complex, Cherry Hinton Village Leisure Centre, Kings Hedges Learner Pool and Parkside Pools.
- iii. Expressed concern that non-disabled people could access the disabled changing facilities at City Council-owned leisure centres (as referred to in 6.12 of the Officer's report). It would reduce disabled people's access to changing facilities if able-bodied people are provided with permission to access disabled facilities.

The Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer said that after consideration the council would amend the report to remove non-disabled peoples' access to disabled facilities. The recommendation would be amended as follows:

The Executive Councillor is recommended to approve the approach to implementing the revised Comprehensive Equalities and Diversity Policy, as set out in section 6.0 of the officer's report, **subject to amendments that:**

- **It is not the Council's intention to allow non-disabled people to access the disabled changing facilities at any City Council-owned leisure centres (as referred to in 6.12 of the Officer's report).**
- **The planned facilities audit will also explore options for greater privacy for non-disabled people when getting changed at Kings Hedges Learner Pool and Cherry Hinton Village Centre, where existing female and male changing rooms are open plan.**

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation as amended.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/10/EnC Community Grants 2019-20

Matter for Decision

The annual report for the Community Grants fund for voluntary and community sector (VCS) organisations provided a brief overview of the process, eligibility criteria, budget, applications received and recommendations for 2019-20 awards.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2019-20, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report, subject to the budget approval in February 2019 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.

- ii. Allowed Safer Communities to retain £10,000 (previously allocated to area committee grants) to enable the Council to respond to community priorities as they arise.

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 Community Funding and Development Manager.

The Community Funding and Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisations was the lead organisation for Support Cambridge. Although based in Huntingdon it was looking to do something specific for Cambridge City. Hence the funding bid. Details would be available in future.
- ii. The formula for area committee allocations goes back to the start of the programme circa 2003. Funding was split proportionally to wards and based on their population numbers. Details on how funding was allocated could be included in future reports.

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.

19/11/EnC S106 Sporting contribution update**Matter for Decision**

To approve the allocations of generic S106 developer contributions for Indoor Sports and Swimming funds towards new projects within the City, aligned with the Indoor Sports and Swimming Pool investment strategies.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Approved the allocation of generic s106 developer contributions towards the following projects that have been identified within the Indoor and Swimming Pool Strategies:

- i. £230,000 of swimming S106 contributions towards the Abbey Pool improvement project, subject to full business case approval.
- ii. Up to £45,000 of additional Indoor Sports S106 contributions towards the new Gym and Studio and Changing Room refurbishment at Netherhall Academy.

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 Community, Sport & Recreation Manager.

The Community, Sport & Recreation Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Water based play equipment was to be provided for disabled children to access in the Abbey Pool project. The proposed slide could be accessed by a lift to the first floor.
- ii. A dedicated 6 hours per week were scheduled into daytime for use by Exercise Referral clients only, and these would be specially staffed sessions which met the safeguarding requirements for use of the new gym during curricular hours, all other public access is outside of School hours.
- iii. Leisure facility providers monitored air quality in the pool halls eg the smell of chlorine, but officers could look at more detailed air quality monitoring within these environments.
- iv. There is a legally binding community use agreement in place with all funded Academy's to ensure school facilities that received funding were available for community use. There is a funding clawback clause if the Academy's did not fulfil these community use obligations.

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.

19/12/EnC Review Of Use Of The Regulation Of Investigatory Powers Act**Matter for Decision**

A Code of Practice introduced in April 2010 recommends that Councillors should review their authority's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and set its general surveillance policy at least once a year. The Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation and Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee last considered these matters on the 22 January 2018.

The City Council has not used surveillance or other investigatory powers regulated by RIPA since February 2010.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Reviewed the Council's use of RIPA set out in paragraph 3.5 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted and endorsed the steps described in paragraph 3.7 and in Appendix 1 to ensure that surveillance is only authorised in accordance with RIPA.
- iii. Approved the general surveillance policy in Appendix 1 to 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 Head of Legal Practice.

In response to the report Councillor O'Connell said she was glad the Council had not used its RIPA powers.

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 7.40 pm

CHAIR