

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 16 January 2020  
5.00 - 6.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Smart (Chair), Barnett (Vice-Chair), Collis, Hadley, Martinelli, Payne, Sheil and Summerbell

Executive Councillors: Massey (Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

**Officers:**

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré

Head of Legal Practice: Tom Lewis

Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager: Wendy Johnston

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Safer Communities Manager Lynda Kilkelly

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**20/1/EnC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Davies. Councillor Sheil attended as the Alternate.

**20/2/EnC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Hadley	20/5/EnC	Personal: Worked at the Fitzwilliam Museum, which is part of the University of Cambridge Museums, who had made a successful funding application.

**20/3/EnC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**20/4/EnC Public Questions**

A public question was asked under minute item 20/6/EnC.

**20/5/EnC Community Grants 2020-21**

Councillor Hadley took part in the debate on this item, but did not vote due to her declaration of interest.

**Matter for Decision**

This is the annual report for the Community Grants fund for voluntary, community, and not for profit organisations. It provides an overview of the process, eligibility criteria and budget.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2020-21, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report, subject to the budget approval in February 2020 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.

**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. People were supported and guided through the application process.
- ii. Workshops were held before the current funding application cycle started. Information and advice was given on funding available, plus

- signposts to alternative funding streams if these appeared more appropriate for applicants.
- iii. Officers continued to offer support to people after they submitted applications. Officers involved in the process came from the Communities Team, as well as others, who could provide expert advice to check if projects were pertinent for funding.
  - iv. Officers did not just say “no” to applications, they tried to ascertain if community funding or another fund was more appropriate.
  - v. Applicants could reapply several times in the same funding cycle if they were unsuccessful on the first attempt.
  - vi. There were several projects to help people get into volunteering. A fund was available to provide help/training to do this. Training/supervision of volunteers could be issues that affected recruitment/retention. The City Council was working with the Council for Voluntary Services to address this.
  - vii. The same application process applied to new Applicants and those who had previously made applications. New Applicants were encouraged to liaise with Officers who could then support them through the application process.
  - viii. Different levels of information were sought from Applicants depending on the level of funding applied for.
  - ix. Funding was not allocated to projects where:
    - a. They were not appropriate for the funding stream.
    - b. They were duplicates of an existing project.
    - c. There was insufficient information on the application form.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 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.

### **20/6/EnC Walking Tours**

#### **Public Question**

A member of the public made the following points:

- i. The report showed that the council was listening to residents’ concerns about walking tours.

- ii. Expressed interest in how the City Council planned to manage the tour coaches, parking locations and reduce visitor groups to a maximum of 20 people.
- iii. Requested a pilot study at Madingley P&R and Cambridge North rail station for range of coach-users: language school pupils, conference groups, tourists, school parties.
- iv. Recommendations to Executive Councillor:
  - a. *Point 2:* Alongside the ongoing monitoring of the situation, would the council include a pilot study with the County using, eg Madingley P&R site for coach parking?
  - b. *Point 4:* It seems a little vague and non-committal to recommend a continued dialogue with the County when this has already commenced. Will alternative parking locations to Queens Road as drop-off points be explored?

The Executive Councillor said a pilot study would be welcome. The County Council were responsible so the City Council would try to influence them.

The Safer Communities Manager said she had looked at the issue of walking tours from a community safety point of view. There was no evidence of safety issues, so this was more of a city centre management issue than a nuisance enforcement one.

The member of the public made the following supplementary points

- i. Sought a way to limit group numbers to 20, particularly groups from coach tours.
- ii. Facilities in the city centre would not be able to match those at a P&R site eg a ticket booth and timed visit slots.
- iii. The City Council could work with the County Council, but the City Council should take urgent action now for reasons of air quality and public safety.
- iv. Queried if points could be reported to the Head of Environmental Services to incorporate into the Tourism Strategy.

### **Matter for Decision**

At the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee of 27 June 2019, the Executive Councillor approved a recommendation to monitor the situation with regards to how walking tours were sold. Also to monitor the frequency of excessively large tour groups in the city centre, including on King's Parade during the summer, by:

- i. Advising coach companies and tour groups and other organisations hosting large visitor groups that the City Council supports a maximum of 20 people in any single group, and
- ii. Reviewing the issue of walking tour groups and reporting to Committee in January 2020 if the problem of large walking tour groups persists, including considering the option of consulting on a Public Spaces Protection Order and other options to set a maximum tour group size if there is assessed to be a serious problem.

Following the approval of the recommendation, a Working Group was set up to look at possible solutions to the issues raised in relation to walking tours. The Group included representation from the City Council's Community Safety Team, Corporate Marketing, Streets and Open Spaces, Property Services, Legal Practice and (externally) Visit Cambridge and Beyond and Cambridge BID.

The Officer's report detailed the actions considered by the Working Group and recommendations for the future.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety**

Agreed to:

- i. Officially request Visit Cambridge and Beyond to include the management of walking tours in the development of their Destination Management Plan (DMP).
- ii. Approve the continuation of the monitoring of the sale and size of walking tours during the 2020 season in order to inform the development of the DMP.
- iii. Continue the dialogue with the County Council to examine the possibilities of coach permit parking in the city to include conditions to limit the numbers in any tour group.
- iv. Start a dialogue with the County Council to consider making park and ride sites more attractive to coach tours and to include incentives to direct groups from the sites to official walking tours of limited numbers.
- v. Use the outcomes from the negotiations to inform the development of the DMP.

### **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 Safer Communities Manager.

The Safer Communities Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The issue of group size had been reviewed from a community safety point of view. There was no evidence of anti-social behaviour. The Working Group discussed the introduction of a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) but considered this to be an inappropriate way to manage walking tours as the issues raised (such as the size and inconvenience caused by the tours) were unlikely to fit the criteria for the introduction of a PSPO. Also the Working Group believed it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to enforce.
- ii. There was disagreement on the effectiveness of parking permits to control coach parking. The County Council said that permits were not respected. The Working Group said parking control would be respected. Officers would follow this up.
- iii. Cambridge Ambassadors were asked to monitor walking tour group sizes during the tourist season, but this ceased when tourist numbers dropped out of season. Monitoring could resume in the new tourist season.
- iv. A limit of 20 people in a group was set in-line with Blue Badge tour group size guidance.

The Head of Community Services said points from this discussion would be recorded in the meeting minutes and forwarded to the Head of Environmental Services (City Council) and Head of Tourism and City Centre Management (Tourist Information).

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.

**20/7/EnC Review of Public Spaces Protection Order for Dog Control**

### **Matter for Decision**

The Public Spaces Protection Order (Dog Control) 2017 (“Order”) is due to expire on the 19 October 2020. At any point before expiry of the Order, the Council can vary or extend it by up to three years if they consider it is necessary to prevent the original behaviour from occurring or recurring.

The Officer’s report revisited the terms of the sealed Order (Appendix A), and asked the Executive Councillor to approve, in principle, the proposal to extend and vary the Order in respect of dog control (including dog fouling, dog exclusion, dogs on leads and restriction on number of dogs requirements) within Cambridge, in the form set out at Appendix B and the locations set out in Appendix C; and to authorise officers to publicise the proposed orders and to consult, as required by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (“The Act”).

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety**

- i. Approved in principle, the proposal to extend and vary the Order for dog control within Cambridge in the form set out at Appendix B [of the Officer’s report] and the locations set out in Appendix C;
- ii. Authorised officers to publicise the proposed orders and to carry out consultation as required by the Act.

### **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 Engagement and Enforcement Manager who corrected a typographical error in paragraph 1.1:

The Public Spaces Protection Order (Dog Control) 2017 (“Order”) is due to expire on the 19 October 2019 **2020**.

In response to the report Councillors sought clarification on the community survey. The Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager said that the previous consultation survey had been sent to stakeholders in electronic format (Survey Monkey) and was available in hard copy format. It was sent to resident groups, charities and voluntary groups who used or were involved with dogs. The survey was also distributed via community centres, the City

Council website and social media. It was proposed that this consultation would also do use the same methods.

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.

## **20/8/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 External Partnerships and Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee last considered these matters on the 17 January 2019.

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

This report sets out the Council's use of RIPA and the present surveillance policy.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety**

- 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 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 Head of Legal Practice.

The Head of Legal Practice said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was good practice (for transparency reasons) for a report to come to committee even if RIPA powers were not used.
- ii. There were no cost implications to the City Council from having RIPA powers. It was something to keep in the locker in case powers were needed.

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 6.00 pm

**CHAIR**