

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2 July 2020
5.00 - 7.15 pm

Present: Councillors Smart (Chair), Davies (Vice-Chair), Barnett, Collis, Hadley, Matthews, McGerty and Payne

Executive Councillors: Massey (Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety), Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Head of Commercial Services: James Elms

Head of Shared Waste Service: Trevor Nicoll

Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager: Wendy Johnston

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer: Helen Crowther

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

20/10/EnC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Summerbell. Councillor McGerty was present as the alternate.

20/11/EnC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Payne	20/22/EnC	Personal: Liberal Democrat Group nominee for Community Forum Chair.
Councillor Smith	20/22/EnC	Personal: Labour Group nominee for Community Forum Chair.

20/12/EnC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January and 28 May 2020 were approved as a correct record.

20/13/EnC Public Questions

There were no public questions.

To Note Record of Urgent Decisions by the Strategic Director

20/14a Action to Support Market Traders

The decision was noted.

20/14b Action to Support Street Traders

The decision was noted.

20/14c Grant to Cambridge Community Foundation Coronavirus Fund

The decision was noted.

Councillor Payne asked what would happen to unspent funding. The Strategic Director said the situation was being reviewed and options would be considered.

20/14d Grant to Support Visit Cambridge and Beyond Whilst it Develops a Business Plan

The decision was noted.

20/14e Addition Financial Support to GLL During Covid Suspension of Facilities

The decision was noted.

To Note Record of Urgent Decision by the Head of Environmental Services

20/15a Actions to Support the Market During the Covid-19 Outbreak

The decision was noted.

Re-Ordering Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety

20/16/EnC Review of Public Spaces Protection Order for Dog Control

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report:

- i. Referenced the statutory consultation exercise conducted by the Council during March and April 2020 in relation to the proposal to extend and vary the Public Spaces Protection Order ('PSPO') for Dog Control 2017 in respect of dog control (including dog fouling, dog exclusion and dogs on leads requirements) within Cambridge.
- ii. Referenced responses to consultation and main substantive issues raised
- iii. Set out recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Council had given careful consideration to the responses to the consultation exercise. The PSPO, as varied and extended, was not put forward as a means of unduly restricting the exercising or recreation of dogs across the city. The reason for the PSPO was to address the detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality caused by the irresponsible behaviour of a small minority of dog owners; and to set out a clear standard of behaviour to which all dog owners were required to adhere.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety

- i. Approved the PSPO, as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
 - Approved the area of the PSPO, as indicated in the maps at Appendix B of the Officer's report.
 - Delegated to officers the authority to install, update and/or remove signage appropriate to any PSPO that may be agreed.

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. She updated paragraph 3.33 of the report as follows:

Following the fairly equal response regarding removal of previous restrictions at the play areas set out in 3.31, officers recommend that the areas detailed should ~~not~~ have the existing restrictions removed and the

areas continue to be locations in which dogs are required to be on leads at all times.

The Community Engagement and Enforcement Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. As part of the consultation process signs had been put up in parks and open spaces advising of a consultation to variation an extension to the 2017 PSPO.
- ii. A consultation exercise had also undertaken so that local residents could feedback on the proposals. 267 had done so, which was comparable to the 330 responses in last consultation of 2017.
- iii. Officers had tried to contact people who walked dogs commercially [usually individuals rather than companies] about the proposals and to seek their views. .
- iv. The Wildlife Trust had also previously been approached.
- v. The PSPO recommendation regarding Byrons Pool and the restriction of the number of dogs followed national guidance that:
 - a. One person should be limited to having a maximum of four dogs on leads at any one time in order to be able to control them.
 - b. Walkers should tidy up after their dogs.

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.

Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

20/17/EnC Decarbonising Cambridge City Council Vehicle Fleet

Matter for Decision

Cambridge City Council declared a climate emergency in February 2019. The Council is keen to reduce its own emissions as close to zero as possible, as soon as is feasible; within the resourcing, technological and service obligation constraints it works within. The Council's vehicle fleet of 113 vehicles currently accounts for 24% of all the council's emissions. We have been incrementally moving our fleet from internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles to ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEV) over recent years and currently there are 10 electric

vans. Of the remainder 41 of the diesel/petrol fleet are Ultra Low Emission Zone compliant and 10 have stop/start technology. The climate emergency creates an imperative to accelerate that transition, and this paper sets out a road map to achieve that.

The Decarbonising Cambridge City Council Vehicle Fleet paper appended to the Officer's report set out the approach to decarbonising Cambridge City Council's vehicle fleet, seeking to commit to replace old vehicles with ULEVs whenever possible.

A key enabler for the transition to ULEVs is the provision of suitable solution infrastructure primarily based at the depot location.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

Agreed to:

- i. Acknowledge the opportunities and detriments when converting to ULEVs as set out in the appended Decarbonising Cambridge City Council Vehicle Fleet paper.
- ii. Endorse the recommended approach notably:
 - The key area for action is a formal commitment to always, where there is a suitable ULEV alternative and the infrastructure allows, to procure ULEVs when replacing Council vehicles.
 - Where there is no ULEV alternative possible then this is only to be procured after a detailed business case has been written.
 - That services will actively monitor the usage of their vehicle assets and, through service reviews, seek to streamline the way work is carried out, with the twin aims of cutting carbon emissions and increasing service efficiency via a decrease in the miles driven, and over time, a decrease in the total number of vehicles required.

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 Commercial Services.

The Head of Commercial Services said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There were no plans to purchase ULEVs in 2021-22, unless they were needed to replace existing ICE vehicles as a matter of urgency eg they were unsafe or there was a justifiable business case to support any new purchase.
- ii. In order to manage the impact on the public purse, ICE vehicles would be replaced with ULEVs and electric vehicles, plus supporting infrastructure such as charging points, in incremental stages rather than through wholesale change [ie all vehicles at once]. The procurement of electric vehicle infrastructure was complex.
- iii. Vehicles would be replaced as and when needed at the end of their working life cycle. By replacing vehicles at the end of their life cycle, their full capital value could be realised. If the council replaced ICE vehicles with ULEVs mid-life cycle, the full financial and environmental cost savings may not be realised, so the council may in fact not realise its aim of saving money and carbon emissions by changing vehicles too early.
- iv. At the time of writing, the Office for Low Emission Vehicles provided a discount on the price of brand new low-emission vehicles through a grant the government gives to vehicle dealerships and manufacturers. The Council's Scientific Officer could provide further information on this upon request.
- v. Electric vehicles had not been in service for 12 years, so it was hard to compare them with the 6 years service life span expected from ICE vehicles. However, 12 years seemed probable.
- vi. There were fewer moving parts in electric vehicles compared to ICE ones, so they should have a longer working life span.
- vii. There were no ULEV vehicle alternatives to a limited number of ICE vehicles such as cherry pickers. Where there is no ULEV alternative possible, then an ICE vehicle would be procured after a detailed business case has been written [to evidence that an alternative was not available].

Councillor Matthews proposed a new [additional] recommendation 2.3:

Sign up to Global Action Plan's "Clean Van Commitment", which publicly pledges the Council to move to a zero emission fleet by 2028.

<https://www.globalactionplan.org.uk/clean-air/clean-van-commitment>

The Executive Councillor said she was happy with existing recommendation wording and actions taken by the council to decarbonise the city. There

seemed no point in replacing serviceable ICE vehicles with ULEVs until they were at the end of their life cycle.

Councillor Matthews withdrew his proposal after a discussion by committee where the Executive Councillor welcomed the idea to work with Councillor Matthews and officers in future on ways to decarbonise the city. She would look at details then consider what to sign up to in future.

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.

20/18/EnC Greater Cambridge Waste Service - Annual Report

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report summarised the performance of the Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service during 2019/20.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

Noted the content of 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 Head of Shared Waste Service.

The Head of Shared Waste Service said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Recycling rates were still around 50% as organic waste was mixed in with other waste, so it was hard to increase the recycling rate when non-recyclable items were mixed in.
- ii. Measures were put in place to mitigate this:

- a. Education schemes and food waste schemes were in place to encourage people not to put certain items in black bins.
- b. Extra blue bins were offered to residents to encourage them not to put items in black bins when the first blue bin was full.
- c. Encouraging people to think before they bought [food] items to avoid buying too much and then throwing it away.

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.

20/19/EnC To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

20/19a Shared Waste Service Business Plan 2020/21

The decision was noted.

Decisions for the Executive Councillor for Communities

20/20/EnC Anti-Poverty Strategy 2020-2023

Matter for Decision

The Council has produced two previous Anti-Poverty Strategies covering the periods from 2014-2017 and 2017-2020. The Officer's report provided an update on delivery of key actions included in the 2017-2020 Strategy.

The Officer's report also presented a revised Anti-Poverty Strategy for the 2020-2023 period for approval.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Approved the revised Anti-Poverty Strategy for 2020-2023 and the accompanying action 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 Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

The Strategy and Partnerships Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. 74 employers had been accredited as paying a living wage out of 4,400 across the city. Residents were also being paid a living wage by some employers who did not have the accreditation.
- ii. Larger employers had been approached first. Small and medium employers were next.
- iii. In order to be accredited, companies would have to sign up to paying a living wage to employees and contractors.
- iv. A lot of dedicated work had been put into the Living Wage Campaign. A lot of 1-2-1 work and networking at business conferences was required with employers to convince them of the need. More work was required but the living wage featured prominently in the Anti-Poverty Strategy.
- v. More people were attending food banks. The City Council was part of the food poverty alliance. This funded work through grants to city residents. Work was ongoing during the corona virus pandemic.
- vi. There was a bid in the council's Budget Setting Report for a project to establish a food hub in the city with voluntary groups.
- vii. It was hard to quantify the impact of Universal Credit on residents. Stakeholders had raised issues with officers about being responsible for managing their own personal budgets; this was difficult if one was not experienced. Officers could offer support to try and avoid people experiencing financial difficulties and rent arrears.

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.

20/21/EnC Single Equality Scheme 2018 - 2021 Annual Review Year Two

Matter for Decision

The current Single Equality Scheme (SES) covers the period from 2018 to 2021. The council produces an SES in order to set out its strategic approach to equalities issues. The SES included a number of equalities objectives for the

Council, which was a key requirement of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010).

This annual report presented information to demonstrate compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty by providing an update on progress in delivering key actions set in SES for 2019/20. It also proposed some new actions for delivery during 2020/21 under the Scheme's objectives.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Noted the progress in delivering equalities actions during 2019/20 set out in the Officer's report.
- ii. Approved actions proposed in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report for delivery during 2020/21.

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.

The Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The council sets targets for and monitors the proportion of BAME and disabled people as a percentage of the workforce each year and produces the Equality in Employment report that is taken to the Equalities Panel.
- ii. The council is an accredited Disability Confident Employer.
- iii. The feasibility of offering unconscious bias training to managers was being looked into in relation to recruitment. It may be possible to offer similar training to councillors if there was demand.
- iv. Officers were trying to make the recruitment process simpler to help encourage equality of opportunity for all by the making application process more accessible and less prescriptive.
- v. Officers were reviewing why the number of successful BAME applicants for jobs did not reflect the percentage of BAME people who applied. The results of this would be reported back to the Equalities Panel in January 2021.

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.

20/22/EnC Appointment to Community Forums

Matter for Decision

The Executive Councillor was asked to appoint to two outside bodies.

North and North West Quadrant Community Forum

At the time of the Annual Meeting of committees when such appointments were usually made, there was a divergence of views on which Member should be appointed between the Groups on the Council with the minority group stating it should be a local councillor.

Environment Scrutiny Committee were asked to nominate a candidate as the matter could not be discussed at May 2020 Annual Council.

East Community Forum

This appointment was not included on the annual list of appointments. The Executive Councillor was asked to appoint a city councillor to it.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Approved appoints to two outside bodies:

- i. North and North West Quadrant Community Forum: Councillor Thornburrow
- ii. East Community Forum: Councillor Smith

Reason for the Decision

As set out on the agenda.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a verbal report from the Executive Councillor. She suggested rolling over Chairs from the previous municipal year for continuity, and that councillors should hold the positions of Chair.

The committee agreed and discussed the merits of candidates that were considered to be both experienced and hold an equal democratic mandate.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation of Councillor Smith to the East Community Forum.

Labour Councillors proposed the nomination of Councillor Thornburrow as the North and North West Quadrant Community Forum appointee.

Liberal Democrat Councillors proposed the nomination of Councillor Payne as the North and North West Quadrant Community Forum appointee.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 3 that Councillor Thornburrow be the North and North West Quadrant Community Forum appointee.

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.

20/23/EnC To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Communities

20/23a King's Hedges Family Support Group
The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

CHAIR