

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 1 July 2021
5.30 - 7.40 pm

Present: Councillors H. Davies (Chair), Healy (Vice-Chair), Ashton, S. Baigent, Copley, Gilderdale, Hauk, Payne, Porrer and Sheil

Executive Councillors: Collis (Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing) and Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Fiona Bryant

Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré

Biodiversity Officer: Guy Belcher

Waste Service Officer: Rebecca Weymouth Wood

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/25/EnC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors O'Reilly and Sweeney. Councillors Ashton and Gilderdale were present as Alternates.

Fiona Bryant attended as the Strategic Director instead of Suzanne Hemingway.

21/26/EnC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Copley	21/30/EnC	Personal: Employed by University of Cambridge.

21/27/EnC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2021 and 27 May 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/28/EnC Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

The Chair advised she would allocate thirty minutes for public speaking. Questions and answers that could not be covered in this time would still be recorded in the meeting minutes, questions that could not be answered in the meeting would receive a response by email.

1. Representative from FeCRA and Hills Road RA:

Visit Cambridge

- i. A new legal entity Visit Cambridge is being set up that will have decision making powers about Cambridge, the Cam & green spaces as a tourist destination. This organisation will be applying for central government grant funding and researching and pursuing donations from private foundations, philanthropic benefactors and heritage bodies and exploring crowd funding. Given the escalated complaint from Friends of the Cam and the unanswered questions about water and sewage how will the governance of this new entity work if Anglian Water, the councils' development partner, a member of Natural Capital East, who set up Water Resources East and is working with the councils, Natural Cambridgeshire and the Environment Agency on the Regional Water Plan, is pumping the Cam full of sewage?
- ii. For the Committee's attention. This extract is taken from <https://naturalcambridgeshire.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/DNIP-Scoping-Study-report.pdf>
- iii. The report was produced for the Defra Group OxCam Arc Local Natural Capital Plan team, Natural Cambridgeshire and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Natural Capital investment opportunities

- iv. Natural Capital East – Andrew Brown, Head of Sustainability, Anglian Water Services Ltd.
- v. Natural Capital East (NCE) are a reasonably new group of business-focussed organisations who want to work together and agree a narrative to take the right decisions, for the environment and business, effectively. It is mostly comprised of national and regional businesses; including Anglian Water, Nestle, National Grid, UK Power Networks, Barratt

Developments, Kier, Sainsbury's and Tarmac, but also includes the CPCA, OxCam Arc LNCP team, Highways England, Natural Cambridgeshire/DNIP, EA, New Anglia LEP, Paul Leinster, Water Resources East and National Trust.

- vi. Emerging from Anglian Water's environmental baseline and natural capital risk assessment work, they want to create an agreed set of regional metrics, a regional natural capital asset register and baseline. They hope that these will help us create a resilient framework for the future. However, with the recent progress of the Defra Group OxCam Arc LNCP team they might instead use their metrics, mapping and methodologies.
- vii. Extracts from the report are posted here
<https://www.fecra.org.uk/docs/Extracts%20from%20Natural%20Cambs%20Scoping%20Nature%20for%20Investment.pdf>

Councillor Davies said that questions regarding the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document should be directed to Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Details regarding Visit Cambridge governance arrangements were expected to be discussed by Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee in October 2021.
- ii. 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond' provided a visitor welcome organisation in the city and a walking tour service to promote/market Cambridge to areas outside of the city.
- iii. A new organisation was needed to replace 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond' as it had not survived lockdown.
- iv. A Destination Management Organisation was needed to manage visitor numbers to the city and their impact on it.
- v. A Destination Management Organisation eg 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond' needed to work with other companies such as bus companies on long term strategic work as it could not act on its own.

Supplementary question:

- i. Queried governance arrangements for, and management of, green spaces.

- ii. Expressed concern over impact of organisations on green spaces in the city. Rules and regulations were not being followed.
 - iii. Unanswered questions from residents to planners were reflected by the Environment Agency.
2. Raised the following points:
- i. The Council's failure to involve its public in the Market Square project over 3 years, both before and during Covid, shows a lack of concern for the people of Cambridge which is also evident in their lack of representation on Cambridge BID and in the proposed Visitor Welcome Project. Will the Council now act to change this proposal, and the BID, to ensure that Cambridge citizens have a voice in bodies which decide the future character of our City?
 - ii. Why is the Market Square consultation so disgracefully badly advertised? There are just 3 posters placed by the City Council, one within the market near the rubbish compactor, and 2 on the Guildhall Street flank of the Guildhall. Throughout the consultation there has been no City Council publicity within the Market Square to tell people walking around the market that the consultation is even happening.
 - iii. Why isn't the City Council consulting on the 2019 feasibility study and its recommendations, including its "repave, re-lay and de-clutter" option? This option includes the much-needed removal of the rubbish compactor. But what is also essential is long-overdue new canopies to the stalls.
 - iv. Why isn't the consultation including or taking account of the outputs from the November 2020 workshops?
 - v. Why is the consultation on demountable stalls being carried out separately and belatedly with the traders, when the demountable stalls are crucial to the whole vision and to the experience of the Market Square by everyone, traders, shoppers and public?
 - vi. The Vision is not a vision but an afterthought. It does not consider the current uses or future potential of buildings surrounding the Square. It treats Peas Hill as a dumping ground for cycle racks rather than as an opportunity for sunny pleasant seating. Removing cycle racks from the Market Square will inconvenience market shoppers, and is symptomatic of the way this project has prioritised visitors over residents.

- vii. The information provided in the Concept Design is totally inadequate and misleading in relation to the proposed flexible use. It does not show the type of stall now being proposed; include any toilet provision for evening events; or give any realistic indication of the logistics of changing from the daytime market to evening events. Will the Council now withdraw the current consultation until it has a broader Vision, and a credible proposal based on:
- a) assessment and evaluation of the trial stalls, in terms of their functionality for traders, their performance in the wind rose, and the logistics of taking down and setting up?
 - b) plus a thorough demand and feasibility assessment of what evening uses might be viable and how they might be accommodated with the default position being the continuation of the current 7 day a week traditional market?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. We were still in the early stages of the project.
- ii. Consultation was being undertaken on the strategic design of the market square, not the final design.
- iii. If the public supported the proposal then details such as materials would be reviewed before a consultation on the final design.
- iv. Two demountable stall designs were being considered. These were existing designs, the intention was to review their appropriateness before taking the risk of commissioning a (new) bespoke design.
- v. Officers were working with traders.
- vi. If the first stage of the consultation was positive, then a trial of the demountable stalls would be undertaken. If the design was unsuccessful then another would be used. The market square project would not move onto the next stage until the concept design and demountable stalls were considered acceptable/successful.
- vii. There had been extensive promotion of the consultation to the public including social media, news releases and notices in the market. The issue would be discussed at a special meeting of the Equality Panel to ensure the market was accessible to all.
- viii. Various networks and groups were invited to respond to the consultation.

- ix. Traders were engaged in the project from the outset. The public were consulted once a concept design was available.
- x. There was no consultation on how to use the market square as it will continue to be an area for a seven day a week market.

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. We have undertaken extensive promotion of the public consultation has using a variety of methods to reach the wider community. This has included:
 - a. News release prior to launch of public consultation with a further release towards the end of the period.
 - b. On-going social media and website content throughout consultation period.
 - c. Full page article in Cambridge Matters summer edition due on doorsteps circa 14 June 2021.
 - d. Poster's advertising consultation in various locations but include 24 of the council's distribution boards across the city, the market, car parks, the central library, food hubs and community centres.
 - e. Postcards placed in Shopmobility offices and on market stalls.
 - f. Engagement with families attending CHYPS school holiday activity programme, family support, Equalities and community groups.
 - g. Project to be discussed at special meeting of Equalities Panel.
 - h. Separate strands of engagement are being developed with the market traders predominantly based around their specific needs and the criteria for a demountable stall.
 - i. Posted on In Your Area website (Cambridge News) which reaches Cambridge, Newnham, Croft, Newnham, Arbury, Chesterton, Grantchester, Trumpington, Fen Ditton, Coton, Cherry Hinton, Girton, Teversham, Impington, Barton and Milton.
 - j. Posted on the Next-Door app.
- ii. Link to consultation and poster/postcard shared with requests made for them to share with their personal contacts and wider networks:
 - a. City and County Councillors.
 - b. Technical staff and staff whose role bring them into contact with the wider community.
 - c. Statutory organisations.

- d. University colleges as landlords
- e. Cambridge University Office of Public Affairs.
- f. Cambridge Network.
- g. Cambridge Ahead.
- h. Cambridge Market Traders Association.
- i. Cambridge Past Present and Future.
- j. Hobson's Conduit Trust.
- k. Historic England.
- l. Community organisations.
- m. Residents' groups.
- n. Ethnic minority community organisations.
- o. Equality groups.
- p. Women's groups.
- q. Cambridge Community Forum on Domestic and Sexual Violence/Abuse.
- r. Disability panel.
- s. Gypsy Council.
- t. Winter Comfort and Jimmy's night shelter (for the homeless).
- u. Students Unions for Cambridge University and Anglia Ruskin.
- v. Cambridge BID (shared with members and has left as an item on its weekly mail out).
- w. Form the Future.
- x. CCC Youth Panel and youth drama group.
- y. Society of Cambridge Tourist Guides.
- z. Taxi drivers.
- aa. Evening food traders.

This list was not exhaustive.

- iii. Organisational and trader stakeholders have been engaged from the outset of the project in 2018/19 and have helped to inform and shape the consultation draft vision and concept design. Engagement of the wider public was not felt to be appropriate or meaningful until the Council had a proposed vision and concept design to share for comment and feedback as part of a formal public consultation process. The online public consultation questionnaire survey was initially scheduled for 6 week period, ending 7th July 2021, but we have committed to extend it for a further three weeks to 31st July, to increase opportunities for those that

- have yet to participate in it and overlap with the planned demountable stall trial (which we aim to launch next week). All feedback will be considered as we begin to plan the detailed design phase of the project.
- iv. Output from the concept design stakeholder workshops that took place in November 2020 has been fed into the vision and concept design development process and will also be used to inform the demountable market stall trial considerations and, subject to Committee approval, detailed design phase of the project.
 - v. Although the proposed project concept design included two prototype demountable stall design options, Council officers have taken the decision to firstly re-assess whether there were any potentially suitable demountable stall designs already in production and use, before incurring the cost/ risk of commissioning a prototype design.
 - vi. To date, with the input of other markets who use demountable stalls, we have identified at least one supplier – City B Group – with a demountable stall product which we would like to trial. Working with market trader representatives, we have designed a two-stage trial process, supported by an agreed demountable stall brief and evaluation framework, which includes the following criteria:
 - a. ‘Quality’ (eg. durable, fire/ tear proof, robust fittings/ components).
 - b. ‘Practicality’ (eg. ease of put up/ take down/ transport (time taken/ number of people required) and storage needs; adaptable internal trading system for different business need (ie. hot food v retail v produce), able to accommodate electrics/ lighting).
 - c. ‘Weatherproof’ (ie. wind loading with suitable anchor system; waterproof).
 - d. Sustainability (ie. economic lifespan; environmental performance standard).
 - vii. The first stage trial, to commence in July, will involve hiring 1 or 2 demountable stall products, from each selected supplier, for a minimum two-week initial assessment to allow traders and shoppers to view and evaluate each supplier product.
 - viii. Subject to a positive first stage trial outcome, the second stage trial would involve selecting a preferred product supplier (or suppliers if more than one identified through the assessment process) for a full operational trial of the selected demountable stall system(s) over the remaining summer/ autumn/ winter period on the market square. The full trial

would involve hiring 5-10 stall systems, with alternative internal trading layouts (eg. clothing v hot food v fresh fruit and vegetable retail businesses) from the chosen supplier(s) and securing the agreement of different participating trader businesses to use the selected demountable stall system in place of their fixed stalls for a defined trial period.

- ix. Should the demountable stall trials prove unsuccessful in finding a workable design, we will revisit the proposed vision and concept design to consider how it could still be reasonably achieved, with either all non-demountable stalls or a combination of both demountable and non-demountable.
- x. At the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee of the 25 March 2021, Members agreed not to proceed to the detail design and associated planning application stage of the project, until the proposed vision and concept design public consultation has been completed; and results brought to and approved by that Committee. In accordance with this resolution, based on the current project plan, Council officers are currently committed to reporting back on the results of the consultation, including the initial demountable stall trial, at the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee in October 2021. At the end of the summer, we will review whether we feel the initial trial has been sufficiently robust to enable an informed Committee decision to be taken in October; or whether it needs to be deferred to a subsequent Committee meeting, either in January or March 2022.
- xi. Our vision is to secure multi-million pound capital investment to transform the market square into a multi-functional outdoor space, which continues to support a vibrant, successful and diverse seven day a week local outdoor market, but with an improved stall layout and design, which allows the square to be used by the community for other events and activities, both during the day (in and around the market) and into the evening. Identifying alternative places to store cycles and incorporate more seating are key objectives for the project.
- xii. Whilst two prototype demountable stall design options are included in the proposed Concept Design, we would like to consider commercially available products before incurring the risk and costs of commissioning a prototype design. We have identified a demountable market stall from City B Group and are currently planning a trial to test its suitability for use in Cambridge, in partnership with the market traders who have helped to

establish the evaluation criteria. The brief and supporting evaluation criteria will cover the following key elements:

- a. 'Quality' (eg. durable, fire/ tear proof, robust fittings/ components); 'practicality' (eg. ease of put up/ take down/ transport (time taken/ number of people required) and storage needs; adaptable internal trading system for different business need (ie. hot food v retail v produce), able to accommodate electrics/ lighting); 'weatherproof' (ie. wind loading with suitable anchor system; waterproof) and sustainability (ie. economic lifespan; environmental performance standard).
- xiii. No detailed market research or planning analysis has taken place yet for any evening use or events. This will be done as part of the next detailed planning stages (RIBA Stages 3 and 4 Spatial Coordination and Technical Design).

Supplementary question:

- i. Engagement of the wider public should have occurred sooner.
- ii. Expressed concern over a lack of public details regarding the agreed brief.
- iii. There was no indication of what could be accommodated in the market square in the timescale available.
- iv. There was nothing in the market square to say the area was being renovated.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Did not agree that traders were only being consulted now, they had been engaged from the outset of the project eg feasibility study workshops.
- ii. This project was about renovating the market and market square to make it a more enjoyable space to shop and work in.

3. Pesticide-Free Cambridge raised the following points via a written statement read by the Committee Manager:

- i. Q1 In light of the Council's commitment to phasing out herbicides (see key targets pp 58-59 in the Draft Biodiversity Strategy document,(1) the 2019 Pesticides motion as well as the Biodiversity and Climate

Emergency declarations, also 2019), will the council add an actual date by which it aims to complete this process?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. The Biodiversity Strategy is committing the City Council to working with the Pesticide Action Network to further reduce our use of pesticides and this will help us to identify a realistic and achievable target date for the City.
 - ii. There are a range of scenarios and circumstances that we need to research and understand, therefore the omission of a target date was considered appropriate for this Strategy consultation as the principles, themes and actions are where we are seeking feedback.
 - iii. A date in time will be agreed and made available once we have a more detailed understanding of the measures and activities we need to undertake. We would be happy to work with Pesticide Free Cambridge in achieving this.
-
- ii. Q2 Will the Council share and include details of which herbicide-free alternatives it has trialled already and which ones it is looking in to?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. We have stopped the use of herbicides on our parks and open space, we have reduced the use of herbicides on grass verges where we can, we are exploring alternatives such as a trial of a hot water system and foam options. We would be happy to share any findings once these trials are complete.
 - ii. With any alternative there are also environmental impacts, for example, use of water, the energy needed to heat the water or the residue effects of foam applications.
-
- iii. Q3 In the absence of a specific date to end herbicide use, and the fact that Pesticide-Free Cambridge has considerable local public support including several Residents Associations and Friends groups, while our petition has over 500 signatures,(2) and also because different methods may be called for in different areas, will the council agree to a trial, in the

upcoming spraying season, herbicide-free methods in selected wards with different demographics and social needs (e.g., Newnham and Arbury/Kings Hedges and/or Abbey) to see what works best in different contexts?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

This will be considered in the work we carry out with Pesticide Action Network, we may be able to consider such a request however any policy change of this type would need thorough consultation and an equalities impact assessment, before making a firm commitment.

- iv. Q4 In light of Ecological Public Health(3) arguments regarding the entwined human and environmental impacts of the destruction of nature and over-use of chemicals, together with robust evidence for the damaging impacts of herbicides on human health, and several successful court cases in recent years that have awarded damages to operatives injured through contact with glyphosate, will the council i) add explicit reference to the direct impact of pesticides on human health as well as air quality to its Biodiversity Strategy document which lacks any such emphases in its current form (although there are references to other sources of air pollution); ii) supply the spraying operatives with full PPE; iii) erect signage to indicate where spraying has taken place; iv) publish a schedule of when spraying will happen to alert the public? And v) conversely, erect signage in areas left unsprayed and unmown to let the public know this is being done for the benefit of biodiversity and public health (building therefore on existing plans outlined on p. 58 to '[raise] public awareness of ecologically sensitive weed management practices')?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. Potentially yes, and we would welcome any feedback to the Strategy through the consultation period.
- ii. City Council operatives currently applying herbicides and pesticides use PPE based on a Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) assessment. There is no requirement to sign areas where applications have taken place, however should the number of occasions reduce as

planned then signage could be resourced in some scenarios (e.g. Giant Hogweed or Japanese Knotweed), equally this could be the case for when treatments are scheduled (as we do with tree works).

- iii. To avoid visual clutter on our streets and open spaces our preference would be the use of the internet and social media to make people aware of areas where we do not treat weeds.

- v. Q5 The draft document (p. 59) refers to plans to encourage the Public to stop using pesticides in gardens, allotments and 'other' areas. Can the council clarify what they mean by 'other' areas and will this category include instances where private pesticide use (both herbicides and insecticides) impacts on public land either through drift, or through direct application of pesticides on public land? And by extension, if the Council is to stop using pesticides on land it owns or manages on behalf of the County Council, will it also prohibit the private use of pesticides on these areas, for example on pavements/roads that directly about private properties)?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. Other areas could be business, shop forecourts, pub gardens, restaurants, there are many permutations and situations where the City Council is not the landowner.
- ii. The Council has no powers to be able to stop private residents using licensed pesticides. We could consider a policy based on a position around no use of pesticides on City owned land by third parties, and this would need to be supported by an enforcement policy and any civil claim or action would have to be proportionate and reasonable. We cannot answer this question on behalf of the County Council who may take a different position.

- vi. Q6 In addition to committing to tackling public use of pesticides, will the Council also add explicit reference in its draft document to the need for it to work with local schools, businesses and the universities, so as to eliminate both herbicides and insecticides in these contexts too?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

The Council has a range of functions and therefore demands and draws on budget, the Council would welcome a discussion with Pesticide Free Cambridge to see how we can assist with achieving this request.

- vii. Q7 Will the council acknowledge the need to for clarity in terminology surrounding pesticides, and in particular with regards the distinction between 'plant protection chemicals' (both herbicides and insecticides used directly on plants whether on streets/pavements or in private/public green spaces) and pesticides used in outdoor and indoor estates and facilities contexts? All of the references to pesticides in current council documents refer solely to the former, with no consideration of non –plant-directed pesticides that also have a significant impact on both biodiversity and health. There is significant porosity between plant/non-plant, and outdoor/indoor boundaries, but moreover, these substances, and especially insecticide powders commonly applied around the outer peripheries of buildings to treat ants, carry far beyond their point of application, both inside and outside, through drift and footfall.

Reference:

1. <https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s55962/Appendix%20A%20%20Draft%20Biodiversity%20Strategy.pdf>
2. <https://www.change.org/p/cambridge-city-council-make-cambridge-pesticide-free>
3. Morris, G. & Saunders, P. 2017. [The Environment in Health and Well-being](#). Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Environmental Science; Rayner, G. & Lang, T. 2012. [Ecological Public Health: Reshaping the Conditions for Good Health](#). Oxford: Routledge.

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

We are happy to consider this request, along with feedback or supporting information received through the consultation. The mainstreaming biodiversity theme within the strategy seek to ensure all service are considering biodiversity in their activities and guidance to property managers may be appropriate. We will raise this within our discussion with Pesticide Action Network.

The following questions were not asked in committee but are included in the minutes for information.

4. In the published proposals, the Council use the phrase "as the owners of the market". If the market is a public space, used and occupied by members of the public, and the Council is a public body, made up of members of the public who are elected by the public on a rolling basis, isn't it a bit of a leap to conclude definitively that the Councillors can act as if they are owners of the square, in the same way as a private landlord can own a property? In short, my question is: "Who really owns the market?"

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

The City Council is the freehold owner of the central cobbled area of the square, ie. the space on which the outdoor market, managed by the Council (as the designated Market Authority for the City of Cambridge) is located. The surrounding road, ie. Market Hill, is adopted public highway and located on land owned in multiple ownership relating to the adjoining freehold properties, which adjoin in, including on its southern boundary, The Guildhall, which is also owned by the City Council. The outdoor market on market square was deemed to have been acquired by the council following the enactment of the Cambridge Corporation Act 1850 and Cambridge City Council Act 1985. While public space is created by governments and shaped by the realities of infrastructure, its meaning and use is determined by the public which is why we are consulting widely on our proposals that are looking to improve and enhance the space for everyone.

5. CMTA raised the following points:
 - i. The current vision of the market redevelopment is based around the introduction of demountable stalls. These will be key to clearing the market in an efficient fashion for, hopefully, those limited number of events where part of the trading areas needs to blend cleared.
 - ii. Also it is well known to market traders and customers that the market square can receive strong stormy winds and sudden strong blasts of

wind on otherwise calm days, in part channelled by the surrounding buildings.

- iii. Therefore as the public consultation (which is effectively a customer consultation amongst other things) ends on the 7th July - there has been a less-than-timely supply of prototype stalls for both traders and the public to examine. We understand that a proposal regarding stall design and supply will be presented in the October meeting of this committee.
- iv. However, it seems there is no way for the public to contribute to this discussion on what will be the most obvious piece of equipment present on the market and also that the prototype will not have been in place for a winter/poor weather.
- v. Similarly, consideration of the size of the square and the type of event requiring the stalls to be demounted has not been defined. Can the committee comment on this and provide security that the views of the public and the traders will be collected and acted upon, when all parties are more aware and have examined the detailed proposed stall design and type of events?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. Whilst two prototype demountable stall design options are included in the proposed Concept Design, we would like to consider commercially available products before incurring the risk and costs of commissioning a prototype design. We have identified a demountable market stall from City B Group and are currently planning a trial to test its suitability for use in Cambridge, in partnership with the market traders who have helped to establish the demountable stall trial evaluation criteria.
- ii. The trial will be in two stages. During the first stage we will carry out an initial assessment of the City B Group market stall over a minimum two-week period whilst continuing to identify other available demountable stall suppliers. Any demountable stall product selected for initial trial will be selected against a proposed requirements brief/ specification, developed with the input of Cambridge Market Traders Association (CMTA).
- iii. The brief and supporting evaluation criteria will include the following elements as we wish to establish if the product is both appropriate and meets traders' needs. We will be evaluating:

- a. Durability and robustness of fittings and component parts
 - b. How waterproof, fire-proof and tear-proof the canopies are
 - c. The practicality of set up and take down
 - d. The adaptability of the internal layout to meet different business needs or ability to work to a bespoke design
 - e. Wind resistance
 - f. Storage needs
 - g. Transport needs
 - h. Sustainability of production
- iv. Should the first stage prove positive, for the second stage - subject to securing the agreement of participating traders - we will run a full operational trial of the selected demountable stall system through to next spring on the market square and will continue to consult throughout this period. Should the trials prove unsuccessful in finding a workable demountable stall design, we will revisit the proposed Vision and Concept Design to consider how it could still be reasonably achieved, with either all non-demountable stalls; or a combination of both demountable and non-demountable market stalls.
 - v. We will not proceed to the next stage of design work on the Market Square Project until the results from the proposed Vision and Concept Design public consultation and initial demountable stall trial are known. At the end of the summer, we will review whether we feel the initial trial has answered enough questions and been sufficiently robust to enable an informed Committee decision to be taken in October; or whether it needs to be deferred to a subsequent Committee meeting, either in January or March 2022.
 - vi. A key aim of the project is to create a flexible space, which can be used for events and activities, while still accommodating a seven day per week, day-time market. The proposed concept design layout incorporates a large area of open space in front of Guildhall, which would be available without the need to move stall infrastructure for small events and activities during the day and evening. It would only be where there was sufficient demand for/value in using the available space and positive cost: benefit assessment.
 - vii. No detailed market research or planning has taken place yet for any events or visiting markets. This will be done as part of the next detailed

planning stages (RIBA Stages 3 and 4 Spatial Coordination and Technical Design).

6. Friends of Cambridge Market raised the following points:
 - i. The public consultation for the market project concept design is due to finish its 6 weeks period on the 7th July. The new stall design samples are being erected on the 30th of June, 10 days before this conclusion. All the responses to the consultation before the 30th June have been made in absence of the new stalls.
 - ii. There are question in the consultation pertaining to stall designs.
 - iii. It is as clear as day the discrepancy this failure causes in giving people a chance to make a fair and valued opinion on stalls that they have not been able to see.
 - iv. Therefore, please can we have an extension to the public consultation which will allow people a fair chance to view the stall samples so they can make a decision on actually seeing the proposed stalls?
 - v. Also, I trade both in the centre of the market and on the windy South West side in the wind rose. The difference of wind levels in these two place is extreme. There is no point in running the new stall trial in the centre of the market where the wind isn't an issue.
 - vi. Please can the trial of any new stall be taken within the wind rose area?
 - vii. There is no point in people saying they like the new stalls if the new stalls can't withstand the ferocity of the wind rose exposure. This is a vital operative factor that will undermine all good work done on the stall specifications if not taken into account in the first instance.

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

As previously mentioned, Council officers, with the support of the Cambridge Market Traders Association (CMTA), are designing a two-stage trial process. The first stage, to commence late June/ early July 2021, will involve a minimum two-week initial assessment to allow traders and shoppers to view and evaluate the market stall in the market square. Subject to a positive initial assessment outcome, the second stage will involve the selection of a preferred supplier (or suppliers if more than one identified through the assessment process) for a full

operational trial of the selected demountable stall system over the remaining summer/ autumn/ winter period on the market square.

7. Camcattle raised the following points:

- i. The redevelopment of the market aims to improve the market and attract more people and suggests a range of events. This will also change how the areas around the market square are occupied and used around the City Centre.
- ii. What process is going to be undertaken to manage the green spaces, biodiversity and support groups like graziers (many visitors love seeing real cows on the commons) to ensure that the atmosphere and heritage of the city and its green spaces is maintained?
- iii. The worry is that this will be regarded as a secondary issue and with it a lot of the things that make Cambridge unique.

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. The Council is fully committed to ensuring the atmosphere and heritage of the city and its green spaces is not just maintained, but also, where possible, enhanced. This includes retaining the historic practice of livestock grazing on the city's common land and nature reserves; and a commitment to achieving biodiversity net gain from Council managed property. At the strategic level, the process for achieving this is through our Corporate and Local Plans and other supporting policies and plans relating to the strategic themes of climate change, biodiversity and green space. Whilst at the local level, the process for achieving this will be through and operational service and individual site management plans.
- ii. As an example of this commitment, one of our corporate plan's three strategic priorities is to lead Cambridge's response to the climate change emergency and biodiversity crisis, with a supporting strategic objective, ref. 2.1.4, to: Manage Cambridge's streets and open spaces for the benefit of both wildlife and people by ensuring that biodiversity protection and enhancement is taken into account in all development decisions and management practices. Key performance indicators against which this strategic objective will be measured include:
 - a. % of insect-friendly wildflower meadows and long grass areas.

- b. % of City Council owned and managed parks and open spaces actively designated and / or managed for biodiversity.
 - c. % of designated Local Wildlife Sites in positive conservation management.
- iii. Given our Council's focus on biodiversity and green space as strategic priorities, I hope you are assured that we will continue to prioritise these issues as key contributors to what make Cambridge, as a place, unique and to the community's physical and mental health and well-being and overall quality of life.

21/29/EnC Market Square Information Update

Matter for Decision

The Committee received an information report in response to a formal update request from Councillor Payne, Liberal Democrat Spokes for Communities, Climate Change, Environment, Waste and City Centre, on the process for trial, testing and consultation of the demountable stalls proposed as part of the Market Square Project public consultation draft vision and concept design.

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

Noted the information update contained in 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 Environmental Services.

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

- i. The council was committed to a demountable stall trial. Referred to the March 2021 Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee report.
- ii. Officers were in discussion with traders to develop a two stage process.
- iii. The proposed stalls were already being used in other British markets. They would be trialled in the city to see how they would be received by

- Cambridge traders and the wider community. If the stalls were a success, there would be a larger trial over the winter period.
- iv. A report planned for October 2021 would set out how the council could proceed over the winter period so the committee could make an informed response to the officer recommendation. (Post meeting note: Report may no longer coming, but comment reflected intention in July committee.)
 - v. Demountable stalls were one part of the market square redevelopment project to renovate the area.
 - vi. Criteria to select the preferred stall design was being developed by officers in consultation with traders.
 - a. Two types of stall would soon be placed in the market square for testing.
 - b. Officers were looking to see if other types of stall were acceptable in addition to the City B Group.
 - c. Officers would invite people to see the stalls in situ and give feedback.
 - d. Feedback over the summer and evaluation criteria would shape officer recommendations (to councillors) on how to proceed (or not) with the winter trial.
 - vii. Other markets around the country did not appear to operate on a seven day principle, but did operate for more than one day. So they set up and took down stalls as Cambridge proposed to do.
 - viii. Officers would seek technical specification information from stall suppliers, which could be displayed on the trial stalls so people could see and comment.
 - ix. Officers were meeting traders in 1-2-1 meetings to engage them in the process. Phone calls and emails were used where this was not possible. Traders recognised the need to engage with officers.
 - x. Traders could put items on trial stalls to test if these suited trader display needs. The stalls were display models to show types of stall on offer. They would be available for two weeks, so people may prefer to quickly try them out then have a longer trial over the winter (if this trial went ahead).
 - xi. There was flexibility in market square layout to accommodate different traders' needs eg food versus clothing traders.
 - xii. Costs for stall set up and take down were a future consideration in later reports. It was expected that costs would be passed onto event organisers (who were using the market square instead of traders).
 - xiii. Stalls had not been tested to see if they were windproof (eg would not be blown over). Any information in advertisements was indicative.
 - xiv. Every market was different. Stalls would be tested in windy parts of Cambridge to see if they were suitable for the conditions. Public safety

- and the viability of the market were key concerns. The market was unlikely to be open in stormy weather.
- xv. There were no plans to replace the canopies on existing stalls in the near future. Officers were looking at infrastructure and did not wish to make significant capital investment in the market until the project started.
 - xvi. Toilet provision would be looked at in the detailed design stage rather than now at concept design stage.
 - xvii. Officers were looking at how to make the best use of the market square. The need to set up and take down stalls depended on how the area was used for different events, so stalls may not need to be taken down each day. There were peaks and troughs in sales on trading days so officers would manage when activity could occur to minimise negative impact on traders. Officers would monitor and manage activities in market square space to minimise the impact of one event on another to protect the market and make best use of the space.
 - xviii. Officers were reviewing how to accommodate market stalls around the city due to public safety needs in lockdown. They were looking at alternative locations to host market stalls when the market square was being redeveloped.
 - xix. A mix of qualitative and quantitative data was expected in response to the consultation. Officers would review and feedback key issues in a future report to committee.

The Committee unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation. She commented:

- i. Some traders supported the market square project, some did not.
- ii. The project would look at renovating infrastructure such as toilets. This would disrupt the market so the intention was to do all work at once including reviewing the design of stalls, to improve the market for traders and shoppers.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/30/EnC Visit Cambridge Destination Management Organisation

Item withdrawn from agenda.

Officers reviewed the paper and identified the need for further work around risk. They recommended not relying solely on the recommendation from Hewitsons Solicitors. The Council had yet to get independent legal advice on the options assessment to see if they agreed with Hewitsons' assessment.

A report would be brought back to committee in future.

21/31/EnC Greater Cambridge Waste Service - Annual Report

Matter for Decision

The committee received a report on the Shared Waste Service.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment 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 Head of Shared Waste Service.

The Waste Service Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Undertook to ask the Waste Service Manager to respond to Councillor Healy's questions about challenges to the service when government support was withdrawn.
- ii. The Council was in the top third of recycling rates when compared to other local authorities. All councils had seen an impact from lockdown on recycling rates.

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.

21/32/EnC Biodiversity Strategy

Matter for Decision

In 2019 the City Council declared a biodiversity 1 emergency in recognition of the pressures facing our natural world, both locally and internationally. The Council pledged to review its 2006 Nature Conservation Strategy to meet current legislation, policy, initiatives, and challenges.

The Officer's report was accompanied by a draft Biodiversity Strategy for Council services for the period, 2021 to 2030. The Strategy sets out a series of objectives to guide work and groups actions under three themes:

- 'Biodiversity Mainstreaming'.
- 'The Core'.
- 'Nature in your Neighborhood'.

Officers requested Committee approval to consult on the draft strategy between July and September 2021, with a view to adopting a further revision of the Strategy after scrutiny in the autumn committee cycle.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Approved the draft Biodiversity Strategy for public consultation.

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 Environmental Services.

The Biodiversity Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The biodiversity checklist was available for all services and departments to take them through project steps.
- ii. Officers were working with Pesticide Action Network to reduce or eliminate the use of herbicides.
- iii. Work was undertaken with schools and Cambridge University to educate and engage younger people. Directly eg building ponds or indirectly by trying to support other groups to engage schools.

- iv. The 2006 Nature Conservation Strategy had 80 projects. It had achieved its objectives. It was recognised the strategy did not have measurable management plans, the intention was to address this in the new strategy and to review management plans with communities.
- v. Officers now had a baseline to review the status/condition of land in future and percentage gain/loss in biodiversity. Some common land areas had been damaged through historic action so would take time to achieve a 'good' status. The intention was to increase biodiversity by ten percent.
- vi. The new strategy action plan would have SMART objectives and proposed to demonstrate change against a baseline.
- vii. The list of strategy stakeholders was not exhaustive, more could be added such as resident associations nominated by councillors.

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.

21/33/EnC Logan's Meadow Local Nature Reserve Designation Extension

Matter for Decision

The City Council has 12 Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and manages them for wildlife and people. LNRs are a statutory designation local authority can declare in association with Natural England.

Officers have been working with the Friends of Logan's Meadow LNR on a proposal to extend the site's existing LNR designation onto former sports pitches and an area of adopted land. See appendix A of the officers report for a location and site plan of proposed LNR extension. Red line demarks the existing LNR designation, green line the proposed extension.

A public consultation on the LNR extension and proposed creation of new habitats was widely publicised between 12th October and the 20th November 2020 and received 460 responses, with an overall support for the proposal.

Officers sought authority to formally consult with Natural England on the proposed LNR extension, prior to public advertisement and declaration.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing

Approved the proposed LNR extension to Logan's Meadow LNR and gave authority for officers to formally consult with Natural England and secure its declaration.

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 Environment Service.

The Biodiversity Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Play areas and other amenities would be kept. Officers were only asking to extend the Local Nature Reserve Designation over grassland.
- ii. The aim was to present detailed plans in future on how to engage communities in plans. A good consultation response was received in lockdown.
- iii. The objective was to present detailed plans in future as a response to the first round.

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.

The meeting ended at 7.40 pm

CHAIR