

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 7 October 2021  
5.30 - 8.15 pm

**Present:** Councillors H. Davies (Chair), Healy (Vice-Chair), S. Baigent, Copley, Hauk, O'Reilly, Page-Croft, Porrer, Sheil and Sweeney

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

**Officers:**

Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities: Jane Wilson

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Community, Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer: Helen Crowther

Committee Manager: James Goddard

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**21/34/EnC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Payne. Councillor Page-Croft attended as the Alternate.

**21/35/EnC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Collis	21/41/EnC	Personal: Former Chair of Abbey Pool.
Councillor Porrer	21/42/EnC	Personal: Put in bid for s106 funding with Councillor Bick (bids G, H and I)
Councillor Copley	21/44/EnC	Personal: Employee of University of Cambridge

## **21/36/EnC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Members were asked to note a correction to the attendance details for the Environment and Community Scrutiny committee on 27 May 2021 during the Annual Council meeting. Cllr Smith was incorrectly recorded as being present and should have been recorded as sending apologies. Councillors had already approved 27 May minutes as a correct record in the 1 July meeting, but the error came to light afterwards.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 May were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

Apologies: Cllr A. Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

## **21/37/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. Chair of the Society of Cambridge Tourist Guides (SCTG) raised the following points:
  - i. The Society has about 120 members, all of whom are trained and accredited professional tourist guides and most of whom are residents. Before the former Visit Cambridge and Beyond (VCB) went into liquidation, its main source of income was from walking tours, and it exclusively employed members of the SCTG as its guides in order to guarantee a high quality experience for visitors to Cambridge given by professional Green and Blue badge guides.
  - ii. Since the demise of VCB in July last year, the tour guides have lost most of their income. Many of them relied on this income and were not eligible for furlough.
  - iii. Guides were led to believe that the Destination Management Organisation (DMO) would be set up before this summer and would

include the appointment of an official walking tour provider to replace the former VCB role in the promotion and booking of walking tours. The main tourist season in 2021 has come and gone without the said DMO being formed and without any information about the future organisation of official walking tours. In the meantime, for the second year running, domestic tourists have returned in large numbers to Cambridge.

- iv. Unofficial, untrained, and uninsured guides have been quick to fill the gap left by VCB and there were now multiple new outfits offering tours of variable quality to unsuspecting tourists. Residents and tourists alike could not venture into the centre of Cambridge without being accosted by touts selling walking tours, who were usually pushy and sometimes intimidating.
- v. Guides were encouraged when they saw the draft memorandum for the new DMO which was published ahead of the committee meeting in July. It contained provision for the DMO to appoint an official walking tour provider. However, this item was pulled from the July agenda at the last minute and postponed until October. Now all reference to the provision of walking tours has been deleted from the Memorandum being considered this evening, but no explanation for that has been given.
- vi. Assumed that the new DMO will do nothing to appoint an official walking tour provider leaving no official structure for the management of tours. Even if it does act later, it seems highly unlikely that there will be time for a provider to be appointed and commence operation in time for the next tourist season which begins in Spring 2022. Visitors would have a third year of disappointing tours provided by untrained guides and sold by aggressive touts and my members will face a third season of little work and little income from guided tours. If visitors do not come to Cambridge local business revenues will suffer.
- vii. Question: Why does the new DMO not have any plans to provide official walking tours when this activity was the main source of income for its predecessor? Should the official guides now conclude that Cambridge will no longer have a proper provision for tourists and should therefore seek alternative arrangements to appoint their own walking tour provider?

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

- i. The liquidation of Visit Cambridge and Beyond was a loss to the city and the region. Since Visit Cambridge closed, an Interim Board was set up to cover just the city. Referred to officer report under item 10 on the agenda.
- ii. The City Council and its partners, Cambridge BID, Fitzwilliam Museum Enterprises (trading arm of the University of Cambridge) and King's College established a new destination management organisation (DMO).
- iii. Walking tours were not being considered as part of the Visit Cambridge Destination Management Organisation report. The purpose of the paper was to set up an independent Community Interest Company, not for the City Council to dictate to the independent company what it should do.

Supplementary question:

- i. There was no information available on a timetable when walking tours could start.
- ii. How would the Society of Cambridge Tourist Guides be consulted on arrangements?
- iii. Requested a response to questions submitted 28 June as none had been received to date.

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities responded:

- i. The DMO would appoint the walking tour manager. This could not be done by another body. Re-iterated the City Council could not dictate to the independent company what it should do.
- ii. The DMO was planning to undertake work as an independent organisation. They would establish a stakeholder group.

Councillor Davies (as Chair of Environment and Community Scrutiny) undertook to respond to outstanding questions from the Chair of the Society of Cambridge Tourist Guides submitted in June 2021.

2. Councillor Copley raised the following points:

- i. Residents all over the city, including some residents near Cambridge Airport, are affected by various noises which frequently affect them out of hours. Recently, it was reported on the council updates page that the out of hours noise complaints service is to be ended

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/updates/2021/09/27/Change-to-investigation-of-out-of-hours-noise-complaints>).

- ii. Could the Executive Councillor or officers share why this service has been ended, and whether that was a decision that members were able to scrutinise when it was taken? Wished to raise concerns that there has been immense damage to some residents' quality of life, which is particularly problematic when out of hours, and would like this service to be retained for these reasons so the noises can be adequately investigated at the time when the disruption is happening.

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

- i. The plan was to continue with an out of hours service.
- ii. Since October 2019, the out of hours noise service has been operating a reduced on-call service. The service was trialling a process where calls continue to be handled initially by the CCTV out of hours call handling based in Huntingdon as they come in, with details taken at the time and passed onto the next available day time service officer, who will action the complaints, rather than passing onto an out of hours noise officer on standby/call out.
- iii. Officers would not have attended a complaint out of hours, a member of the public could only have registered a complaint then. Officers would continue to investigate complaints and gather evidence prior to taking any necessary action, this part of the service was unaffected.
- iv. Noise recording equipment was still available upon request for members of the public to gather evidence to provide to officers.
- v. The airport noise issue was well known and being kept under review by officers.

Supplementary question:

- i. Abbey Ward was particularly affected by noise from the airport. Welcomed the availability of an App and noise recording kit for residents to monitor noise issues so they could be passed to officers to provide an evidence base.
- ii. Requested details be brought back to committee in future so the public could see what was on offer through the service.

The Executive Councillor offered to liaise with Councillor Copley about Ward issues after committee.

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities responded:

- i. The Noise App provided by the service had been used 2,500 times in the last year by officers to monitor noise and gather evidence.
  - ii. The trial aimed to check that the service meets residents needs whilst out of hours work by specialist officers would be focused on known issues, rather than being on call for initial reports. During the trial residents would still be able to have an in-person conversation to report at the time of any initial incident, at the same time making best use of specialist officer time where appropriate.
  - iii. A report could be brought to January 2022 committee.
3. In view of the Full Council resolution of the 22 July 2021 opposing the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill with particular reference to its criminalisation of the traditional way of life of Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers, both protected ethnic minorities under the Equality Act (2010), what progress has Cambridge City Council and the Combined Authority made in providing transit sites and stopping places in and around our City?

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager responded:

- i. The impact of the Bill was debated at Council. The motion was approved in July 2021.
- ii. For the City Council to consider a request to facilitate transit sites and stopping places it must have confidence in the evidence with which the council make any decisions, including that the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community supported the use of these.
- iii. A sub-regional Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (GTANA) was currently being carried out to prepare this evidence which may or may not support such a request.
- iv. The Council expected to have the final GTANA report in January 2022.

Supplementary question:

- i. How would the City Council get evidence if it talked to 'Travellers' who did not travel?

- ii. People who stopped in unauthorised sites were moved on, not questioned about their needs for a transit site.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager responded:

- i. The consultant undertaking the site need assessment were undertaking 1-2-1 assessments to gather information.
- ii. The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager would welcome an introduction to Traveller community contacts whom the consultant should engage with.

4. Raised the following points:

- i. Friends, families and Travellers say "There is a significant national shortage of places for nomadic Gypsies and Travellers to legally and safely stop. However, the Government is planning to bring in new laws which mean people who live on roadside camps could face time in prison, a £2500 fine or their home being taken from them."
- ii. Will Cambridge City Council promise not to contribute to the criminalisation of Travellers by declaring the City of Cambridge a city of sanctuary for Travellers like it has done for refugees?

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager responded:

- i. For the City Council to consider a request to declare the City of Cambridge a city of sanctuary for Travellers we must confidence in the evidence with which we make any decisions.
- ii. At this time the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill is not statute law, and there may be further amendments as it passes through the House of Lords and the final stages to Royal Assent.
- iii. The City Council must also have confidence that it has the infrastructure to support a sanctuary for Travellers and new sub-regional Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (GTANA) is currently being carried out to prepare evidence which may or may not support such a request.
- iv. We are expecting to have the final GTANA report in January 2022.
- v. To help with some context to your question, the City Council on the 22<sup>nd</sup> July considered and supported a Motion on the Policing Bill.

- vi. When officers visited unauthorised encampments they carried out needs assessment as a first step, liaised with other organisations and only took enforcement action as a last resort.

Supplementary question:

- i. When Travellers stopped without permission there was 100% eviction rate.
- ii. Queried how measures could be put in place before January 2022.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager responded:

- i. The Gypsy and Traveller Bill had not received Royal assessment. A guidance note would then be developed with the Association of Chief Police Officers.
- ii. The City Council would have the final GTANA need assessment by January 2022. There would be a 'change over' when the Bill came into effect. The City Council would ensure any actions it took were reasonable and proportionate.

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

5. What, in concrete material terms, does it mean for the city council to stand in solidarity with Gypsies and Travellers, particularly in the context of their recent history of complicity in Gypsy and Traveller evictions? For example, will the council be making a commitment to appoint legal stopping places?

Officer response sent by email after meeting:

- i. The City Council has recently taken enforcement action against unauthorised encampments having first carried out welfare assessments and made referrals to support agencies in relation to one family. The Council in all cases has acted proportionately and reasonably and the Courts have considered and made judgements on our complaints.
- ii. The City Council's current operating policy is negotiated stopping wherever a welfare needs assessment undertake for people on an unauthorised encampment identifies welfare needs for staying in the area. Here we would negotiate for people to stay on the unauthorised encampment for an agreed amount of time ideally until the welfare need



is met. However, we balance the needs of the encampment with the local community in deciding whether negotiated stopping is appropriate in each case, and we cannot enable an unauthorised encampment to stay on land we have a duty to immediately move people from, such as parks, open space, and recreation grounds.

- iii. The City Council must have confidence in the evidence with which it makes any decisions for example with stopping places. A new sub-regional Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (GTANA) is currently being carried out to prepare this evidence.
- iv. The City Council expected to have the final GTANA report in January 2022.

6. Raised the following points:

- i. The officer response to my public question (21/28/EnC Public Questions no 2) said that “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.”

There is no report on the Market Square consultation to this meeting.  
Why?

- ii. How many responses were received to the public consultation:
  - a) Before the trial stalls were installed?
  - b) After the trial stalls were installed?
- iii. When will the responses to the consultation be made public?
- iv. The minutes to item 21/29/Enc record an unsubstantiated assertion by the Executive Councillor that “some traders supported the Market Square project, some did not”. What evidence did the Executive Councillor have in making that assertion that any traders supported the project, and if so, how many?

Officer to respond by email after meeting.

7. Pesticide Free Cambridge raised the following points:

- i. We at Pesticide-Free Cambridge were happy that in the passing of Cllrs Porrer and Payne's motion at the Full Council on 22 July, albeit with amendments, meant that we had, in principal, a statement of intent from the Council to explore herbicide-free alternatives for weed control in two wards before the next spraying season of this year (Sept 2021), in consultation with us at Pesticide-Free Cambridge, with the view to stopping all herbicide-use across the city by the end of 2022.
- ii. We had some informal discussions with the Biodiversity Project Lead at Cambridge City Council about the best herbicide-free alternatives for the focused trial being run. For the subsequent two-ward trial, we have suggested both Arbury and Abbey as potential wards for the larger trial, along with Newnham, and have had support from Councillors in these wards, but have not yet received any information about formal decision making. Can the Council let us know whether a decision has been made over choice of trial wards, and when Pesticide-Free Cambridge will be included in related discussions?
- iii. Can the Council clarify why in a recent communication from Alistair Wilson, he refers to herbicide-free alternatives currently being sought 'before the start of the 2022 cycle of treatments', given that it was agreed in the July motion that these would take place in the then-next spraying cycle of autumn 2021. Does this mean that city-wide herbicide spraying has already taken place in September, and have any wards been left out of the spraying schedule?
- iv. Could the Council confirm when the signage and information warning residents about planned spraying programmes will be actioned, given that the agreed motion promised to 'to explore the most effective methods of communicating with residents (and any additional resource implications) about any necessary herbicide applications, which may include the following commitments: 'publishing the planned dates of herbicide treatments by road/ward for the remainder of 2021 and thereafter on the council's website'. We consider this to be a minimum step towards reducing residents' direct exposure to toxic glyphosate during the 5-10 days that it takes for plant die-off to occur.

Officer to respond by email after meeting.

## **21/38/EnC Single Equality Scheme 2021-2024**

**Matter for Decision**

The Council has a legal obligation to publish equality objectives at least every four years to assist it in its performance of the Public Sector Equality Duty. The Officer's report provided recommended objectives and priorities covering 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2024 relating to this.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Approved the Single Equality Scheme 2021 to 2024, including the objectives and priorities for the Scheme (Appendix A of the Officer report) and Actions listed for the first year of the Scheme (Appendix C of the Officer report).
- ii. Noted actions undertaken relating to the three recent council motions around equality and diversity and approve recommended actions to be carried forward relating to them in the new Scheme.

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

- i. Members of the Gypsy and Traveller community:
  - a. Needed access to Addenbrokes Hospital.
  - b. May not trust the City Council and so not interact with it. Therefore, evidence may not be available for a needs assessment.
- ii. Queried how to protect women and girls in the city, particularly at night.

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

- i. The City Council was working with South Cambridgeshire District Council to implement phase two of the Government's Syrian Vulnerable Persons Refugee Resettlement programme. The Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer would check to see if Afghan refugees were also included in the programme.

The Councillor for Communities said she would seek to add Afghan refugees Refugee Resettlement programme after committee.

- ii. A refugee' needs assessment was undertaken in 2016 which identified there was a need for provision. National legislation issues prevented an identification of exact needs, but the subject could be revisited in the 2022 need assessment.
- iii. Members of the Black community were 6 times more likely to be stopped and searched than others. Would advise councillors after committee on any updates regarding use of police stop and search powers as details from the Police were not available at present.

The Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing said she would follow up issues with the Police after committee.

- iv. There was a community panel to liaise with the Police on the impact of 'force' on the community.
- v. Cambridge City Council employees valued the staff group who reported minority group issues to the Chief Executive. The intention was to do more to assist members of the minority community progress through their careers eg obtain promotion.
- vi. The Council was implementing the new 'digital first' customer services model, ensuring that vulnerable people were provided with opportunities to have face-to-face support from the Council. People could also use the internet or phone to contact the Council. If they wanted other support, face-to-face was an option to cover all needs, not just a lack of internet access.
- vii. The City Council was an accredited member of the White Ribbon Campaign which was set up to end male violence against women. The Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer would share information with Councillors after committee about the Celebration of Women Event.
- viii. Streets and open space lighting around the city were the responsibility of the County Council.
- ix. The City Council was working with other organisations to signpost the intersectionality (joined up approach) of its Single Equality Scheme as good practice.

Agenda P34: Key priorities and approaches for the Single Equality Scheme 2021 to 2024 Part 4 - For services to consider intersectionality in responding to residents' and customers' needs (where groups have more than one protected characteristic that taken together create

overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage).

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Re-iterated that Officers undertook a needs assessment as the first point of contact when visiting unauthorised encampments. Enforcement was a secondary option. Officers tried to build positive relations with the Gypsy and Traveller community.
- ii. The Traveller community may leave the area to seek winter work. Consultants undertaking the transit site needs assessment will try to interact with the community elsewhere.

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.

### **21/39/EnC Decisions to Support Community Services Reviews**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Play Pods scheme is a chargeable service operated by the Council's Children and Young People's Participation service (ChYpPS). It was set up in 2014, in part to raise funds to support other ChYpPS work. However, a review of the service in February 2019, found that staffing costs in fact outweighed any income benefit, and the service has a net annual cost to the Council of £26k. The review also found that, since 2015, only four Play Pods had been delivered to city schools, but eighteen had been delivered to schools outside of the city.

On 26th February 2019, the Strategic Director took an operational decision to cease delivery of any more out-of-city Play Pods, and to implement exit routes for schools to secure training support and scrap top-ups from other providers. The loss of anticipated Play Pod income (which offsets some of the net cost) has been managed in year by the ChYpPS service through a staff vacancy freeze.

The proposal now is for the Council to cease Associate Membership of the Bristol Scrap Store Play Pods scheme, and to discontinue the ChYpPS Play

Pod service from 31st March 2022. There is potentially scope for other associate members to provide a Play Pod service to city schools from 1st April 2022.

The Council helped set up the Scrap Store scheme in 1988, and it was initially managed by The Castle Project. In 2000, for viability reasons, the Council agreed to take this on, and it was delivered as a mobile project from community centres. In 2012, Scrap Store moved into a commercial unit, The Box on Barnwell Business Park, under the management of the ChYpPS team. In addition to providing materials for the Play Pod scheme, city residents could also pay a membership fee to source arts, crafts and play materials at a low cost.

Like the Play Pod scheme, one of the intentions of Scrap Store was to raise income to support other areas of ChYpPS work. However, the 2019 review found that, like Play Pods, once staffing costs had been attributed to the Scrap Store, the service has a net annual cost to the council of £46.5k. Even if footfall to The Box were to double, the Scrap Store scheme would still not be able to generate sufficient income to cover staffing costs. The service uses The Box Unit, a council commercial unit at Barnwell Business Park for £5k per year rent, but the council could let The Box commercially to generate £18k income per year.

There are currently 9 staff posts which include an element of delivering either the Play Pod or Scrap Store schemes, or both. A staffing review is planned to support the council's corporate transformation programme, and this will include community development, community facilities and ChYpPS services. The review will aim to minimise redundancies and maximise opportunities for staff development and progression.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

- i. Agreed to cease delivering the ChYpPS Play Pod scheme from 31st March 2022.
- ii. Agreed to complete feasibility work for a revised scrapstore-style scheme, aligned to support anti-poverty work, and for this new service to be launched as soon as possible in the 2022-23 financial year.
- iii. Noted the staffing implications.

### **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 Community Services.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendation in the Officer's report. Councillor Porrer said the intention was to remove a 'hard stop' to the service.

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

- i. Agenda P96 set out an indicative timetable for when the Scrap Store service would cease. It was hoped there would be a smooth transition not a hard deadline to stop activities.
- ii. Staff and stakeholders would be involved in developing the new model. It was hoped that the Scrap Store service would be retained in some way during the transition period.
- iii. Officers wished to invite councillors to input into the work.
- iv. A progress report could be brought back to committee in March 2022.

Recommendation No 2 of p95 of the agenda pack (additional text underlined)

Proposer: Councillor Porrer

Secunder: Cllr Copley

2: To complete feasibility work for a revised scrap store-style scheme, aligned to support anti-poverty work, and for this new service to be launched as soon as possible in the 2022/23 financial year, having been scrutinised by a future ECSC to allow public and member views to be taken into account, and for the existing scrapstore service to be maintained until a new scheme is approved and launched.

The amendment was lost by 4 votes to 6.

Opposition Councillors asked what lessons had been learnt if the Council had lost money over 7 years of the ChYpPS service?

The Head of Community Services said the following in response:

- i. Officers working in these areas had provided an excellent service.
- ii. The review had uncovered higher staff costs than originally budgeted when these ChYpPS services were set up. The trading services now

require subsidy rather than contributing revenue. Both have considerable out of city usage. It was not feasible to continue.

- iii. Action has not been taken earlier due to the focus on supporting the community during the pandemic. There is now an opportunity to evolve the scrapstore project to support other anti-poverty work.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee unanimously endorsed recommendation (i).

The Committee endorsed recommendation (ii) by 6 votes to 0 with 4 abstentions.

The Committee unanimously endorsed recommendation (iii).

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.

### **21/40/EnC S106 Funding Round 2021: Public Art**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Council uses S106 contributions paid by developers to mitigate the impact of development in Cambridge. As part of its 2021 generic S106 funding round, the Council has invited grant applications from community groups working with professional artists for small-scale (say, up to £20,000) public art projects in Cambridge. This has focused on those parts of the city where off-site public art generic S106 funding is still available. All eight public art grant applications received have been assessed against the Council's Public Art S106 selection criteria. Officers recommend six of these proposals for funding (subject to further information to address queries raised on five of them).

A further Public Art report would follow in January 2022, focusing on the Public Art Commissioning Strategy and how the remaining off-site public art generic S106 contributions can be used effectively and on time.

The January 2022 report will also look again at the progress made by two applicants (for proposals D and H) that require further work to meet the public art S106 selection criteria.



## Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

The Executive Councillor agreed to:

- i. Allocate generic S106 funding to the small-scale public art project identified in the 'allocate' column of Table 1 (as detailed the Appendix), subject to business case approval, a public art agreement and project completion or significant progress within 18 months.
- ii. Delegate authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities to allocate generic S106 funding to projects to the small-scale public art projects identified in the 'delegate' column of Table 1 (as detailed in the Officer's report Appendix) that make sufficient progress towards meeting the eligibility criteria set out in paragraph 4.1 by the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2021.

**Table 1:** Public art proposals that require further clarification

	<b>Small scale public art proposals</b>	<b>Allocate</b>	<b>Delegate</b>
A.	Abbey People's Creative canopy (Abbey ward)	c.£20,000	-
B.	Birdwood Area Art project (Coleridge ward) Dinky Doors	-	Up to £10,000
C.	Cherry Hinton Brook mural (brook runs through Romsey, Coleridge & Cherry Hinton wards)	-	c.£6,600
E.	Jesus Green community art project (Market ward)	-	Up to £20,000
F.	Living at Mitcham's Corner (West Chesterton)	-	Up to £12,000
G.	Ride with Pride (City-wide)	-	£18,900

- iii. Instruct officers to seek further details from projects (summarised below and detailed in the Appendix) and work with the applicants to further develop their applications and report back to the next Scrutiny Committee with a further recommendation.
  - a. D. Coldham's Lane Bridge public artwork (Romsey ward);
  - b. H. Romsey Rec Ground public art installation (Romsey ward).

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee made no comments in response to the report from the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

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.

**21/41/EnC S106 Funding Round 2021: Community Services****Matter for Decision**

The Council uses S106 contributions paid by developers to mitigate the impact of development on facilities and amenities in Cambridge. As part of its 2021 generic S106 funding round, the Council has invited grant applications from local groups for improvements to their community facilities (to be made available for wider community use). This has focused on those parts of the city where community facilities generic S106 funding is still available.

All six community facilities grant applications received have been assessed against the Council's S106 selection criteria. Officers recommend two proposals for a grant based on generic S106 funding, while another proposal qualifies for funding from an already agreed specific S106 contribution. Other proposals are either not yet ready for consideration (and could be developed further ahead of the next funding round) or would not be eligible for S106 funding: in the case of the latter, alternative sources of funding have been suggested to the applicants.

The use of generic S106 contributions for sports facilities is managed separately from the annual S106 funding round (that is, without an application process) because funding is normally focused on needs identified by the

Council's sports strategies. This report recommends allocating outdoor sports S106 contributions to several projects which could be taken forward soon.

### Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Agreed the following community facilities S106 grants and funding allocations, detailed in paragraphs 4.5 and Appendix C, subject to business case approval, project completion or significant progress within 18 months and the signing of a community use agreement (see paragraph 6.1 of the Officer's report):

**Table 1:** Recommended uses of community facilities generic S106 funding

	Facility (and ward)	Purpose	Award
a.	Akeman Street Community Centre (Arbury)	Equipment and furnishings for new centre	Up to £40,000
b.	Trumpington Village Hall (Trumpington)	Disability access and an outside meeting space	£3,450

- ii. Deallocated community facilities S106 generic funding from the following two projects (see paragraph 4.6 of the Officer's report):
  - a. £55,000 allocated to Cromwell Road community meeting space (Romsey) as part of the nursery as it is no longer viable; and
  - b. £100,000 earmarked for St James' Church community facilities improvements (Queen Edith's) as they are not ready to progress now but have been encouraged to reapply in the next funding round.
- iii. Agreed the following sports facilities S106 grants and funding allocations, (detailed in paragraphs 5.2-5.6), subject to business case approval, project completion or significant progress within 18 months and the signing of a community use agreement (see paragraph 6.1 of the Officer's report):

**Table 2:** Recommended uses of outdoor sports generic S106 funding

Facility (and ward)	Purpose	Award
---------------------	---------	-------

a.	Abbey Leisure Complex (Abbey)	3G pitch enhancement	£100,000
b.	Chesterton Rec. Ground Pavilion (East Chesterton)	Building costs supplement	£54,000
c.	Nightingale Avenue Pavilion (Queen Edith's)	Building costs supplement	£60,000
d.	Coleridge Rec. Ground fit kit equipment and pavilion upgrades (Coleridge)	Repurposing on an existing allocation for improvements to Coleridge Rec & pavilion.	£70,000 (re-purposed)
e.	Outdoor fitness area at Abbey Leisure Complex (Abbey)	Installation of new 'kettlebell' frame alongside existing 'fit kit'	Up to £20,000

- iv. Instructed officers to place even greater emphasis in the 2022 generic S106 funding round on welcoming applications from local community and sports groups for small-scale improvements to the equipment, furnishings and equipment at their facilities, which could help them to provide additional benefit to their local communities (see section 6 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 made no comments in response to the report from the Community Funding and Development Manager.

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.

## **21/42/EnC S106 Funding Round 2021: Open Spaces and Play Provision**

### **Matter for Decision**

The Council uses S106 contributions to mitigate the impact of development on facilities and amenities in Cambridge. Through its 2021 generic S106 funding round, the Council has invited proposals for improvements to open spaces and play areas, focused on those parts of the city where the relevant generic S106 funding is still available.

Sixteen proposals for improvements to open spaces and play areas have been received through this 2021 funding round. The Council thanks all those who have taken the time and effort to apply. The proposals have been assessed against the relevant S106 selection criteria. Seven (either in whole or in part) were eligible, affordable and ready to be allocated S106 funding now. A number of other eligible proposals were also being actively considered, subject to S106 funding availability. In addition, three other projects allocated S106 funding in the 2020 round were recommended for additional funding, which has become available.

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

Recommendations i, ii & iv were subject to business case approval and project completion or significant progress within 18 months.

- i. Allocated informal open space generic S106 funding to the following projects (see the assessments in paragraphs 4.1-4.2 and Appendix B of the Officer's report).

**Table 1:** Recommended 2021 S106 funding proposals

<b>No.</b>	<b>Project proposal</b>	<b>S106 funding</b>
2.1.1	Alexandra Garden Rec: additional seating (West Chesterton ward)	£5,000
2.1.2	Jesus Green: seating, benches and additional trees (Market ward)	£13,000
2.1.3	Midsummer's Common community orchard: improved seating, bins, paths and new raised beds (Market ward)	£15,000

No.	Project proposal	S106 funding
2.1.4	Coldham's Lane play area: benches, bins noticeboards (Romsey ward)	£10,000
2.1.5	Parker's Piece tree-planting: supplement for information boards (Market ward)	Up to £5,100
2.1.6	Trumpington Rec Ground environmental enhancements (Trumpington ward)	£70,000

- ii. Delegated authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods & Communities to allocate open space and play area generic S106 funding formerly from Trumpington ward but now in Petersfield, still available for eligible open space and play improvements in Petersfield (see paragraphs 4.3- 4.4). This could include some play area improvements at St Barnabas Court play area. These allocations would be in consultation with Petersfield councillors, the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing, Opposition Spokes and the Chair of the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee.
- iii. Instructed officers to seek detailed updated estimates of the likely construction costs of the Coldham's Common BMX track improvement project and to take appropriate follow-up action (see paragraph 4.5 of the Officer's report).
- iv. Allocated additional informal open spaces S106 funding to the following projects supported in the 2020 S106 funding round (paragraph 4.6 of the Officer's report).

**Table 2:** Recommended additional allocations to existing projects

No.	Project proposal	S106 funding
2.4.1	Chesterton Recreation Ground wheelsports project: landscaping (East Chesterton ward)	£15,000
2.4.2	Five Trees open space: wildflower and tree-planting (East Chesterton ward)	Up to £10,000
2.4.3	Pearl Close play area and community garden improvements (East Chesterton ward)	£5,000

- v. Instructed officers to take a more targeted approach for the 2022 generic S106 funding round to seeking eligible proposals for open space and play improvements from the remaining generic S106 funds, with a greater focus on dialogue with councillors (see paragraph 4.7 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 Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

In response to the report Councillors asked why Donkey Common (skate park) was not allocated funding? The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said the project did not meet eligibility criteria. Offices had engaged with proposers already and signposted alternative streams to s106 where limited funding was left to allocate in Petersfield Ward.

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.

### **21/43/EnC Petition - Regarding Cam Floating Boat**

The Lead Petitioner made a presentation to Committee setting out background information. 516 people petitioned the Council to stop enforcement action against the Floating Cam Bar Ltd and allow the company to continue trading from the River at Jesus Green.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said the following in response to the petition and Members' questions:

- i. Floating Cam Bar Ltd operated on the river and had a licence to sell alcohol. They had no permission to moor or sell alcohol on council

owned land. Floating Cam Bar Ltd could navigate up and down the river but not sell alcohol to people on the bank (for council owned land), only on the river.

- ii. There were other land owners up and down the river, the Floating Cam Bar would have to engage with them separately.
- iii. The City Council had an injunction to stop anyone selling alcohol in (council owned) open spaces. The one exception was the City Council who may sell alcohol for temporary events as it could control these.
- iv. If the Council wanted to make a change of use, it would need to seek a review. This would allow others to sell alcohol in its open spaces which could lead to concerns.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing said it would set a precedent if the Council allowed Floating Cam Bar Ltd to sell alcohol on council owned land. Others could sell alcohol on open spaces if the council allowed the petitioner to. Their licence was to trade on the river not Jesus Green.

## **21/44/EnC Visit Cambridge Destination Management Organisation**

### **Matter for Decision**

This paper sets out the work being undertaken by the Council and its partners, Cambridge BID, Fitzwilliam Museum Enterprises (trading arm of the University of Cambridge) and King's College, to establish a new destination management organisation (DMO), following the closure and liquidation of the former DMO (Visit Cambridge and Beyond) in July 2020.

The four partners had established an DMO 'working group' and brand known as 'Visit Cambridge', using the former VCB branding and other intangible assets, which they successfully acquired last autumn. The working group has identified the need for the new DMO to be legally incorporated to enable it to be independent and effectively fulfil its organisational development and management needs, including business banking, entering into legal agreements/ contracts and procuring goods and services to support its DMO function and the recovery and development of a sustainable visitor economy.

The Officer's report set out the proposed business case for the new DMO and its proposed incorporation as a Community Interest Company (CIC), informed by learning from the former VCB business model performance and the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on the city's visitor economy. The decision to



pursue CIC incorporation was informed by independent legal advice sought by both the Visit Cambridge working group and, separately, by the Council.

Subject to the Council supporting the incorporation of Visit Cambridge as a CIC, the Visit Cambridge working group is inviting the Council to nominate a representative to sit as a company director. Based on legal advice and the predominantly operational nature of the DMO business, the Officer's report recommended the Council nominated an Officer, rather than elected Member, to sit as a Director on the CIC Board.

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

- i. Approved the establishment of Visit Cambridge as a Community Interest Company (CIC).
- ii. Delegated authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities to complete all practical, financial and legal matters to enable Visit Cambridge CIC to be established including approval of the final form of all necessary legal documentation.
- iii. Approved the City Council's officer representation on the Board of Visit Cambridge CIC, with the officer nominee decision to be delegated to the Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities.

### **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 Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities.

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

- i. It was important to have a fixed place where people could find tourist information in the city.
- ii. Requested that more than 1 councillor was appointed to the stakeholder group so that representation could be cross-party.
- iii. Queried how to get a net positive impact of tourism on the city and environment.

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. An independent Community Interest Company was being set up, it was not for the City Council to dictate to the independent company what it should do. Would pass on councillors' request that more than one councillor was invited to participate in the stakeholder group, but it was up to the Community Interest Company to make operational decisions.
- ii. Most tourists to the city were local or from the region. International tourism had declined since lockdown. There were things the council could do to encourage sustainable tourism such as encouraging tourists to stay longer and not make short trips.
- iii. Tourism was important to the city economy. For example it provided jobs and revenue for cultural venues.

The Committee resolved by 9 votes to 0 with 1 abstention 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.

### **21/45/EnC Annual Climate Change Strategy and Carbon Management Plan Update Report**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided an update on progress so far in 2021 on the 2021/22 actions of the Council's Climate Change Strategy 2021-26. As part of this, the report includes an update on progress in implementing the projects to reduce our direct carbon emissions from our corporate buildings, fleet vehicles and business travel as detailed in the Council's Carbon Management Plan 2021-26.

The Officer's report also provides an update on:

- The council's Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2020/21
- UK100's Net Zero Pledge as in Appendix C

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

- i. Noted the progress achieved in the first five months of 2021/22 in implementing the actions in the Climate Change Strategy and Carbon Management Plan.
- ii. Approved the updated Climate Change Strategy action plan presented in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- iii. Agreed to sign the UK100's new Net Zero Pledge as detailed at Appendix C 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 Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

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

- i. The Council had approximately 7,000 properties. It was looking at measures to retrofit these to net zero. Residential and commercial properties with the lowest energy efficiency performance would be targeted first.
- ii. The City Council has lower emissions when benchmarked against neighbouring and similar authorities.
- iii. Climate Change Strategies of similar authorities have been reviewed to see if the City Council can learn from them.
- iv. The Environmental Services Team were reviewing the electric vehicle charger trial:
  - a. Rapid chargers that took 1 hour.
  - b. Fast chargers that took 2-7 hours.
  - c. Capacity/resources would determine if/where chargers could be placed in other wards after the trial. The City Council would have to work with power networks and Central Government to implement this, the City Council could not do work on its own.
  - d. The pilot would be reviewed after March 2022. The Council would then decide if it would bid for more funding to take action.
  - e. The following were needed in order to put in chargers:
    1. Power.
    2. Demand for chargers.
    3. Parking spaces.

- v. Traffic regulation orders were in place in car parks to ensure only electric vehicles used spaces where chargers were available. Pulse were the company awarded the contract to install and maintain these.
- vi. A report on Corn Exchange boilers would be brought to committee in March 2022. Gas boilers were installed as the previous ones were at request of failure. The new boilers were more efficient and would have 20% lower emissions.
- vii. The Council Environmental Awareness e-learning course could be promoted as good practice to other organisations.

Councillor Copley said the City Council could better inform residents of the nature of the climate change emergency and how Central Government needed to take action. Personal action was not enough to effect change. For example, housing was at risk of flooding. The City Council could explain that residents could lobby Central Government direct.

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

- i. Agreed that Central Government should take action. The City Council was trying to engage residents on how to lobby Central Government, for example, through Cambridge Matters. Welcomed ideas on how to do more.
- ii. There were 2 electric vehicle charging point projects:
  - a. One with the County Council for on-street parking. Another separate one for City Council car parks.
  - b. There had been issues regarding infrastructure in place to support electric vehicle charging.
- iii. The intention was to insulate all council homes as per the aims of Insulate Britain. It was unclear if this could be achieved by 2025. Sufficient funding from Central Government and a skilled workforce were required to do this.

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 8.15 pm

**CHAIR**