

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 24 March 2022
5.30 - 10.25 pm

Present: Councillors Healy (Chair), H. Davies (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Copley, Gilderdale, Hauk, Payne, 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)

Present virtually: Councillors Hauk and Moore

Present physically: Councillor Bick

Officers:

Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development: Fiona Bryant

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Head of Housing Maintenance and Assets: Lynn Thomas

Asset Manager: Will Barfield

Community Development Manager: Vicky Haywood

Community Safety Manager: Keryn Jalli

Development Manager, Streets & Open Spaces: Alistair Wilson

Environmental Health Manager: Yvonne O'Donnell

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Strategic Project Manager: Allison Conder

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Senior Urban Designer: Nadine Black

Strategy Officer: Graham Saint

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

22/12/EnC Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor S. Baigent (Gilderdale as Alternate).

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre said that due to illness she would participate in the committee online via

Teams as she could listen and contribute to the debate, but the decision would be taken by Councillor Collis as Deputy Leader (who would be present in the room).

Councillor Hauk would join by Teams, he would participate in the discussion but not vote.

Councillor Gilderdale offered her apologies as she had to leave the committee during 22/21/EnC item 9 The Way Forward for Public Art.

Fiona Bryant (Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development) to attend in place of Jane Wilson (Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities).

22/13/EnC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

22/14/EnC Minutes

No minutes of previous meetings were submitted to this meeting for approval.

22/15/EnC Public Questions - Communities Portfolio

Public Question

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

1. Many residents in Newnham were concerned at the proposal for a new artwork on Sheep's Green. Various people were worried that an artificial structure did not fit well with the current natural appearance of the bank, and the potential impact on biodiversity. Residents understood that public artwork, by its nature, did not have to be universally popular, but there seemed to be a high level of opposition to this particular proposal. Please reassure residents from Newnham and across the city that their views would be considered, and that, if necessary, the proposals would be rethought.

The Executive Councillor for Communities responded:

- i. The consultation would be considered before a response was made.

- ii. The project was part of a larger commission for public art to celebrate the river.
- iii. The University of Cambridge and Conservators or the River Cam were involved in the steering group.
- iv. The consultation period had been extended so everyone could contribute.
- v. A decision would not be taken tonight on a piece of art to use. This would occur after responses had been considered. Further consultation would then occur which would be reviewed by the Public Art Panel before a decision was made.

2. Raised the following points:

- i. Spoke on behalf of both the Federation of Cambridge Residents (FeCRA) and Friends of the River Cam regarding recommendation 2.3 (22/21/EnC item 9 The Way Forward for Public Art) to allocate between £80,000 and £150,000 to the 'To the River' project.
- ii. This was supposed to be a public work of art based on interaction with local people and groups, with a brief '*To explore the river's relationship to the foundation of Cambridge as a city, its ecology and social history through research and community engagement and activity*' yet there had been no communication or involvement with any of the City Residents' Associations or Friends groups, including the Friends of the Cam. The response to the recent consultation had been overwhelmingly negative, with people from across the city asking 'How **was** the local community 'creatively engaged' and who **were** the stakeholders that were involved in the development of this project?
- iii. The Declaration of the Rights of the River Cam, made on the 21st June 2021 stated that, 'In sharing rights with rivers we show our determination to end the human exploitation of nature and, instead, to live in harmony with it'.
- iv. The river speaks for itself - it does not need gold decoration for people to appreciate its beauty and Sheeps Green is a city nature reserve that is part of the river corridor that stretches from Grantchester into the heart of the city.
- v. The metal piling that supports the river bank here was not beautiful, but it is functional and unobtrusive, allowing people to enjoy the natural

landscape - the river and view here were loved by many residents, and they do not need 'enhancing'.

- vi. The work itself shows a very superficial understanding of the importance of the river to Cambridge as a city. It does not illustrate its ecology and the social history in a way that is accessible to the general public - who, looking at this from the opposite bank, will even be able to see the lace patterns, let alone make any connection with the University and the laundresses who washed their dirty linen here?
- vii. There is clear symbolism in fake 'gold' being used to decorate a river that is polluted and dying due to over- abstraction from the chalk streams which support it because of the major over-development taking place in this region. Putting growth ahead of well-being is harmful in social as well as environmental terms and is contributing to an inequality like that shown by the exploitation of the laundresses who toiled here for the University.
- viii. This proposal shows a complete lack of understanding of both the natural environment and what it is that people value about the river and this very special landscape, there seemed a misguided focus on what would be a 'visitor attraction'. The project had failed to engage the community as required in the brief, and the public response to the resultant 'Work of Art' shows clearly that it is felt to be harmful to the river and nature reserve rather than preserving and enhancing them.
- ix. Section 106 funding was supposed to compensate residents for the impact of development - so my question is:
 - a. 'Please will you ensure that no more of our money is wasted on this project, and that there is now a genuine consultation on what would really be of benefit to Cambridge people?

The Executive Councillor for Communities responded:

- i. The project has a steering group.
- ii. Various public engagement activities had been undertaken. Stakeholders were asked about the history of the river at the start of the project to develop the concept of the art piece.
- iii. Re-iterated a decision on the piece of art would not be made tonight. This would be made in future by the Public Art Panel. If the results were overwhelmingly negative towards the proposal, then the concept would

go back out for consultation. If the concept was popular with residents, it would then go to Planning Committee to seek planning permission.

- iv. The decision tonight was to ensure finance was available (in the form of developer contributions) to be used by the project. The Council had to follow due process to ensure funding was in place. If developer funds were not used, the Council would have to allocate funding from other services in its own budget.

Supplementary question:

- i. FECRA had links to various resident associations, but the City Council had not engaged with them. Please review and respond to feedback.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The City Council did not try and engage every resident association as the consultation was open to all. Public Art Officers were happy to liaise with FECRA to ensure they were engaged in future.

22/16/EnC Future Leisure Management Arrangements

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out a proposed approach for a strategic review of the council's leisure provision that will inform a future management options appraisal. The report also recommended a rationale to extend the current leisure management contract by 30 months, until 31 March 2026 and covered the findings arising from 2021/22 trial of winter opening hours at Jesus Green Lido.

GLL managed the lido.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Agreed the proposed approach for completing a strategic review of leisure, to help inform the most optimal future leisure management arrangements for the council.
- ii. Approved the officer recommendation to extend the current management contract for 30 months until 31st March 2026, under the same terms, but for a reduced management fee.

- iii. Noted the findings of GLL's review of the Jesus Green Lido winter opening pilot and agree to its continuation under the same arrangements.
- iv. Noted the update and progress on carbon reduction plans at the Council's swimming pools.

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 Sport & Recreation Manager.

In response to the report Councillor Bick commented:

- i. The lido was a good form of social engagement. It attracted people of various ages from casual users to the very fit.
- ii. People welcomed the lido being open during the winter. Flood lights assisted this when there was less daylight in shorter winter days so people could swim 'at night'.
- iii. In future, could all open days be spaced out eg on alternate days?

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

- i. GLL were using their own maintenance funds to ensure the Jesus Green Lido stayed open to the end of the extended contract period.
- ii. (Report paragraph 4.4) GLL made savings of £84k pa through capital investment at the start of the project, so there were savings to use now.
- iii. The contract was extended, not put out to public tender, to give a longer time period to look at options on how to manage leisure facilities. These would be brought back to committee in future.
- iv. GLL had recruited lifeguards and swimming teachers. Some of these needed to qualify. GLL offered a range of courses and classes to facilitate this. Staffing levels were now close to pre-pandemic levels, so the impact on leisure facilities was limited.

The Committee resolved by 9 votes to 0 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.

22/17/EnC Extension to Storeys Field Community Centre Contract for Services**Matter for Decision**

The Storey's Field Centre (SFC) on the Eddington Development in the Northwest of the City, opened to the public in February 2018 and has been managed and operated by the City Council under a contract for services with the Storey's Field Centre Trust (SFCT) since June 2016.

On 22nd September 2021, SFCT were given advance notification that, in line with the council's corporate priorities and Community Centres Strategy, and following the successful establishment of the Centre programme and staffing team, the councils operation of Storey's Field Centre would not continue beyond the current contracted deadline of 31 December 2022, and that the Trust would now need to begin to assess other options.

SFCT responded to state that it will continue to work with the Council towards achieving a successful transfer of service by 31.12.22 but requested that provision is also made for a further contract extension period if required until 31.03.23 in case additional time is needed to complete negotiations and TUPE arrangements. A further extension provision would be pragmatic to ensure a smooth transfer for the staff involved, with a hard end date of 31st March 2023.

Following the transfer of service to a new operator, the councils Community Services team would focus on working collaboratively with SFCT and The University to ensure a joined-up programme across community facilities in the local area and that community work is continued, at least to the requirements as set out in the Section 106 agreement.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Agreed to extend the councils contract for management services if required by Storey's Field Centre Trust (SFCT), until 31 March 2023.
- ii. Noted the Council's management and operation of Storey's Field Centre would end 31 March 2023 and that eight Council employed posts will then transfer under a TUPE arrangement, to a new operator appointed by Storey's Field Centre Trust.

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 Strategic Project Manager.

The Strategic Project Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Staff would TUPE over to the new contractor with their existing pay and conditions.
- ii. The City Council were currently responsible for half of the running costs. When the contract was handed over, the group running the centre would be responsible for ensuring it was viable in future to maximise income whilst still meeting community needs.
- iii. The Business Plan set out cost details. Running costs would be benchmarked against other leisure centres.
- iv. The development of Eddington had slowed due to Covid. This had not been factored into earlier Business Plans.

The Committee resolved by 9 votes to 0 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.

22/18/EnC Update on Lending, Loaning, and Reuse Project, Including Cambridge Scrapstore**Matter for Decision**

In October 2021, the Executive Councillor for Communities approved recommendations to support a review of Scrapstore to greater align to corporate priorities. This paper provides an update on progress and further recommendations.

Following a mapping exercise and workshop with community partners, an options appraisal and feasibility work has taken place to consider the broader

topic of community lending, loaning and reuse and options for direction of travel going forward.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Noted progress on wider project work to support community lending, loan and re-use in the city in line with the council's priorities.
- ii. Noted progress to establish alternative options and support for individuals and groups to access arts, craft and scrap materials, noting intention to close down Scrapstore in its current form and repurpose the unit for Cambridge Food distribution hub in July 2022.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Community Development Manager.

In response to the report Councillors commented that a mobile scrapstore could be provided like a mobile library.

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

- i. The Scrapstore had been running for twenty years. Many donated items could be recycled, but they eventually ended up in landfill (so had climate change implications). There was also a climate impact as people travelled to and from the store, plus the van used by the Scrapstore.
- ii. The Scrapstore could reduce its carbon footprint by moving to a community hub.
- iii. The store venue and staff were being moved, items in the store were being retained, not disposed of, during the move.
- iv. Officers were looking at how to support community led recycling schemes in future.

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

- i. Scrapstore cost details were set out in the October 2021 committee report.

- ii. Not all costs could be considered when the project was set up. Costs were covered by Community Services during covid, so managed through the staff budget not the (corporate) capital budget. A new way to provide the facility was now proposed.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Porrer proposed to add the following recommendation to those in the Officer's report:

(New) 3. Bring back a report to the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee before the end of 2022 with an update on progress on matters described in Section 3.

The Committee rejected the recommendation by 6 votes to 3.

The Committee resolved by 6 votes to 0 to endorse the (unamended) substantive recommendations as set out in the Officer's report.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

22/19/EnC Re-Ordering Agenda

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

22/20/EnC Update on the Work of Key External Partnerships

Matter for Decision

The Officer's paper provided an update on the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board and Cambridge Community Safety as a part of the Council's commitment given in its "Principles of Partnership Working".

The paper highlighted recent NHS reforms that have led to the setting up of Integrated Care Systems that will lead to adaptations in Health and Wellbeing arrangements to accommodate and share priorities and ways of working that will improve health and care for all, through shared leadership, integration and collaborative action. It also highlighted the achievements of the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership during the year.

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

- i. Agreed to continue to work with the Health and Wellbeing Board and engage with the Integrated Care Partnership to ensure that public agencies and others can come together to address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge City and that the concerns of Cambridge citizens are heard, as the system is developed.
- ii. Agreed to continue to work with partners within the framework of the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership, identifying local priorities and taking action that will make a positive difference to the safety of communities in the city.

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 Officer. It was noted the report was listed as for the attention of the Executive Councillor for Communities but would in fact be considered by the Executive Councillor for Open Spaces, Sustainable Food and Community Wellbeing.

In response to Members' questions the Strategy Officer undertook to set up a briefing for councillors on health reforms.

The Community Safety Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The anti-social behaviour when driving motion referenced by Councillor Hauk fitted into Community Safety Partnership priority 2. This was a high-level partnership which looked at strategic rather than operational level details.
- ii. Undertook to set up a briefing for councillors on policing priorities and the Community Safety Partnership.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 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.

22/21/EnC The Way Forward for Public Art**Matter for Decision**

The Council's approach to public art has, for many years, been under-pinned by both:

- i. ambitious policy for high quality, original public art, combining professional expertise and community engagement; and
- ii. planning obligations from developers to mitigate the impact of their developments, either via on-site public art or by providing off-site financial contributions (S106 funding).

Against a context of dwindling off-site S106 funding availability for public art (which will reach 'best before/expiry dates' over the next five years), the Officer's report set out a new way forward, including the new Manifesto for Public Art.

The proposed Manifesto is a public declaration of the City's intentions for public art commissioning and a reminder of the benefits of public art and the achievements so far; it demonstrates the City's commitment to deliver new public art and its support of best practice when commissioning.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Agreed to release S106 funds currently allocated to the Southern Connections public art commission (see paragraph 3.6 and Appendix B of the Officer's report) for use on future public art projects.
- ii. Approved delegated authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities, in consultation with the Executive Councillor and Opposition Spokes for Communities and the Chair of the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee to:
 - a. take stock of the progress made on the on-going History Trails 2 project (see Appendix B of the Officer's report) in order to identify next steps and bring the project to a conclusion in 2022/23; and
 - b. review the following proposals (for which S106 funding has been earmarked but not yet allocated) to confirm the funding allocation via the development of the Public Art Commissioning Strategy or

whether release the earmarked funds for future public art projects (see paragraphs 3.6-3.7 and Appendix B of the Officer's report):

1. Travellers & Outsiders public art proposal
 2. Chesterton village sign proposal.
- iii. Agreed to allocate between a further £80,000 to £150,000 of off-site public art S106 'strategic' funds to enable the delivery and/ or future development of the public art installation arising from the "To the River" residency, subject to a constructive public consultation response, planning permission and other necessary consents and confirmation of project affordability within the proposed increased budget range (see paragraph 3.8 of the Officer's report).
- iv. Instructed officers to seek and identify eligible proposals for local public art through the Commissioning Strategy in or near:
- a. Romsey ward, incorporating use of around £32,500 of local S106 funds that need to be contractually committed by autumn 2023; and
 - b. Queen Edith's ward, incorporating use of around £12,500 of local S106 funds that need to be contractually committed by spring 2024.

These proposals would be reported back to this committee for approval of S106 funding allocations later this year. (See paragraphs 3.9-3.11 and Appendix C of the Officer's report.)

- v. Approved the use of the Manifesto for Public Art (Appendix D) and the Public Art Commissioning Strategy principles (see Section 4 of the Officer's report).
- vi. In the context of the new Manifesto for Public Art, instructed officers to:
- a. identify appropriate public art projects to make effective use of existing off-site S106 funds that need to be used between 2025 and 2027;
 - b. develop a Public Art Commissioning Strategy for the City (including possible future projects) which will guide future commissioning principles for the delivery of all public art in the City, whether through Council commission or the planning process and report back to this committee later this year (see paragraph 3.12 of the Officer's report);

- c. explore options for accessing the wider resources required to achieve the Manifesto for Public Art's aims and objectives (see paragraph 5.1 of the Officer's report).

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Development Manager (Streets & Open Spaces).

Council Copley made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Expressed concerns about the benefits of public art listed in the public art consultation.
- ii. Queried if all stakeholder groups had been engaged in the public art consultation process.
- iii. Queried how to measure the public art project outcomes and if the project is delivering against these.

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

- i. Were keen to make the most of public art opportunities. Wanted diversity and inclusion as part of the commissioning process.
- ii. Funding came from s106 agreements so its uses were limited compared to general council funding.

The Development Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Officer's report referred to offsite funded projects not on-site ones.
- ii. Feedback had been received on manifesto proposals for public art delivery.
- iii. <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/to-the-river-project> 'To the river' project. A residency celebrating and promoting the story of the River Cam and its role in shaping the city.
- iv. The council had a legal duty to spend s106 funding in a timely and correct manner.
- v. It was correct that the £290,000 is available to spend after the £150,000 is allocated not £150,000 from £290,000.

Councillors Copley and Porrer requested a roll call vote as per section 46.2 of the constitution on page 143 which reads "Any two members of a committee present and voting on any matter may require the names of the persons voting for, the persons voting against and the persons abstaining to be recorded in the minutes."

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Copley proposed to amend the recommendation in the Officer's report:

- **2.3 Await the response of the public consultation response to the public art installation arising from the "To the River" residency, and defer allocation of off-site public art S106 until the views of residents are known on the proposal, and the consultation is fully reported. This report will then be brought back to a future scrutiny committee with recommendations (see paragraph 3.8).**

and

3.8 Recommendation 2.3 awaits the consultation response before allocation of further funding for the 'To the River' public art installation. a. The River Cam artist residency was allocated £120,000 of S106 public art funding, as a strategic project, in January 2018. Since 2019, public engagement events have focused on understanding the influence that the River Cam has on Cambridge and its residents and visitors, with a view to providing a permanent work of public art on the River Cam. b. Following extensive engagement during 2018/19, the artist has now developed a proposal for the permanent artwork ('Selvedge'), drawing on the textile industry that existed in Cambridge in 17th century and, specifically, the Cambridge weave, still used in graduation gowns produced today. The proposal is to fix a metal artwork proposed to the existing metal sheet piling at Sheep's Green. c. Public consultation on these proposals took place until mid-March 2022. Planning permission, Environment Agency consent and consent from the Conservators of the River Cam are also required. d. **The consultation response will be reported back to a future scrutiny committee, to then consider what funding to allocate to this project. If the project were to continue as described,** between £80,000 and £150,000 **would** be needed for the artwork in addition to the remaining amount from the original £120,000 budget for the 'To the River' artist residency⁷. Whilst it is hoped that the extra funding required for production may be at the lower end of this range, delivery costs for the final artwork **would have to be** confirmed, due to fluctuating market prices for materials (in the context of both the Coronavirus pandemic

and Brexit). Any of the additional £80,000 to £150,000 allocation not used would be returned to strategic funds for other future projects.

The Committee rejected the recommendation by 5 votes to 3:

- For: Councillors Copley, Payne and Porrer.
- Against: Councillors Ashton, H. Davies, Healy, Sheil and Sweeney.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 3 to endorse the (unamended) substantive recommendations as set out in the Officer's report:

- For: Councillors Copley, Payne and Porrer.
- Against: Councillors Ashton, H. Davies, Healy, Sheil and Sweeney.

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.

22/22/EnC Public Questions - General

Public Questions

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.

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

1. Representative from Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd raised the following points:
 - i. This is our proposed fare chart and I would like to add Bicycle charge and Dog charge as £3 each.

Element	Unit	2021	Consult	CCLT
Tariff 1	£	3.15	3.30	3.30
Tariff 2	£	4.15	4.30	4.80
Tariff 3	£	5.15	5.30	6.30
Initial distance	metres	90	90	80
Metered distance	m/20p	170	161	160
Waiting time	secs/20p	38	36	36
Multi Seater	£	3.00	3.00	3.50
Bicycle	£	1.00	1.00	1.50
Soiling charge	£	80.00	80.00	100.00

- ii. It was not mandatory to take dogs or bikes so please allow these charges. The taxi trade had recently experienced a lot of charges eg for installing CCTV and moving to electric vehicles.

The Environmental Health Manager responded:

- i. The current charge for carrying bikes was £1. £3 was too much. The Officer's report suggested £1.50.
- ii. It was unusual for taxis to be required to carry animals, most local authorities did not include a charge in licensing terms (as per the taxi trade's original request), so the City Council recommended no charge.

Supplementary question:

- i. Re-iterated drivers wanted to levy a charge for large domestic animals such as dogs.
- ii. Drivers were reluctant to take bikes in taxis in case they made the vehicles dirty.

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

- i. Re-iterated charges would not be made for carrying dogs in taxis and £1.50 could be charged for carrying bikes.
- ii. Referred to the Licensing Committee decision 21 March which set charges.

2. Representative from Cambridge City Licensed Taxis Ltd raised the following points:
 - i. The taxi trade suffered in the pandemic. Needed to think how to improve the service to customers without passing increased costs onto customers.
 - ii. The Environmental Health Manager met the taxi trade a few days ago to discuss revised charges. The trade were looking at how to be an accessible and competitive taxi service.

The Environmental Health Manager responded:

- i. It was for the trade to set operating costs not the City Council as the licensing authority.
- ii. There was no reason for taxis to have dual vehicle plates.

Supplementary question:

- i. Hackney Carriage could not charge more than set charge by licensing authority but Hackney Carriages could. They implemented higher surge charges in peak demand and lower at other times. Hackney Carriages would like to do the same.

The Environmental Health Manager responded:

- i. Hackney Carriages could operate as Privat Hire Vehicles.
- ii. The taxi handbook said that vehicles could be licensed by the City Council or South Cambs District Council.

3. Raised the following points:
 - i. Speaking as a Historic Environment Consultant, Cambridge resident and market shopper. On behalf of the CMTA, FECRA, Cambridge Market Community, Friends of Cambridge Market and Living Streets Cambridge for the Open letter, Cllr Healy's response, and my reply this morning to be read into the record as part of the report on this item. I ask for urgent action in relation to the procedural matters raised.
 - ii. The public consultation responses are the closest this project has got to a publicly agreed brief. I call for a comprehensive independent report, as

has been provided in item 9 for the Public Art Strategy. Fresh eyes are essential to identify the public's wishes and priorities.

- iii. These will be among many competing demands on the limited space available. Yet the report has no feasibility assessment of how competing demands can be reconciled. The Cultural team's initial options report could have been helpful, but it is not in the papers. Why not?
- iv. I welcome the more strategic approach in section 3, but the list of topical issues is incomplete. Growth pressures and capacity issues are not mentioned, nor are policy initiatives notably the Historic Core Management Plan. Only City Recovery gets detailed coverage in a report which does not look beyond the edges of the Market Square.
- v. The report says that the City Council is reviewing its assets, but without mentioning its own listed buildings the Guildhall and the Corn Exchange. Any strategic consideration of activities in the city centre must consider the Market Square in conjunction with the Guildhall and Corn Exchange, and in particular their ability to house evening events without disturbance to surrounding occupiers, particularly residents and students overlooking the Square.
- vi. What if any discussion has there been between officers, councillors, Cambridge BID and owners of properties fronting on the Square, including Caius, Kings and the China Centre among others, to see if their needs and plans fit in with the plans for the Market?
- vii. When will the Council notice that the 2 oldest secular buildings on Market Hill (including 5 which is listed grade I) urgently need viable use?
- viii. Yet 2 recent applications for flats at 3-4 Market Hill which would have secured the future of that listed building were scotched by Environmental Health, who consider that even existing market noise would make them uninhabitable.
- ix. If that is the case for proposed new residential, what is the situation for existing flats and student accommodation? And how could any increase in noisy activity be acceptable?
- x. None of these issues and interrelationships feature in the report before you, which fails to fully understand both the immediate and the wider strategic context.
- xi. Any decision needs to be deferred, and a more comprehensive report brought to a future Committee.

The Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development responded:

- i. The City Council had various assets.
- ii. The Officer's report focussed on the market square and gave a project update.
- iii. Would meet with Great St Mary's in the near future to invite them to the stakeholder steering group as local landowners.
- iv. Noted issues of noise in the market square raised by the public speaker.

Supplementary question:

- i. Expected a report on the public consultation in October 2021. Details in today's report were limited. The public consultation was an opportunity to look at the project brief to ensure it was fit for purpose.

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

- i. It was normal practice to delegate project implementation to officers.
- ii. Stakeholders and the market traders had been consulted throughout the project.
- iii. A lot of work had been undertaken which led to a delay in reporting details back to committee. Details would be listed on the Council website when available (April 2022 possible).
- iv. The project brief remained unchanged to create a space for a seven-day market to make the best use of space.

The Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development responded:

- i. Had weekly briefings with the Executive Councillor on the market square project. It was also periodically reviewed with senior officers.
- ii. All key decisions were required to come back to committee for consideration and decision.

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

4. Raised the following points:

- i. Since plans for the market square and our democratic civic space were first vaunted, interested groups and individuals have been asking for an inclusive public consultation on the Market Square project.
- ii. A partial consultation took place last summer.
- iii. It was partial for several reasons:
 - a. A first reason being that the consultation was very sparsely publicised.
 - b. A second reason being that it took the council until almost the end of the consultation to find and bring an example of 'a' demountable stall for the traders and the public to see and assess. I think we all know how that went.
- iv. 90% of responses to the consultation were submitted before the demountable stall was in place. Even then the demountable stall was so hidden that even when people knew it was there, many were not able to find it in amongst the existing active market stalls.
- v. Now we find that this inadequate and greatly flawed consultation is only being very partially reported. We can only wonder why?
- vi. Whilst at the same time wondering why the plan is for these results to be made public only after this meeting ie: after the vote recommending that this project now becomes an officer delegated one?
- vii. The public must be fully involved in proposals for their Market Square, and for our central civic, democratic and public space. A space that includes our central civic building - The Guildhall.
- viii. The recommendation here is for this project to be delegated to officers, the chair of the committee and to spokes. This is the complete opposite of essential democratic engagement and involvement. And there are no guarantees of what public involvement will take place, or when.
- ix. There will be statutory public consultation when a planning application is submitted, but that will not at all afford the public the opportunity of input into deciding what the project will provide, and how it could evolve.
- x. It's vital that the many competing demands on the Market Square are reconciled in a way which gets public approval.
- xi. We need a clear programme setting out how the public will be involved and their views sought throughout this project. This needs to begin with the residents of Cambridge being fully involved in deciding on the brief.

- xii. There is a Stakeholder group being proposed. This is 'what it says on the tin'. A group of solely invited stakeholders. Being brought together entirely under the auspices of the Council.
- xiii. This proposed group is the antithesis of public engagement. We wonder how this will engage with, or reflect the views of, the interested public? And are clear that such an exclusive 'Stakeholder Group' is the opposite of what is now needed.

5. A representative from Cambridge Market Traders (CMTA) raised the following points:

- i. Firstly, it is good to see a report being delivered, in which there are some very positive points which we wish to embrace, but also where some substantial gaps exist. Some of them are of sufficient concern to possibly require the report to be withdrawn, but also there are some content and points which need to be highlighted.
 - 1. The establishment of a stakeholder group, which includes trader and residents' organizations as well as other council-based partnerships - excellent. *Our question here: can a clear start date for such a group be established, giving a clear timeline and frequency of engagement?*
 - 2. The report does not include a clear report on the public consultation about the market plans (2020 version), there are some comments and passing reference made but no serious presentation of data. A CMTA organized trader survey was conducted and circulated to the Guildhall in Autumn 2020 - to provide focussed and broad-based trader response - so this was clearly known; but it is not mentioned in the report. *When will a full report on the public consultation be presented? This needs to be published as soon as possible to inform both discussions at, and the composition of the stakeholder group.*
 - 3. Traders have been promised a steel-based structure to over-winter in order to see how well it endured, a different stall to the rapidly rusting aluminum-steel structure which was on the market in the summer of 2020. *Why did this not happen?* The National Market Traders Federation (NMTF) has extensive country-wide knowledge of the types of stall, suppliers and issues, and on which types work well under a variety of conditions, this expertise based on 123 years of

operation, is offered to the stakeholders and Guildhall and they would be a useful stakeholder to include.

4. It is clear many other initiatives are taking place in the city centre, from regeneration to feasibility studies, however, the report on the market makes little linkage between those aspects which seem to form part of the council vision. *Can such linkages, and the strategic context be made explicit in an amendment to the report?* (e.g. traffic measures, distribution hubs etc.) as well as details about changes and arrangement for trader storage (fitting into limiting carbon footprint).
5. *Finally, a general point - the report outlines the vision in broad terms, but lacks detail. This has been an ongoing theme in the questions the CMTA tends to pose. Practical detail is key. If an analysis of the public consultation of last year is used to provide such detail, as part of the basic information for a more detailed plan and the proposed stakeholder group acts as a sounding-board on the feasibility of such specific details and broader vision - then as stated above, an excellent start to the re-set.*
6. Pesticide-Free Cambridge raised the following points:
 - i. Further to the last ECSC meeting in January, and the council's formal launch of its Herbicide Reduction Plan (HRP), and Herbicide-Free Streets (HFS) scheme, it concerns us greatly that there has been no mention since that meeting of progress regarding the two-ward herbicide free trials planned to begin in Newnham and Arbury this Spring. We also have heard nothing about the Working Group that was committed to in January nor of the precise wording of the Herbicide-Free Streets adoption scheme or indeed the overall communications strategy for the HRP.
 1. Can we have an update on the two-ward herbicide free trials please? When precisely will these start and what kinds of community consultation are being planned around these?
 2. When will the working group be set up? Who will sit on it, and who will be taking the lead?
 3. On streets that have been adopted as part of the HFS scheme will residents be obliged to remove all weeds, or will some be allowed to flourish if they don't present a trip hazard, in recognition of recent

research that shows that urban weeds can be more important for insect pollinators than planted wildflower meadows?

4. When will the Herbicide-Free streets webpage be made available to inform residents about how they can opt in to the street adoption scheme? We are concerned that it is nearly Spring and this information still hasn't been made available.
 5. Will your online communications make it clear that members of the public should not be using herbicides or any other pesticides on council land, for example insecticidal dusting powder commonly used for ants, on pavements and streets that border private gardens? How can residents report such instances of pesticide-free breaches?
 6. Will the council highlight in its communications the public health dimension of pesticide exposure in addition to its links to biodiversity breakdown so that people better understand the rationale behind the HRP?
 7. Will you post herbicide spraying schedules in advance of spraying or at least at the time it happens, in keeping with commitments made in last July's herbicide-free motion to protect the health of residents and particularly those with existing allergies for whom pesticide-exposure presents additional risks?
 8. Will you at the very least, ensure that schools are pre-warned of herbicide spraying in their vicinity, and will operatives be advised to avoid spraying at school drop-off and collection times (e.g., 8.00-9.30 am, and 2.30-4.00 pm) given childrens' heightened vulnerability to the toxic impacts of chemical exposure?
 9. We were pleased by the response to our question at the last ECSC meeting that herbicide spraying operatives will now be required to wear full PPE as is the law. Can you confirm that this requirement will now be enforced? Can you also explain why it has not been enforced until now?
7. Raised the following points:
- i. Has the city council started any planned herbicide treatments in 2022? If so, which streets?
 - ii. What is the web address of the pages giving dates/streets/wards of planned herbicide treatments? This was promised verbally by Cllr Collis

at the January ECSC and confirmed again as being at a 'very advanced draft stage' at North Area Committee on 28th February. This information is needed so residents can avoid neurotoxic areas.

- iii. How will the 12 streets/small areas for the Herbicide Free Street scheme trial be selected?
 - iv. Where is the webpage for residents to apply to the scheme? How will volunteers be trained and how will the scheme be evaluated?
8. Has any progress been made regarding finding appropriate locations for Gypsy and Traveller transit sites or negotiated stopping places in Cambridge and South Cambs?

The Housing Strategy Policy Team responded:

- i. An Officer Working Group was exploring several issues relating to Gypsies and Travellers, including looking for potential site options and exploring how transit sites and negotiated stopping places have been delivered elsewhere. We are also still awaiting the results of the sub-regional Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment.
9. Raised the following points:
- i. I note with grave concern the reference to 'recent NHS reforms that have led to the setting up of Integrated Care Systems...' and the further presumption that these will improve health and care in the report to the March 24th Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee. May I point out that these 'reforms' are based on the American model of HMOs, a privatised healthcare system, totally opposed to our publicly funded NHS, still a model for healthcare provision around the world. Meanwhile the current Health and Care Bill, which enshrines the potential for further private control through Integrated Care System (ICS) boards and private collaboratives alongside the effective demise of General Practice as the basis for our public National Health System (90% of patient contact) has NOT YET BEEN PASSED. The government has continued its privatisation by stealth during the pandemic, handing out billions of pounds to private companies for failed provision of PPE and Track and Trace systems, while continuing to underfund the NHS. During the early stages of the pandemic, the government saw fit to allow

tens of thousands of still infectious people to be discharged into care homes resulting in the avoidable deaths of 20,000 people, yet this report to Committee puts forward the view that the 'adaptations' will improve health and care provision. The concerned public (which should be all of us including local government councillors) have yet to see or be consulted on critical issues like the constitution and powers of the ICS.

- ii. Question: On what basis and evidence is the report and recommendations to the Scrutiny Committee on the highly contentious Health and Care Bill been authored in advance of its passage?

The Strategy Officer responded:

- i. The report is concerned with the Councils involvement with the Health and Wellbeing Board and that the preparations for the Integrated Care Partnership and other new local arrangements, such as Integrated Neighbourhoods, are only provided to show how partnership working is likely to develop over the next year and its impact on our involvement in the Health and Wellbeing Board and the emerging care system. Did not think the paper implies support for the proposed new ways of working and only reflects the arrangements being put in place by the CCG and its view about priorities for public health, which pretty much align with the existing priorities of partners.
- ii. The papers that provided this context were provided to the county's Adult and Heath Committee on 13 January and were considered as a part of the it's Health Scrutiny role. The papers can be found here: [Council and committee meetings - Cambridgeshire County Council > Meetings \(cmis.uk.com\)](https://cmis.uk.com)

22/23/EnC Proposed Improvements to the Market Square

Matter for Decision

The City Council has been working with stakeholders to consider the potential opportunities for improvement of the Market Square. Stakeholder views raised at scrutiny committee regarding the project in early 2021, alongside the continued impact of the pandemic, offered the Council's team the potential to consider all the evidence and views collated over the past few years and to review the project.

The project team have reviewed the feedback, previous reports and more recent work. There is a groundswell of support for changes to the market square, making it a more accessible, attractive, welcoming, exciting and safe place to visit, shop and gather both during the day and into the evening. Stakeholders want to see the 7 day market continue, but also want the ability to experience other events in the space.

The Officer's report provided an update on the review of the project, the other major projects potentially impacting on, or which may impact on the city centre, and the additional work done to look at the possible options for sustainable improvements to the square to address stakeholder requirements in an effective way whilst recognizing the importance of the surrounding heritage, alongside the needs for a fit-for purpose future.

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

- i. Noted the update on the project status and next steps at section 8.0 for the project workstreams.
- ii. Noted the need to consider the project in line with other key projects including the heat network feasibility study and GCP's Road network hierarchy review and any resulting proposals which may arise before progressing a more detailed scheme proposal, in order to ensure that a strategic approach is taken to the project. This is likely to mean that the development of any scheme, if still feasible, for approval to progress to a planning application will not be finalized until at least 2023.
- iii. Approved the amended vision as proposed in section 4.3 of the Officer's report.
- iv. Delegated authority to the Director, in consultation with Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes, to continue to develop the project in line with the Corporate Programme Office and project management requirements, and with the Council's formal decision processes. The project will be managed in collaboration with partners leading other major schemes which may have an impact on the outcomes for this project. Formal scheme development, where proposed, will be developed in line with current policy, including on voluntary and statutory consultation, and brought to committee. Future delivery of any approved project will be subject to available funding.
- v. Noted the proposal to set up a liaison group to ensure updates on the project are shared with key stakeholders, with the first meeting of this

group to take place before the next Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee. The Liaison group engagement does not preclude other specific engagement with partners, or replace the relevant voluntary or statutory public consultation processes.

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 Enterprise and Sustainable Development.

The Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Was liaising with police colleagues on how to improve the safety of the market square area such as lighting for the night time economy. There was a feeling the market square was unfriendly when there was no market present, so officers were looking at ways to mitigate this such as changing market stall orientation to all better CCTV coverage.
- ii. Opposition Spokes would be included in the stakeholders group. Any future decisions on the market square would come back to committee for discussion and debate in public.
- iii. The consultation had been widely promoted. It was up to people in and outside of the city (including tourists) to respond. Over a thousand responses had been received to date, so officers felt the responses represented various views.
- iv. The market square was being improved to facilitate a multi-use area including a seven day market. Officers were not prescribing who could use the area eg agency or independent traders.
- v. There was a lot of concern about material used in the trial demountable stalls so other options were being considered.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Noted some discontent regarding the market square project had been expressed by some traders and members of the public. The project had started well and been supported by traders. The pandemic occurred which forced the closure of the market. This changed the tone of

responses. Misinformation and distrust arose. The Executive Councillor hoped things were in a better position now.

- ii. Traders were updated through regular meetings with officers.

The Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development amended the recommendations in her report as follows (amendments shown as bold and struck through text):

2.1 Note the update on the project status and next steps at section 8.0 for the project workstreams.

2.2 Note the need to consider the project in line with other key projects including the heat network feasibility study and GCP's Road network hierarchy review and any resulting proposals which may arise before progressing a more detailed scheme proposal, in order to ensure that a strategic approach is taken to the project. This is likely to mean that the development of any scheme, if still feasible, for approval to progress to a planning application will not be finalized until at least 2023.

~~2.2~~ **2.3** Approve the amended vision as proposed in section 4.3.

~~2.3~~ **2.4** Delegate authority to the Director, in consultation with **Executive Councillor**, Chair and Spokes, to continue to develop the project in line with the Corporate Programme Office and project management requirements, and with the Council's formal decision processes. The project will be managed in collaboration with partners leading other major schemes which may have an impact on the outcomes for this project. Formal scheme development, where proposed, will be developed in line with current policy, including on voluntary and statutory consultation, and brought to committee. Future delivery of any approved project will be subject to available funding.

~~2.4~~ **2.5** Note the proposal to set up a liaison group to ensure updates on the project are shared with key stakeholders. The Liaison group engagement does not preclude other specific engagement with partners, or replace the relevant voluntary or statutory public consultation processes.

Councillors requested a change to the Officer's recommendations. Councillor Porrer proposed to amend the following recommendations from the Officer's report (amendments shown as bold and struck through text):

- 2.3 Approve as amended ~~draft the~~ **vision as proposed in Section 4.3, subject to a full report on the consultations undertaken so far and further scrutiny at the next ECSC.**
- 2.5 Note the proposal to set up a liaison group to ensure updates on the project are shared with key stakeholders, **with the first meeting of this group to take place before the next Environment and Community**

Scrutiny Committee. The Liaison group engagement does not preclude other specific engagement with partners, or replace the relevant voluntary or statutory public consultation processes.

The Chair decided that the proposed new recommendations should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee rejected recommendation 2.3 by 5 votes to 3.

The Committee accepted recommendation 2.5 by 8 votes to 0.

The Chair decided that the amended recommendations should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse recommendation 2.1 as amended.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse recommendation 2.2 as amended.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse recommendation 2.3 as amended.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse recommendation 2.4 as amended.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse recommendation 2.5 as amended.

The Deputy Leader 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 or Deputy Leader.

22/24/EnC Asset Management and Decarbonisation Plan Progress Report

Matter for Decision

The Council has commissioned surveys of corporate buildings, prioritising those with gas boilers, to start to develop a programme to incorporate the

decarbonisation of these buildings by 2030 within a planned maintenance programme. This report provides a progress update and the next steps.

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

Noted the contents of the report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Asset Manager.

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

- i. The intention was not to replace existing gas boilers with new gas ones, but to use alternative heating systems such as air source heat pumps.
- ii. Where gas boilers should have been replaced in 2021, they would be repaired and maintained until suitable non-gas alternatives could be installed.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Deputy Leader approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Deputy Leader or Executive Councillor.

22/25/EnC Hackney Carriage Table of Fares

Matter for Decision

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

The existing Table of Fares came into effect on the 1st April 2021 and is attached to the Officer's report as Appendix A.

In previous years amendments to Table of Fares was completed on an ad hoc basis. However, in January 2019, Executive Councillor agreed for consultations to take place in early March each year with the adaptation of fares coming into effect on 1st April.

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

- i. Considered and agreed the amended Hackney Carriage Tables of fares as seen on Appendix B which incorporates requested amendments, which have been considered by Environmental Health Manager;
 - 1.1.1.1. Change from “For each subsequent 176 yards (161 metres) or part thereof” to “For each subsequent 175 yards (160 metres) or part thereof”;
 - 1.1.1.2. Amend extra charges to the following;
 - 5 or more passengers travelling in the vehicle - £3.50
 - Bicycles - £1.50
 - Vehicle unfit to continue working (soiling) - £100
 - 1.1.1.3. Include but amend the Fuel Surcharge, under Extra Changes. Amendment is as followed:

“£0.40 Fuel Surcharge (only applicable if the national retail price of diesel, as published by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy , has exceeded 179.9p per litre since 1 April 2022)

**There will be a separate notice in this vehicle if this extra charge is payable.”
 - 1.1.1.4. Extra Fuel Charge will only be applicable during dates fuel exceeds 179.9p per litre, as published weekly by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy up until the next fuel publication detailing that fuel charge has fallen back and no longer exceeds 179.9 per litre. Trade will be made aware via e-mail.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Environmental Health Manager.

The Environmental Health Manager updated recommendations in her original report by referring to the published amendment (amendments shown as bold text):

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

1.1.2. Consider and agree the amended Hackney Carriage Tables of fares as seen on Appendix B which incorporates requested amendments, which have been considered by Environmental Health Manager;

1.1.2.1. Change from “For each subsequent 176 yards (161 metres) or part thereof” to “For each subsequent 175 yards (160 metres) or part thereof”;

1.1.2.2. Amend extra charges to the following;

- 5 or more passengers travelling in the vehicle - £3.50
- Bicycles - £1.50
- Vehicle unfit to continue working (soiling) - £100

1.1.2.3. Include but amend the Fuel Surcharge, under Extra Changes. Amendment is as followed:

“£0.40 Fuel Surcharge (only applicable if the national retail price of diesel, as published by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy , has exceeded 179.9p per litre since 1 April 2022)

**There will be a separate notice in this vehicle if this extra charge is payable.”

1.1.2.4. Extra Fuel Charge will only be applicable during dates fuel exceeds 179.9p per litre, as published weekly by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial

Strategy up until the next fuel publication detailing that fuel charge has fallen back and no longer exceeds 179.9 per litre. Trade will be made aware via e-mail.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Deputy Leader approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Deputy Leader.

22/26/EnC Review of PSPOs

Matter for Decision

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 ("2014 Act") gives the Council powers to make Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs).

The Council has two PSPOs due to lapse in 2022. These are:

- i. The Cambridge City Council Mill Road Cemetery, Petersfield Green and the front garden at Ditchburn Place, Cambridge Public Spaces Protection Order 2016, and
- ii. The Public Spaces Protection Order (Touting) 2016.

Before the orders lapse a decision must be made to either extend the period of the orders for up to three years, to vary or to discharge the orders. All three decisions will require action by Cambridge City Council.

A consultation on which decision to take has been conducted with the Police and Crime Commissioner, the local policing body, relevant community representatives, ward councillors and the owner/occupier of land the PSPOs cover. Over 92% of respondents supported the extension of the orders.

Whilst reported incidents of prohibited behaviours have significantly decreased, community groups and councillors remained concerned about anti-social behaviour re-occurring without the PSPOs in place.

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

- i. Approved extending both PSPOs for a period of 12 months on the grounds of:
 - a. Consultation feedback highlighting concerns about anti-social behaviour (ASB) re-occurring if the orders were discharged and evidence of lower levels of prohibited behaviours.
 - b. The impact of Covid-19 on social life in the areas concerned and the potential that behaviour and anti-social behaviour may resume now that restrictions have been lifted.
 - c. The need to address the disparity between low reporting to the Council and Police and ongoing community concerns about prohibited behaviours.
- ii. Noted that, if approved, the extension period would be used to assess if there is further evidence to warrant a 3-year extension, variation or discharge of either or both of the PSPOs.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Community Safety Manager.

The Community Safety Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. People could report anti-social behaviour to the City Council anti-social behaviour team if they did not feel comfortable contacting the police.
- ii. As covid restrictions were lifting, the City Council was liaising with residents as people anticipated that levels of anti-social behaviour could rise.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 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 10.25 pm

CHAIR