

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

13 March 2012

4.00 - 5.35 pm

Present: Councillors Kightley (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Herbert, Marchant-Daisley, Owers, Tucker, Tunnacliffe and Znajek

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services: Jean Swanson

Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport: Tim Ward

Officers: Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Jas Lally (Head of Refuse & Environment), Matthew Paul (Urban Designer), Simon Payne (Director of Environment), Glenn Richardson (Head of Joint Urban Design Team), Jen Robertson (Waste Strategy Manager) and Susan Smith (Senior Conservation and Design Officer)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**12/15/ENV Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Wright.

12/16/ENV Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Saunders	12/22/ENV 12/26/ENV	- Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future

12/17/ENV Minutes

The minutes of the 10 January 2012 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/18/ENV Public Questions

There were no public questions.

12/19/ENV Future of Plastic Pots, Tubs and Trays in the Blue Bin**Matter for Decision:**

As of March 2012 plastic bottles were the only plastics accepted for recycling in the council blue bin.

Cambridge City Council collected and recycled 44% of household waste through the blue bin, green bin and bring banks.

In November 2011 a resident's waste collection survey was carried out. More than half of respondents to the online element of the survey said that being able to recycle a greater range of materials would encourage them to recycle more.

Officers negotiated with the current contractor for the inclusion of additional plastic material (i.e. plastic pots, tubs and trays), in the blue bin collections.

The contract between the City Council, two partner authorities (Huntingdonshire DC and Fenland DC) and Viridor Waste Services is due to expire November 2014. Partner authorities are supportive of the inclusion of this material.

The addition of this material has financial implications that are covered in Section 4 of the Officer's report.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

Agreed the inclusion of plastic pots, tubs and trays in the blue recycling bin scheme with our contract partner authorities Huntingdonshire DC and Fenland DC.

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 Refuse and Environment plus the Waste Strategy Manager regarding the Future of Plastic Pots, Tubs and Trays in the Blue Bin.

The committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- (i) Welcomed the proposal to include additional plastic material in the blue bin collections to encourage recycling.
- (ii) Labour Councillors expressed the view that they would have preferred the expanded recycling scheme to have been implemented sooner; and had been pressing their Liberal Democrat colleagues to do so for some years.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services, Head of Refuse and Environment plus the Waste Strategy Manager confirmed the following:

- (i) The value of recycled materials was based on national demand. The recycling scheme was expensive when the City Council first entered into the contract in November 2009. The value of recycled materials has since risen, thus generating more potential income for the Council. Financial implication details were set out in section 4a of the Officer's report. This led to the recommendation to introduce more plastic recycling, so 'waste' material could now be seen as desirable material. The value of recycled materials for the City Council should be protected as the cost of disposal should be equal to, or less than, income from recycling additional plastics; so there would be no negative net change to the overall revenue.
- (ii) It is anticipated that the range of plastics to be recycled would increase in future.
- (iii) The Head of Refuse and Environment has been in discussion with Councillors and Officers from Huntingdonshire and Fenland Councils. He expected a favourable response to the joint contract proposal as all organisations would benefit.
- (iv) The current City Council contract terms would have to be reviewed and amended to implement additional plastic recycling. The Head of Refuse and Environment would discuss contract terms with the provider in future. Discussions had been on-going with Viridor since November 2009 when the contract began. It has only recently become economically viable for the City Council to recycle additional plastic materials. The Officer acknowledged that other councils had different recycling contract terms with the provider, and that members of the public would assume these to be universal.
- (v) The amended recycling scheme would be included in the (refuse collection) Route Optimisation Strategy if approved.

- (vi) The public were given recycling scheme information through a variety of media including leaflets and the Cambridge Matters magazine. Radio adverts had been used in the past, and there was provision in the budget for further radio adverts.
- (vii) Officers acknowledged the difficulty in engaging students and residents of multiple occupancy housing in recycling schemes due to the transient nature of the community. Communication and engagement schemes specifically targeting these groups would be reviewed in future. Cambridge Officers were liaising with their Oxford counterparts on methods to achieve better engagement.
- (viii) Materials for recycling were sent to a recycling facility for sorting and processing, then passed to another facility for further processing prior to export to China for recycling into other products. Recycled materials were sent to China at minimal cost, as they were put into containers that would be empty once imported goods were unloaded.
- (ix) There was no monitoring to limit the number of times items were sent for recycling. Items could potentially be processed multiple times before they degraded into low grade waste and were filtered out of the process.

The committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/20/ENV Health and Safety Work Plan 2012-2013

Matter for Decision:

The Health and Safety Work Plan incorporates the advice and guidance given to Local Authorities in the Health and Safety at Work Act, 1974 and the Health & Safety Executive's (HSE) Strategic Plan. It is more comprehensive and detailed in respect to health and safety enforcement than that contained in the general Refuse and Environment Operational plan.

The document would provide some reference point to which managers can measure work performance and outputs while recognising the need for continually reviewing the work programme throughout the year.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

Approved the attached Health and Safety Service Plan 2012/2013.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

12/21/ENV Food Safety Work Plan 2012-2013**Matter for Decision:**

The Food Standards Agency (FSA) require each food enforcement authority to produce a Food Enforcement Work Plan that outlines the Authority's work programme to ensure that food businesses in the City comply with the relevant legislation.

The document provides a reference point to allow the service to be reviewed against its objectives whilst still allowing the flexibility to respond to urgent incidents.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

Approved the Statutory Enforcement Work Plan for Food Law Enforcement 2012/2013 as set out in the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

Committee did not request this item for pre-scrutiny.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

12/22/ENV Adoption of Cambridge Skyline Guidance (Guidance Note in Respect of the Application of Policy 3/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan)**Matter for Decision:**

The Officer's report requested the adoption of guidance to support the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). The guidance was formerly referred to as the "Cambridge Skyline Guidance" during previous draft versions up to January 2012. Final revisions have now been made to the draft document following agreement from the Executive Councillor to responses to representations for the draft guidance in January 2012.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

- (i) Agreed the responses to the Draft Cambridge Skyline Guidance (October 2011) included in Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.
- (ii) Approved the document "Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)", attached as Appendix 2 (with text amendment to paragraph 4.4.5 set out below), as a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications.

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 Joint Urban Design and Urban Designer regarding the Adoption of Cambridge Skyline Guidance.

The Officers referred to an amendment to paragraph 4.4.5 (P31) of the Skyline Guidance document (appendix 2 of the Officer's report):

"Policy 8/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) is about the Cambridge Airport Safety Zone and Airport safeguarding restrictions. Developers of tall buildings should contact Marshalls Airport at pre-application stage to discuss

the effect which safeguarding restrictions may have on the maximum height of the building.”

The committee welcomed the document as a material planning consideration to ensure that the ‘right building’ was located in the ‘right place’.

In response to Member’s questions the Chair, Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport and Head of Joint Urban Design recommended including a dossier of ‘successful’ building good practice case studies in a supplement to the Local Plan Review, rather than delaying the Skyline Guidance to include it.

The committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations, including the amendment to paragraph 4.4.5 of the Skyline Guidance.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/23/ENV Pro-Active Conservation Programme

Matter for Decision:

The Officer’s report reviewed 2011-12 progress on the Proactive conservation work programme, which itself was originally started in 2008-9. The purpose of the Officer’s report was to outline work completed, what was outstanding, what was proposed for 2012-13, plus the current and proposed budget to support the programme.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

- (i) Noted Appendix 1 of the Officer’s report, which comprises an update of the programme of Pro-active conservation work undertaken in 2011-12; and agreed work still to be completed.
- (ii) Agreed proposed projects of proactive conservation work to be undertaken by the City Council in 2012-13 and beyond as set out in Appendix 2 of the Officer’s report, including the required budget carry over from 2011-12 as noted therein to support the programme.

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 Joint Urban Design plus the Senior Conservation and Design Officer regarding the Pro-Active Conservation Programme.

The Officers referred to a typographical error on P226 (Appendix 2 of the Officer's report) listing 'Conduit Heat Road' instead of 'Conduit Head Road'.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport and the Head of Joint Urban Design and Conservation confirmed the following:

- (i) The Executive Councillor undertook to ask Officers to set up a meeting between Councillors and Officers to investigate the practicability of safeguarding advertising signs such as Bull's Dairy, which were seen as historic. Councillors Ward, Herbert and Saunders expressed an interest in joining the discussion.
- (ii) The Executive Councillor undertook to ask Officers to investigate sources of funding for public art provision/conservation to mitigate the impact of developments. Officers would be asked to clarify if signage could be classified as art, and so attract section 106 funding.
- (iii) The designation of Howes Place as a Conservation Area was on hold pending signing of the NIAB site Section 106 agreement.
- (iv) Suburbs and Approaches Studies were proposed as a database of reference material for consideration of application suitability. This would support the Local Plan criteria assessment.

The committee resolved by unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/24/ENV Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study, Trumpington Road Suburbs and Approaches Study and Long Road Suburbs and Approaches Study**Matter for Decision:**

The Officer's report sought approval of the Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study, plus Long Road Suburbs and Approaches Study.

The Trumpington Road Suburbs and Approaches Study was withdrawn from the agenda as Savills had queried if their representation had been given due consideration. This report would be brought back to a future Environment Scrutiny Committee.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

- (i) Approved the text of the Hills Road Suburbs & Approaches Study, attached as Appendix 2 to the document, and that the study be used to inform planning decisions in this area.
- (ii) Approved the text of the Long Road Suburbs & Approaches Study, attached as Appendix 2 to the document, and that the study be used to inform planning decisions in this area.

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 Joint Urban Design and the Senior Conservation and Design Officer regarding the Hills Road Suburbs and Approaches Study, plus Long Road Suburbs and Approaches Study.

The committee resolved by unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/25/ENV Conservation Area Boundary Review and Appraisal for Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Area

Matter for Decision:

The City Council has an obligation under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to periodically review its Conservation Area designations and boundaries, to consider any new areas, and under Section 71 of the Act to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these areas.

In 2010, consultants drafted an Appraisal of the New Town and Glisson Road area of the Central Conservation Area with a proposal to extend the boundary, taking in the areas of modern development that were formerly omitted. The Central Conservation Area was designated in 1969 and part of this area now being appraised was included. There have been a series of extensions to this part of the Central Conservation Area, the last being to the east of Hills Road in 1983. This draft Appraisal provides evidence to illustrate that the New Town and Glisson Road area meets current national criteria, in terms of the special architectural and historic interest for Conservation Area designation, and in addition that sections currently outside the existing boundary are also worthy of inclusion.

A period of public consultation began in December 2011 and finished in February 2012. The broad consensus of opinion was in favour of the proposals as outlined in the Appraisal.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport: Approved the Appraisal of the New Town and Glisson Road area of the Central Conservation Area and to agree the revised Central Conservation Area boundary.

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 Joint Urban Design and the Senior Conservation and Design Officer regarding the Conservation Area Boundary Review and Appraisal for Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Area.

In response to Member's questions the Head of Planning Services and the Senior Conservation and Design Officer confirmed the following:

- (i) In the area proposed for removal from the existing Conservation Area, newly built or developments underway had their own forms of protection under the CB1 Master Plan, and so did not necessarily meet the criteria for Conservation Area protection. This principle had guided Officer's recommendations for areas to be excluded from the Conservation Area boundary map (ref Appendix 2 of the Officer's report). The original reasons for including CB1 land in a Conservation Area (eg industrial uses and related rail infrastructure), had now fallen away as these uses had now gone and the use of the area was substantially changing.
- (ii) Newly built or developments underway as part of the CB1 Master Plan could be included in the Conservation Area, this would provide a duplicate form of protection, as opposed to an additional level.

Councillors requested a change to the proposed boundary of the Conservation Area (ref Appendix 2 of the Officer's report). Councillor Herbert formally proposed to amend the Conservation Area boundary to include all of the CB1 development around Foster's Mill for consistency of protection of character.

The committee approved this additional recommendation by 6 votes to 0.

The committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

12/26/ENV Conservation Area Boundary Review and Appraisal for Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area

Matter for Decision:

The City Council has an obligation under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to periodically review its

Conservation Area designations and boundaries, to consider any new areas, and under Section 71 of the Act to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these areas.

In 2010, consultants drafted an Appraisal of the Riverside area of the Central Conservation Area with a proposal to extend the boundary. The Central Conservation Area was designated in 1969 and extended to include the Riverside area in 1993. This current Appraisal provides evidence to illustrate that the area meets current national criteria, in terms of the special architectural and historic interest for Conservation Area designation, and in addition that sections currently outside the existing boundary are also worthy of inclusion.

A period of public consultation was held in 2011, the responses were broadly in support of the findings in the appraisal and the boundary changes. However some parties notified were unaware that part of the boundary of the enlarged Conservation Area included land in Chesterton and therefore a second round of consultations was undertaken in 28th November 2011 to 23rd January 2012.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:
Approved the revised Conservation Area boundary and the content of the draft Appraisal for the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area.

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 Joint Urban Design and the Senior Conservation and Design Officer regarding the Conservation Area Boundary Review and Appraisal for Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area.

The committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 5.35 pm

CHAIR