

**ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

15 January 2013

5.00 - 6.02 pm

**Present:** Councillors Kightley (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Johnson, Marchant-Daisley, Owers, Reid and Reiner

**Also Present:**

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services: Jean Swanson

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Tim Ward

**Officers Present:**

Director of Environment - Simon Payne

Head of Planning Services - Patsy Dell

Head of Refuse & Environment - Jas Lally

Urban Design and Conservation Manager - Glen Richardson

Cambridge 20mph Project Officer - Ben Bishop

Project Delivery and Environment Manager - Andrew Preston

Committee Manager - Toni Birkin

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****13/1/ENV Apologies**

All members of the Committee were present.

**13/2/ENV Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012 were approved and signed as a correct record.

**13/3/ENV Declarations of Interest**

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Saunders	13/8/ENV	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Reid	13/8/ENV	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

	13/6/ENV	Personal: School Governor
Reiner	13/8/ENV	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Johnson	13/6/ENV	Personal: School Governor

### **13/4/ENV Public Questions (See information at the end of the agenda)**

There were no public questions.

### **13/5/ENV Decision Taken By Executive Councillors**

**5a** Delegation to South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Members noted the decision.

### **13/6/ENV Annual Update About the Work of "Strategic" Partnerships**

#### **Matter for Decision:**

The Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services remit covers the work of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough). The report gave scrutiny members a feel for the direction of travel for this partnership and its developing priorities. It was part of a commitment given in the Council's "Principles of Partnership Working" that the Council's lead member in each partnership provide his or her scrutiny committee with an annual account of their work.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services:**

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Continue to work with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough) to ensure that the strategic issues affecting the management of municipal waste (all waste under the control of an authority), environmental quality and wider waste management issues are responded to in a way that is appropriate for Cambridge.

#### **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 regarding the Annual Review of Strategic Partnerships.

In response to member's questions the Officer confirmed the following:

- i. Contractual discussions were on-going to resolve the problem of residual waste from the City going to landfill sites. Concerns had been noted and the officer undertook to keep members fully informed of progress.
- ii. Members of the RECAP Board were clear on their individual authority. All decisions were taken by the individual authorities and not at the Board. Joint decision regarding waste services were business rather than political decisions.
- iii. School waste was not monitored. However, recycling rates had improved which indicated success in this area. Schools were aware that there was a good economic case for reducing waste.
- iv. While the RECAP objectives were a work in progress, the last year had seen improvements such as: route optimisation; increased opportunities for recycling; improved procurement together with software and service improvements.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

**13/7/ENV Changes to the Commercial Waste Policy in Relation to the Controlled Waste Regulations 2012****Matter for Decision:**

The Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012 were enacted on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2012 and amended by The Controlled Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 which came into force on the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012. This identified what and who should be charged for the collection of waste and its disposal. In particular the new regulations have

changed the charging strategy and definitions surrounding waste previously described as 'household waste for which a collection charge can be made'

Officers have worked with the County Council to determine a process for implementation of this legislation and establish principles where charging discretion will be considered.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services:**

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Approve the implementation of the charging principles and strategy for Cambridge City Councils Commercial Waste Service as set out by the County Council's waste charging policy to be implemented in April 2013.

**Reason for the Decision:**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

There was no debate on this item.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

**13/8/ENV Cambridge 20mph Project**

**Matter for Decision:**

The Executive Councillor was asked to agree the project scope, initiation, and programme. Also for spending to be authorised on initial project costs.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:**

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Approve initiation of the project and initial project costs in accordance with the project documentation referenced in the Officer's report, with

implementation subject to further scrutiny, and approval of project appraisals.

- ii. Approve the Programme as detailed in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- iii. Approve the Governance/Decision making process as set out in section 4 of the Officer's report.
- iv. Approve the Board terms of reference as detailed in Appendix B of the Officer's report.
- v. Approve the phasing as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- vi. Approve the Engagement/Consultation to commence for the first phase as detailed in Appendix D of the Officer's report.

Approve the following estimated initial project spending:

- vii. Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs) for project baseline data collection – < £12,000
- viii. Project wide Engagement/Consultation Activities – < £50,000

**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 Cambridge 20mph Project Officer regarding the Cambridge 20mph project.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- i. The Police needed to be fully consulted at an early stage of the project.
- ii. Could short-term street closures of some streets be considered for community events and play days?
- iii. As there has been no public consultation to-date can members be assured that the questions are open and neutral?
- iv. A skewed consultation would not result in public buy in and the project would fail.
- v. Members did not feel that a PR firm could add value to the project. However, a pro-active approach to the local paper would be welcomed.
- vi. The Committee suggested that there were omissions to the consultee list. The final consultee list would be agreed by the Project Board.

In response to members' questions the Officers present confirmed the following:

- i. The consultation process would be phased along area committee lines. However, no individual area committee could opt out.
- ii. If the consultation demonstrates a lack of public support, the project would not go ahead.
- iii. If the public had strong views that a particular A or B road be included in the project, the County Council would be consulted.
- iv. The County Council was contributing officer time and equipment but was not contributing financially.
- v. The Police had agreed to enforce the limit once adequate signage was in place.
- vi. The Project Board would have the role of project management. They would not be empowered to make decision.
- vii. Area Committee Chairs would be members of the Project Management in rotation.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

**13/9/ENV Restoration of Cambridge's Historic Advertising Signs**

**Matter for Decision:**

The report provided a brief update of one of several projects forming part of the Planning Services Pro-active Conservation Programme which were reported to committee in March of 2012. The historic advertising signs restoration project was proposed to start with two pilot schemes, one on Cherry Hinton Road and one on Victoria Avenue.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:**

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Note the update on the historic advertising signage restoration project and to endorse the pilot projects as described in the attached "Briefing Note and Project Appraisal – Restoration of Cambridge's Advertising Signs (November 2012)".

**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 Urban Design and Conservation Manager regarding the Restoration of Cambridge's Historic Advertising Signs.

The Committee expressed disappointment that property owners had been reluctant to take up the scheme. This was thought to be due to fears of future maintenance requirements or restriction on the property. Members suggested that officers needed to be very clear in their communications with owners and to ensure that they were aware there was no liability attached to the offer. Members suggested that they could help with this and could engage with property owners in their wards.

Whilst there is no budget allocation at present, suggestions of further signs for consideration would be welcomed.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 6.02 pm

**CHAIR**