

**COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

25 March 2010  
1.30pm – 4.25pm

**Present:**

**Executive Councillors:**

Cllr Smith, Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation  
Cllr Blair, Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health  
Cllr Smart, Executive Councillor for Housing

**Scrutiny Committee Members:**

Councillors Kightley (Vice-Chair), Al Bander, Benstead, Blencowe, Ellis-Miller, McGovern, Walker, Best, Dutton, Lott and Haywood

**Non-voting co-optees:**

Diane Best, Brian Haywood and Anna Vine-Lott (*Tenant/Leaseholder Representatives*)

**Officer Present:**

Liz Bissett (Director of Community Services)  
Debbie Kaye (Head of Active Communities)  
Ian Ross (Recreational Services Manager)  
Alistair Wilson (Green Spaces manager)  
Yvonne O'Donnell (Environmental Health Manager)  
Diane Docherty (Single Homeless and Rough Sleepers Co-ordinator)  
Glenn Burgess (Committee Manager)

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**10/CS/25            Minutes**

A slight correction was made to 10/CS/13 of the minutes of 14 January 2010. The minute should have stated that an allocation of 'up to £2000' be allocated to the Cambridge Cats Basketball Club.

With this slight correction, the minutes of the 14 January 2010 and the 10 February 2010 were agreed as correct records.

**2                    Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Liddle (Chair) and Sanders. Councillor Kightley, as Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

### 3 Declaration of Interests

| Councillor | Item | Interest   |
|------------|------|--|
| Al Bander  |      | In the process of purchasing a boat to moor on the River Cam |
| Blencowe   |      | As a Governor of St Matthews School                          |
| Boyce      |      | Trustee of the Cambridge Sports Hall Trust                   |
| McGovern   |      | Member of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)                  |
| Smith      |      | Works for Cambridge University                               |
| Walker     |      | Employee of the University of Cambridge                      |

### 4 Public Questions (See information below)

The Chair directed members of the public to a set of revised recommendations for the Mooring Policy Report (agenda item 13).

Richard Brown (on behalf of the Strawberry Fair Committee) asked the following question:

*'Has the council any plans to support a Strawberry Fair event in 2011 (pending the outcome of the license appeal hearing) and would the council be willing to work in partnership with the SF committee to plan some activities which would fill the vacuum left by the cancellation of the fair this year?'*

*The Strawberry Fair committee are worried by the intense internet chatter which the cancellation has caused and we would like to work on providing positive activities across the city in existing licensed venues to offer something for young people to do should they still turn up on the 5th June.'*

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation confirmed that, whilst plans were not yet in place for 2011, she would be happy to meet with the Strawberry Fair Committee (SFC) to discuss this further.

The Council shared the concern regarding the ongoing Internet discussions regarding the event. The Executive Councillor would, again be happy to work with the SFC to raise awareness that the event had been cancelled and also minimise any issues or disruptions on the day. It was emphasised that a multi-agency approach, including the Police, would be the best way forward.

Richard Brown emphasised the importance of communicating the message that the event had been cancelled. He confirmed that the SFC had released two press releases locally but felt that communication to a wider audience may be beneficial. He suggested that existing signage in the City could be utilised in the few weeks running up to 5 June for this purpose.

Richard Taylor asked the following question:

1. Strawberry Fair (Not on the Agenda)

*'Why was the Strawberry Fair not allowed to use the Council's licence for this year's event? Was this as a result of pressure from the Police and if so what form did that pressure take? What political direction was given by councillors to the City Council officers who decided not to allow Strawberry Fair to use the Council's licence for this year's event?'*

*How is the Council responding to the possibility of a disorganised gathering on Midsummer Common on the date of the fair? For example will it still be providing additional toilets for example? It has been reported that a meeting between the Council and Police was scheduled for Wednesday, what came out of that?*

*Will the council be vigorously defending the licensing Committee's decision at the appeal in front of the Magistrates?*

The Director of Community Services confirmed that the Police had requested a review of the licence for Midsummer Common due to concerns over some of the conditions. The Licence was held by three individual Council officers who would be held personally responsible for any breaches of the conditions. It was therefore decided that the SFC would need to apply for their own licence with the required conditions to meet the concerns of the Police.

The Director of Community Services agreed that mitigation measures may be required on the 5 June but suggested that the issue be discussed in detail at the meeting between the Executive Councillor and the SFC.

With regard to the decision of the Licensing Committee, it was confirmed that a corporate statement was currently being drafted.

Richard Taylor asked if Councillors were involved in the decision not to let SFC use the Council licence.

In response the Director of Community Services confirmed that, as responsibility for any breach of the conditions would sit with the individual officers, it was done under a delegated decision. However, the Executive Councillor had been fully involved.

Amy Tillson (residential boater, rower and a member of the Camboaters) asked why the Camboaters had not been consulted on the changes to the Mooring Policy, whilst others such as anglers and rowers had been.

The Head of Active Communities emphasised that the Council had a good working relationship with the Camboaters and met them on a quarterly basis to discuss any issues.

It was confirmed that there had been full consultation with them but it was also noted that the statement from Camboaters contained some factual inaccuracies that did not reflect the Council's ongoing discussions with them.

It was also emphasised that the Moorings Policy impacted on the whole City and it was therefore important that the consultation was wide ranging.

Amy Tillson agreed that the policy did impact on the whole City, but felt that the specific pricing structure was of most concern to the actual boaters on the river Cam.

Ros Connygham (residential boater and member of Camboaters) asked why a recommendation had been brought forward to raise the fees, when consultation was still ongoing.

The Head of Active Communities confirmed that due to a number of complaints in the last 12 months, it was suggested that mooring in Area B be retained but change the use to permit visitor mooring only, and Area C be re-designated for use by mooring licence holders only

This suggestion had been discussed at length with the Camboaters and others, who felt it was worthy of further investigation.

Ros Connygham stated that she felt this had not been thought through properly.

Luther Phillips (member of Cam Conservators Committee and Camboaters) felt that a small number of complaints should not be used as justification a change such as this. He felt that whilst the policy was not well managed by Active Communities, the current pricing structure did work.

It was suggested that the policy be retained in its current format for the next three years and then be reviewed.

The Head of Active Communities confirmed that as all of the complaints were specific to Area B, the Council had felt a need to look at this area. The views of the Camboaters had been taken on board and the pricing policy now related to the length and beam of boats and not just the width.

Luther Phillips reiterated his view that the current policy should only be reviewed after three years, and stated that a pricing policy based on length and beam would be administrative blunder.

Clare Laidler (Secretary of Camboaters) raised the issue of the waiting list. The website currently only showed the first five on this list and it was felt that the list was not being managed effectively.

The Head of Active Communities confirmed that turnover was slow and problematic due to the decision to allow those without a boat to still have equal access to the waiting list. When a space became available, the person at the top of the list had 28 days to respond to the initial letter and then a further three months to purchase a vessel. Unfortunately this caused a hold up in the system.

The waiting list did only show the first five on the list, but this had been done with the agreement of Camboaters.

Andy Rankin (residential boater) stated that the waiting list was out of date and in need of a refresh. He emphasised that the consultation process should be

fair and take into account the views of those most affected. Where clear views had been expressed through a consultation, these were the views that should be taken forward.

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation again directed the public to the revised recommendations and stated that further consultation was now an option.

Andy Rankin welcomed revised recommendations 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5 but was not in favour of continued ongoing consultation on this issue.

Mike Prior-Jones (residential boater) referred to page 3 of 'Tails of the River Bank', which stated that.....He asked if this was still correct

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation confirmed that this was correct.

Stephanie Clare (residential boater) stated that when the mooring fee was first established it was based on Council Tax band A, and asked when the Council had changed this.

The Head of Active Communities confirmed that originally the Mooring Licence Fee had been set at a level comparable with Council Tax Band A. In January 2008 a decision had been taken to establish an independent basis for charging, albeit using the existing level of fee as a starting point, and to raise this annually in accordance with the Retail Price Index (RPIX).

Stephanie Clare felt that this issue had caused confusion through the consultation.

The Executive Councillor agreed that there seemed to be some communication issues but suggested a meeting with the Camboaters to discuss the problems in more detail.

## **5 Key Decision - Additions to the programme for new affordable housing 2009/10**

**Matter for decision:** Remodelling and refurbishment of the former sheltered housing scheme at Roman Court.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing:**

Approved:

- a) commencement of the capital project, which was already included in the Council's Capital Plan. The total capital cost of the project in respect of redevelopment of the east court by Cambridge City Council was £1,375,364, and it was proposed that this was funded from the existing earmarked capital resource for the redevelopment of Roman Court of £1,863,000. The revenue implications arising from the project were a net revenue benefit to the Council of £9,650 per annum, assuming the scheme existed outside of the HRA subsidy system.
- b) The re-phasing of £1,375,364 of capital resources currently approved to be spent 2011/12 and 2012/13, to £500,000 in 2010/11, £815,364 in 2011/12, and £60,000 2012/13.
- c) The instruction of Property Services to arrange the transfer of the land that forms the west court to Papworth Trust under a 125 year lease at a peppercorn rent with the requirement that they provide supported housing for young people with disabilities. The Council would have 100% nomination rights.
- d) The waiver allowing the direct appointment of the Papworth Trust as Development Partner for this project and appointment of Papworth Trust as project manager for works to the east wing, without making the appointment subject to any form of competition.
- e) Supporting an application by Papworth Trust to the Homes and Communities Agency for grant funding for the redevelopment of the west court of Roman Court.

- f) The implementation and completion of the procurement of Roman Court refurbishment works to the east court by the Council, including tender and award of contract.

**Reason for the Decision:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Head of Strategic Housing Services introduced the report.

In response to a question from Councillor McGovern, he stated that if the Papworth Trust were unable to secure the funding, an alternative proposal would have to be brought back to the Committee for consideration.

The Director of Community Services confirmed that, due to insufficient capital allocation, the Council would be unable to refurbish both wings.

In response to concerns from Diane Best about the impact of refurbishment of those living on the site, it was agreed that Tenant and Leaseholder representatives would be consulted along with the residents.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Housing approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**5a** Appendix 1 - Additions to programme for new affordable housing 2009/10:  
Site Plan

**6** Key Item - Street Outreach and Mental Health Outreach and  
Resettlement Services



**Matter for decision:** Joint commissioning process to create a single Street Outreach and Mental Health Outreach and Resettlement Service.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing:**

Agreed:

1. To enter a joint commissioning process with the Adult Social Care Department at the County Council and to offer one single contract for two services that are very closely related but currently commissioned separately.
2. To commit funds of up to £175,000 per annum from the Homelessness Grant, which the Council received from the Communities and Local Government Department (CLG) and to award a contract for three years with an option to extend for a further two.
3. To authorise the officers to jointly procure with the County Council and award a contract for the provision of the Street Outreach Service and Mental Health outreach and Resettlement Service for a term of 3 years, with an option to extend for a further 2.years

**Reason for the Decision:** Significant advantages to be gained from entering into a joint commissioning process to create a single service. Many of the service users were also common to both services and the existing services operate from the same building at 125 Newmarket Road.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Single Homeless and Rough Sleepers Co-ordinator introduced the report to Members.

In response to a question from Councillor Walker, it was confirmed that the main risk to the Council was the Communities and Local Government Department Grant being changed into an Area Based Grant.

The Executive Councillor and Members praised the current Service and thanked staff for their hard work and dedication.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Housing approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

## **7 Key Item - Affordable Housing Development Partnership: 500 Partnership**

**Matter for decision:** Establishment of an Affordable Housing Development Partnership made up of four Registered Providers (RPs - housing associations) and two developer/house-builders.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Housing:**

Agreed:

- To approve that an Affordable Housing Development Partnership be set up to provide new Affordable Housing on Council owned sites.
- To give delegated authority to the Director of Community Services, following consultation with the Director of Finance and the Head of Legal Services, to complete a procurement process to select four housing associations partners (now called Registered Providers -RPs) to be part of the Affordable Housing Development Partnership.
- In the event of changes to the financial environment to give delegated authority to the Director of Community Services following consultation with the Director of Finance and the Head of Legal Services to complete a procurement process to select and appoint two developer/house-builder partners to join the Affordable Housing Development Partnership to progress new Council house-building and to procure the services of a professional property consultant to act as Partnership Facilitator.

- To note that, should the financial environment change, then schemes for new Council house building on Council owned sites will be brought back to Committee for scheme specific approval.
- To approve that Home Loss and disbursements be paid to tenants of Seymour Court consistent with payments made to-date to other tenants re-located under the Sheltered Housing Modernisation Programme. In this case the relocation costs to be paid from the Affordable Housing Capital reserve which will be replenished either by capital receipt following disposal of the Seymour Court site to a partner RP, or be accounted for as part of the total capital cost of a new Council house scheme, if viable (see paragraph 7.8 of the officers report). It is estimated that a contingency of £236,000 should be allowed to cover Home Loss and disbursements.
- To approve that £20,000 of the Affordable Housing Capital reserve also be set aside to cover the services of a Partnership Facilitator should these services be required prior to any scheme specific approval. These costs would also be replenished either by capital receipt following disposal of the Seymour Court site to a partner RP, or be accounted for as part of the total capital cost of a new Council house scheme.

**Reason for the Decision:** This approach would provide the flexibility for sites for new Affordable Housing to either be retained in the Council's ownership (should the financial environment allow), or to be appropriately procured in a timely fashion from RPs.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Head of Strategic Housing Services introduced the report to Members and highlighted the amended recommendations as circulated.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Housing approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

## **8 Non-Key Item - Strategy to Tackle Health Inequalities In Cambridgeshire**

**Matter for decision:** To approve the Strategy to Tackle Health Inequalities in Cambridgeshire.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health:**

Agreed:

- To endorse the Strategy to Tackle Health Inequalities in Cambridgeshire

**Reason for the Decision:** The Strategy would enable the City Council in Partnership with other agencies to deliver the health inequalities identified as a priority in the Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy and identified through the Improving Health Partnership.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

### **Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Environmental Health Manager introduced the report to Members and confirmed that the Strategy came about as a result of an audit of the Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust. The audit highlighted the need for the many different strands to be brought together under one single partnership.

In response to a question from Councillor Ellis-Miller it was confirmed that, whilst the partnership did not have enforcement powers, the main aim was to educate and advise others.

A minor error was highlighted on 3.6 of the report. It was confirmed that there were actually 4 city wards (not 3 as reported) that were in the '20% of wards within the highest deprivation scores in the County'.

It was confirmed that the partnership would be reporting back against both local and nation indicators, and discussions would be had with the Executive Councillor about how best to feed back to this committee.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that a monitoring report on the City Council and South Cambs Health Improvement Action Plan would be brought to committee in July 2010.

The Environmental Health Manager agreed with Members that the Strategy needed to be clear on how outcomes would be measured. She emphasised that improvements in areas such as smoking cessation were difficult to quantify, but progress was being made.

In response to Members question regarding the health of children, the Executive Councillor confirmed that this was being tackled through the Children's Trust and a whole range of partnership work.

Councillor Al Bander asked about the ranking of the priorities and the PCT Representative indicated that this was difficult to assess as many of them overlapped and could not be looked at in isolation. However, the biggest priorities Countywide seemed to be obesity and smoking, and for Cambridge City it would be alcohol related.

In response to a question from Councillor Walker regarding the new Health Officer post, the Environmental Health Manager stated that on three occasions they had been unable to successfully fill the post. It was also noted that they would be unable to deliver the new Strategy within the existing resources.

The Council were currently working with Anglia Ruskin University on the possibility of A Public Health student working on the project for 40 weeks, with the support of a professor. The 'Knowledge Transfer' would be jointly funded by the Government (60%) and the Council (40%) and would enable a sharing of skills and experience. The idea had been agreed in principal and it was hoped that a student might be in post within the next 8 weeks.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**8a** Appendix 1 - Strategy to Tackle Health Inequalities in Cambridgeshire:

**9 Key Item - Cambridge Allotments - A Management Policy for Consultation**

**Matter for decision:** To approve the 'Cambridge Allotments – A Management Policy' for Consultation.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:**

Agreed to:

- Approve the Management Policy for consultation; and to obtain feedback on the recommendations and objectives, contained within it;
- Instruct Officers to develop further the Allotment Management Procedures and consult on these in conjunction with the Management Policy; and
- Following consultation, to instruct officers to bring forward for further scrutiny the final Management Policy at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on the 1st of July 2010.

**Reason for the Decision:** To provide the Council with a strategic approach to the management of its allotment assets.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Green Spaces Manager introduced the report to Members.

In relation to Appendix A, it was agreed that for future consultations, the Orchard Park Community Council would be added to the list.

Members raised concerns that the allotment societies may feel 'over managed' by this new policy. In response the Green Spaces Manager confirmed that currently societies had different management 'styles' and there would be merit in having some standard guiding principals. He emphasised that this would not be about the council interfering but simply being on available to offer help when needed.

Councillor Kightley noted that whilst objective 2.3 (Good and safe access to sites) was important, consideration did need to be given to the possible affects on residents parking in the allotment areas.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**9a** Appendix 1 - Cambridge Allotments Management Policy and list of consultees

## **10 Non-Key Item - Follow up report: Improvements to Jesus Green**

**Matter for decision:** Information on the skateboard, play area and tennis court reviews and setting of timescales for implementation during 2010/11.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:**

- Agreed proposals and timescales as detailed within the report
- Instructed officers to proceed with implementing improvement work to skateboard facilities once stakeholders have agreed final design, and subject to planning permission.

- Instructed officers to procure a contract to refurbish two hard tennis courts on Jesus Green and install two additional hard courts, as per the outcomes of the consultation and subject to planning permission.
- Instructed officers to procure a final design for play area improvements based on results of recent consultation.

**Reason for the Decision:** A number of key consultations reviewing current facilities on Jesus Green had recently been concluded.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Green Spaces Manager introduced the report to Members.

In response to Members questions regarding the provision of free tennis on the refurbished courts, the Head of Active Communities confirmed that this would continue to be provided. A code of conduct was currently being drawn up with local stakeholders, and the Council were hoping to work with 'Tennis for Free' in order to maximise the resource.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**11 Non-Key Item - Review Open Space And Recreation S106 Programme**



**Matter for decision:** Approval of the Open Space And Recreation S106 Programme.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:**

Agreed:

- That the s106 project list revisions detailed in the officer's report be approved, and that the working list content be amended accordingly.

**Reason for the Decision:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Recreation Services Manager introduced the report to Members.

He confirmed that the new procurement approach had been agreed with the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) and the use of the existing framework to do S106 work was currently being discussed.

Members highlighted the need for comprehensive stakeholder consultation in order to get 'fine detail' correct on these schemes, and this was noted by officers.

Councillor Blencowe raised the issue of the non-delivery of the University Sports Centre and the Head of Active Communities confirmed that this was now being managed directly by the University. The Council had identified some strategic support for the project but they were still awaiting a nominated university lead for the project.

Officers confirmed that new schemes could still be submitted to the programme. Publicity of the programme was being increased, with information being brought to Area Committees in the summer.

Councillor Blencowe suggested that professional sports groups should be approached to use the university sports facilities in the run up to the Olympics. This was noted by officers.

Councillor Ellis-Miller thanked the officers for the new Romsey Recreational Ground.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**11a** Appendix 1 - Proposed new S106 Open Spaces and Recreation Project list 2010/2011

## **12 Non-Key item - Project Appraisal - Pathfinder Play Scheme**

**Matter for decision:** Approval of the following Project Appraisal: Play Pathfinder

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:**

**Recommendation/s**

Financial recommendations –

*For schemes not included in the Council's Capital Plan*

- Approved retrospective approval for works detailed in the formal recommendations below and the report attached in the main agenda.
- Recommended this capital scheme (which was not included in the Council's Capital Plan) for approval by Council, subject to resources being available to fund the capital and revenue costs associated with the Scheme. The total capital cost of the project was an award of £55,000 for Ditton Fields and an award of £40,000 for Cherry Hinton Hall. The monies had been awarded to the City Council as a grant received from the County Council for delivery upon the National agenda of natural play spaces funded directly from the Department of Children, Families and Schools.

- There were no revenue implications arising from the project.

**Procurement recommendations:**

- Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of works for delivery of these natural play spaces.
- If the quotation or tender sum exceeded the estimated contract value by more than 15% the permission of the Executive Councillor and Director of Finance would be sought prior to proceeding.

**Reason for the Decision:** To provide two natural play spaces taking into account and delivering upon the ten objectives for play as issued by Play England. To provide a natural play space at Ditton Fields and a Natural Play space at Cherry Hinton Hall.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Recreation Services Manager introduced the report to Members.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously)

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

**13 Non-Key Item - Review of River Moorings Policy**

**Matter for decision:** Review of the River Moorings Policy.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:**

Approved:

- To retain moorings in Area B. Request officers to explore with stakeholders the possibility of switching the designations for Areas B and C and to bring forward any proposals for change in October 2010
- Subject to planning permission and necessary permissions from statutory agencies that secure mooring points were installed for a trial period on the visitor moorings and between Victoria Avenue bridge up stream to the Pump Out at Jesus Green for RML holders.
- To retain the existing Mooring Policy pricing structure and review after a 3-year period.
- To note the current approach to the waiting list, and to instruct officers to work with Camboaters and the Conservators of the River Cam to make improvements to the allocation of RML's and improve efficiency, particularly the time taken to allocate a RML.
- To note information relating to mooring at the Riverside area and continue to offer support and cooperation to the County Council and other agencies involved in addressing concerns raised by local people.

**Reason for the Decision:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:** As set out in the officer's report.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Head of Active Communities introduced the report to Members and referred in detail to the revised recommendations as noted below:

**2.1 (amended)**

Retain moorings in Area B. Request officers to explore with stakeholders the possibility of switching the designations for Areas B and C and to bring forward any proposals for change in October 2010

**2.2 (as per officers report)**

**2.3 (amended)**

Set up a cross-departmental working group (which includes representation from the boating community) to bring forward proposals for a pricing structure with a minimum duration of three years that addresses length and width of boat alongside an equitable and consistent concessionary policy. Bring forward proposals for scrutiny in October 2010.

## **2.4 Delete**

## **2.5 Delete**

## **2.6 (as per officers report) Becomes new 2.4**

## **2.7 (as per officers report) Becomes new 2.5**

In response to a question from Councillor Blencowe regarding the cost to the Council of the independent research, the Head of Active Communities agreed to send this information to all Members. She also indicated that no further research would need to be commissioned as a result of any ongoing consultation.

Councillor Boyce raised concern that the switching of Areas A and B would increase movement through the lock, potentially causing damage to the gates. In response the Head of Active Communities stated that the Camboaters had expressed support for this, as increased movement would prevent potential silting problem. Recreational boaters also tended to like using of the locks during their trip.

In response to Councillor Kightley's concern about the aesthetics of the proposed mooring points, the head of Active Communities confirmed that the detail of these was still being looked at and yet to be agreed.

In response to Councillor Walker's concern that some moorings are still being asked to pay Council Tax, the head of Active Communities stated that the exemption only applies to mooring license holders with the City Council.

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Ellis-Miller seconded the following amendment to recommendation 2.3:

Delete 2.3 and replace with:

*'To retain the existing Mooring Policy pricing structure and review after a 3-year period.'*

**RESOLVED:** On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 5 votes to 3.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that:

The Executive Councillor approved the following recommendations:

Approved:

- 2.1 To retain moorings in Area B. Request officers to explore with stakeholders the possibility of switching the designations for Areas B and C and to bring forward any proposals for change in October 2010
- 2.2 Subject to planning permission and necessary permissions from statutory agencies that secure mooring points were installed for a trial period on the visitor moorings and between Victoria Avenue bridge up stream to the Pump Out at Jesus Green for RML holders.
- 2.3 To retain the existing Mooring Policy pricing structure and review after a 3-year period.
- 2.4 To note the current approach to the waiting list, and to instruct officers to work with Camboaters and the Conservators of the River Cam to make improvements to the allocation of RML's and improve efficiency, particularly the time taken to allocate a RML.
- 2.5 To note information relating to mooring at the Riverside area and continue to offer support and cooperation to the County Council and other agencies involved in addressing concerns raised by local people.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 8 votes to 0 (unanimously).

The Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation approved the recommendations.

**Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted):** None

The meeting ended at 4.25pm

**CHAIR**