

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

17 March 2015

5.30 - 8.45 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrope (Chair), Perry (Vice-Chair), Moore, Pitt, Ratcliffe, Robertson, C. Smart and M. Smart

Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste & Public Health: Peter Roberts

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Kevin Blencowe

Officers:

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Refuse & Environment: Jas Lally

Building Control Manager: Ian Boulton

Team Manager (Commercial): Frank Harrison

Project Delivery and Environment Manager: John Richards

Environmental Quality & Growth Manager: Jo Dicks

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/10/Env Apologies

No apologies were received.

15/11/Env Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

15/12/Env Minutes

The minutes of 13 January 2015 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

15/13/Env Public Questions

No public questions were asked.

Re-Ordering Agenda

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

15/14/Env Environment, Waste and Public Health Portfolio Plan

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report covered the draft Environment, Waste and Public Health Portfolio Plan 2015-16, which sets out the strategic objectives for the portfolio for the year ahead, describes the context in which the portfolio is being delivered and details the activities required to deliver the outcomes and the vision. Performance measures and risks are also shown for each strategic objective.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Approved the draft Environment, Waste and Public Health Portfolio Plan 2015-16.

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 & Environment; introduced by the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health.

The Committee generally welcomed the Portfolio Plan principles.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. The timeframe for moving from the Mill Road Depot site depended on finding an alternative location.
- ii. Having more Enforcement Officers should encourage greater recycling for Houses in Multiple Occupation and target areas that required action eg to address fly tipping.
- iii. There is an option to potentially charge for the use of a rebuilt Silver Street toilet to offer an alternative means of reducing costs.

The Head of Refuse and Environment and Team Manager (Commercial) said

- i. The intention behind the Healthier Catering Commitment for Cambridgeshire (HCCC) project was to work with companies to introduce healthier menus. A report will be made to Councillors when HCCC is up and running.
- ii. HCCC was based on the London project. Take up was limited in Cambridge, but it was hoped this would increase in the future.
- iii. HCCC would be launched as a pilot project in two areas of the city.
- iv. Legislation regarding food safety applied to mobile and static premises. Static premises would be inspected at their location, mobile premises at the owner's home. City Officers would investigate all locations in the city.
- v. 'Vision Statement 2: To increase the availability of healthier food alternatives to those who may suffer increased risk of social exclusion' linked into anti-poverty work. Performance measure 2.2 is a starting point that can then be rolled out if resources allowed. There were no extra resources within the team, resources to date had been freed up by the Executive Councillor reprioritising work.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation. He thanked Officers for their work to date and Former Councillor Swanson for starting the work.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/15/Env Cambridge Air Quality Action Plan - 2015 to 2025

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report described the current air quality in Cambridge, briefly summarised recent activity to reduce the levels of airborne pollution and set out the pathway and ambition for the next ten years, through a revised Air Quality Action Plan (Appendix A). The Plan contributes to the Corporate Objectives, the Local Transport Plan and contributes to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment on public health. It will be aligned with the City Deal.

There is a statutory requirement for both the City and the County Councils to work towards reducing levels of air pollution under the Local Air Quality Management regime (Environment Act, 1995, Part IV).

Most air pollution in Cambridge is caused by traffic, therefore the Plan is focussed on this, but does include other measures that can be taken to effect a positive change. Air quality will remain under pressure because of growth in and around Cambridge as more people and jobs come to the area. Future improvement is dependent on accelerating and stimulating the shift to ultra-low emission vehicles for both private and public fleets with continued traffic restraint.

The proposed Air Quality Action Plan 2015 – 2025 contributes towards all three strands of the Cambridge City Council Vision:

- One Cambridge – Fair for all.
- Caring for our environment and our people.
- Creating a great place to live, learn and work.

The ambition of the Air Quality Action Plan is for Cambridge to become a low emission city, with clean fresh air for all residents, visitors and workers in the City. The outcome must be to achieve compliance with national targets for air quality and ensure that they are maintained.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Instructed Officers to:

- i. Engage with stakeholders, such as Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, and partners, such as local businesses, to develop the detail of the Air Quality Action Plan 2015 – 2025 and to implement the Plan over the next 10 years.
- ii. Report back to the Environment & Scrutiny Committee with a completed Air Quality Action Plan and update on interim progress in 12 months' time (March 2016).

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 Quality & Growth Manager.

In response to the report the Committee asked if the Council could implement a Single Transport Scheme through the City Deal program. The Executive

Councillor said strategic boundaries were being set now, operational details would be covered later.

In response to Members' questions the Environmental Quality & Growth Manager said the following:

- i. Noted Councillor's comments that the Council monitored air quality, but others had levers to improve it. However, the Council could take improvement action such as applying for Central Government funding to bring in low emission vehicles. A working group had been set up with County Council and private sector colleagues to bid for funding to undertake various work in future.
- ii. The ongoing growth in the greater Cambridge area attracted more residents and more jobs, which could lead to increased traffic. Roads were approaching maximum capacity so traffic levels could not rise much more if further houses were built, but emission levels may rise.
- iii. The purpose of the proposed Air Quality Action Plan, 2015 – 2025 was to reduce pollution across the city. It had been declining in the city, but developments on the outskirts were pushing up pollution levels there.
- iv. The Plan set out the future strategy and actions to take in the face of new technology to achieve change and engage with stakeholders. Work linked into other initiatives such as the City Deal and 20mph project.
- v. There is a mix of intermittent and continuous air quality monitors around the city. The Environmental Quality & Growth Manager undertook to provide Mill Road sensor figures to Councillor Robertson in response to resident's concerns.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/16/Env Business Regulation Plan 2015-16

Matter for Decision

Cambridge City Council is responsible for food hygiene and health and safety enforcement in its area, and is required to produce an annual plan clarifying how this will be achieved. The Business Regulation Plan needs to clearly define the objectives allowing the Council to fulfil its responsibilities for the year, and confirm that it has committed sufficient resources to enable this work

to be achieved. It also needs to be submitted to the Council for their consideration and to have evidence of the formal approval of the plan. The Plan is a large document and therefore this year an Executive Summary has been produced as Appendix A which identifies all of the key aspects of the full report, which is available to view in full, and if approved by committee will imply approval of the full Plan.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Approved the Executive Summary of the Business Regulation Plan 2015-16, and by implication the full 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 Team Manager (Commercial).

In response to Members' questions the Team Manager (Commercial) said the following:

- i. There were no Category A businesses in the city (ref P58 of the Officer's report).
- ii. (Ref P60 of the Officer's report) A commercial estate targeted intervention initiative was set by Food Standards Authority guidance on standards such as how food based businesses were managed, stock rotation and staff training.
- iii. It was expected that the circa 90% compliance figures for inspected premises could be maintained through Officers offering training and mentoring.
- iv. Training for businesses on hygiene, health and safety etc could be a future source of income for the Council.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/17/Env Planning Policy and Transport Portfolio Plan 2015/16**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report covered the draft Planning Policy and Transport Portfolio Plan 2015-16, which sets out the strategic objectives for the portfolio for the year ahead, describes the context in which the portfolio is being delivered and details the activities required to deliver the outcomes and the vision. Performance measures and risks are also shown for each strategic objective.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Approved the draft Planning Policy and Transport Portfolio Plan 2015-16.

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 Planning; introduced by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

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

- i. Welcomed progress on City Deal negotiations.
- ii. Liberal Democrat Councillors regretted that planning applications had moved from Area Committees to the Planning Committee.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport said the following:

- i. The City Council Local Plan was at a key stage of examination. Housing allocations have been well tested, but room for 2,000 more homes may have to be found within the city limits.
- ii. South Cambridgeshire District Council was experiencing higher demands for housing. They are a key delivery partner.
- iii. The City Council was confident it could meet Local Plan requirements and that its planning policies were robust.
- iv. There was a memorandum of understanding between authorities and duty to co-operate across the county. If one partner could not deliver, other organisations would have to cover the shortfall in housing delivery.
- v. The City Council Local Plan included performance targets to meet for major, minor and other planning applications. These were being met. Councils who did not meet targets were penalised.

The Head of Planning Services undertook to send Committee Members performance information on the speed of processing planning applications.

- vi. The Executive Councillor would pass on Councillors' requests for the City Deal Assembly to have alternate members as well as substantive ones.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/18/Env Citywide 20mph Project - Phase 3 Implementation

Public Question

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

1. Dr Goyal-Rutsaert raised the following points:

- i. Took issue with the consultation basis and cost benefit analysis of the evidence base.
- ii. Suggested that residents should have been given more information on the impact that the 20mph limit would have on them eg air quality. Suggested that residents had been misinformed by consultation letter details.
- iii. Referred to the experiences of other local authorities such as Portsmouth. Local authorities had not gained many benefits from imposing a 20mph limit, but had been affected by high implementation and enforcement costs. The schemes were poor value for money and led to higher levels of congestion and pollution.
- iv. Suggested the outcome of the consultation would have been different if people were aware of all the facts. Requested the evidence base be reviewed.

2. Mr Sewell raised the following points:

- i. Unenforced laws encouraged disrespect for the law. The speed limit should be 30mph as per the existing law.
- ii. 20mph could contribute to accidents and be more harmful to cyclists.

- iii. **Was unaware of any adequate evidence to favour a speed limit of 20mph instead of 30 mph.**
- iv. **Expressed concern that the Police had asked for volunteers to help with enforcement action.**
- v. **Had undertaken a survey on Grange Road where the speed limit was 20mph already. This was not observed by vehicles.**
- vi. **Invited Councillors to drive along Grange Road at 20mph prior to taking a decision to change the speed limit to see the impact it would have.**

The Project Delivery & Environment Manager responded to both members of the public:

- i. Some initial evidence based work had been undertaken by the Council to support the initial funding allocation and involve key stakeholders in the 20mph scheme to get their views. The level of detail involved was proportional to the scale of the project, and the anticipated impacts. A key objective was to bring speed limit consistency between Cambridge areas which were a mix of 20 and 30mph.
- ii. Most roads affected were in residential and commercial areas where typical average speeds were already relatively low.
- iii. Many of Cambridge's C class roads were wide and open in nature and likely to present more of a compliance challenge. Therefore Councillors needed to consider which to include as enforcement action was likely to be needed. The Police were happy to do this where average speeds were low and roads complied with Department for Transport guidance.
- iv. Research showed the introduction of a 20mph speed limit generally led to benefits with few disadvantages. The cost of implementing area wide schemes could be quite significant but there were clear benefits particularly in terms of consistency and safety.
- v. The 20mph limit could be expected to lead to an average reduction of 1-2mph, where the observed level of change for the north of the city so far implemented was consistent with national guidance. This, in turn, could be expected to lead to a 5-10% reduction in casualty figures.
- vi. This project was intended to provide a largely self-enforcing speed limit. Traffic delays were more influenced by junctions than the speed limit. Many of Cambridge's streets were already congested, particularly at peak times, so average traffic speeds were already relatively low and conducive to the introduction of 20mph control.

- 3. Dr Goyal-Rutsaert and Mr Sewell raised the following points:**
- i. There may be some benefits, but people may not be aware that the lower speed limit may lead to higher transport costs (ie longer travel times led to higher fuel bills) and increased pollution.**
 - ii. Took issue with the concept of a self-enforcing scheme.**
 - iii. Observed that Officers had acknowledged that the expected impact of the 20mph speed limit was limited as traffic was already slow due to congestion.**

Matter for Decision

To provide infrastructure (signs and lines) for a new 20mph speed limit on the public highway across West/Central and southern areas of the city. The new 20mph infrastructure would include repeater signs mounted on existing lamp columns, and white coloured 20mph roundel road markings. Entry into new 20mph limits would be via entry points highlighted by larger 20mph terminal signs, roundel road markings and on more main roads, patches of coloured road surface material.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Implementation recommendations:

- i. Approved the inclusion of all unclassified roads in the South and West/Central areas.**
- ii. Approved the **inclusion** of the following 'C' Class roads:**
 - Both north and south sections of Grantchester Road.
 - Castle Street.
 - Church Lane and Maris Lane in Trumpington.
 - Cherry Hinton High Street.
- iii. Include the following 'C' Class roads, as recommended for inclusion by South Area Committee on 02/02/15:**
 - Teversham Drift/Hinton Road north of Church End, Cherry Hinton.
 - Cherry Hinton Road east of Walpole Road.
 - Queen Ediths' Way east of Mowbray Road.
- iv. Approved the exclusion of the following 'C' Class roads, as recommended by South Area Committee on 02/02/15 and West/Central Area Committee on 05/03/15:**
 - Brooklands Avenue.
 - Fulbourn Road.

- Victoria Avenue.
- v. Supported work to encourage the introduction of 20mph control in new developments on the City's fringes.

Financial recommendations:

- vi. Approved the commencement of the implementation of Phase 3 (South and West/Central areas) of this scheme, which is already included in the Council's Capital & Revenue Project Plan.
 - The total cost is estimated to be £251,400 funded from the 20mph project capital allocation SC532.
 - There are no on-going revenue costs for the project.

Procurement recommendations:

- vii. Approved the carrying out and completion of the procurement of:
 - Phase 3 Traffic Order making process including street notices - £16,000.
 - Commencement of implementation of Phase 3 (in line with the roads recommended for inclusion above) -£150,000.
 - Commuted sum maintenance contribution to Cambridgeshire County Council for Phase 3 - £41,400.
 - Phase 3 post implementation automatic traffic count (ATC) monitoring - £8,000.
 - Subject to:
 - The permission of the Director of Business Transformation being sought prior to proceeding if the quotation or tender sum exceeds the estimated contract.
 - The permission from the Executive Councillor being sought before proceeding if the value exceeds the estimated contract by more than 15%.

Recommendations from South (02/02/15) and West/Central (05/03/15) Area Committees (as superseded by the implementation recommendations outlined above):

- Inclusion of all unclassified roads in the south and west/central phase area.
- Inclusion of the following 'C' class roads:
 - Teversham Drift/Hinton Road north of Church End.
 - Both north and south sections of Grantchester Road.
 - Castle Street.
 - Church Lane and Maris Lane in Trumpington.
 - Cherry Hinton High Street.

- Cherry Hinton Road east of Walpole Road.
 - Queen Ediths' Way east of Mowbray Road.
- Exclusion of the following C class roads:
 - Brooklands Avenue.
 - Fulbourn Road.
 - Victoria Avenue.

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 Project Delivery and Environment Manager. He said the report contained a typographical error listing "vi Cherry Hinton Road west of Walpole Road" instead of "Cherry Hinton Road east of Walpole Road".

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

- i. Residents had been involved in the consultation process, there had been expressions of support for a 20mph speed limit. Key stakeholders eg the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Ambulance Service had expressed support for the 20mph limit.
- ii. Speed limits currently varied across the city, this scheme could standardise them to 20mph.
- iii. Recommended that the speed limit on new developments be 20mph instead of 30.
- iv. Lowering the speed limit to 20mph would lead to safety benefits. This outweighed cost implications.
- v. Costs may be charged to the City Council, but the benefits would go to the NHS (ie lower accidents). These came from the same public pot in effect.
- vi. Taxi fares should be unaffected as they were based on distance not travel time.
- vii. Congestion led to slow travel speeds in some areas already, so the 20mph limit may have less impact in these areas.
- viii. 20mph could be enforced. It would be expensive to do so and take time to change drivers' behaviour, but a positive change was expected.

In response to Members' questions the Project Delivery and Environment Manager said there was conflicting evidence on the impact of 20mph on air

quality, with no clear advantages or disadvantages for a change from 30 to 20mph for an area such as Cambridge. Whilst vehicle born pollutants increase with congestion, there were less emissions from traffic consistently travelling at 20mph compared to varying speeds. A shift in travel modes (eg walking and cycling instead of vehicular) could be expected if people felt safer on the roads due to the lower speed limit, with some consequent reduction in vehicle pollutants.

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

- ~~Consider the inclusion of~~ **Include** the following 'C' Class roads, as recommended for inclusion by South Area Committee on 02/02/15:

The Committee unanimously approved this amended recommendation.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations. He made the following points:

- i. Thanked the public speakers for their comments. These had raised the profile of the debate.
- ii. In 2012 the Council allocated £400,000 to the 20mph scheme subject to public support, this was generally received. This was a cross party decision across the Council.
- iii. Referred to the projects original aims and hoped these would lead to more walking and cycling.
- iv. The impact of the scheme could not be judged solely on the results in the north city area for just one year.
- v. The 20mph scheme should rationalise isolated 20mph zones into a consistent speed limit across the city.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/19/Env Building Control Shared Service

Matter for Decision

The Council has recognised the need to change the way services are provided in the future in order to create opportunities for innovation and provide service

efficiencies. As a result the Council has agreed to work in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Huntingdonshire District Council to deliver a number of shared services.

The Council also seeks to support economic growth within the area and as a consequence needs to provide effective and efficient services. The building control service is responsible for ensuring delivery of safe, healthy, accessible and sustainable buildings; and operates within a commercial and competitive arena.

A shared building control service has the potential to be a more sustainable and resilient business model for future service delivery and cost effectiveness. The ability to generate additional income from new services and efficiencies will also support enhanced competitiveness.

The Officer's report set out the strategic benefits and outline business case for a single shared building control service for Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Huntingdonshire District Council.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Agreed:

- i. The outline business case for entering into a shared Building Control service with South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire District Councils.
- ii. That a fully developed business case is provided to the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 7 July 2015.
- iii. That recruitment of an Interim Shared Building Control Manager be authorised to help develop the full business case and the design of the new service.

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 Building Control Manager.

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

- i. The Council Building Control Shared Service was an important service.

- ii. The business case to share services with other councils had some merits, but the quality of the service should not be compromised.
- iii. The service needed to be located near to customers in order to be effective. Resilience and specialist services were also important considerations.
- iv. Charging for the Building Control Shared Service could be a source of income for the Council.

In response to Members' questions the Building Control Manager said the following:

- i. The location of the Building Control Shared Service would be reviewed in future. The intention was to place it so that Officers could visit city and outskirt locations.
- ii. An options appraisal would be set out in the full business case coming to 7 July 2015 Environment Committee.
- iii. Regulations and guidelines set fees that could be charged for the Building Control Shared Service on a not for profit basis for chargeable activities.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 8.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank