

Public Document Pack

Community Services Scrutiny Committee

CmSrv/1

Thursday, 29 June 2017

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

29 June 2017
5.00 - 7.35 pm

Present: Councillors Ratcliffe (Chair), Sinnott (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Austin, Barnett, Bird, Gillespie and O'Connell

Executive Councillors: Johnson (Executive Councillor for Communities) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement: Wendy Young

Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Principal Accountant (Services): Chris Humphris

Committee Manager: James Goddard

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/7/Comm Apologies

No apologies were received.

17/8/Comm Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Barnett	17/11/Comm	Personal: Works at Addenbrooke's Hospital
Councillor O'Connell	17/15/Comm	Personal: Council appointed Trustee of Cambridge Live

Councillor Abbott	17/17/Comm	Personal: Member of Health and Wellbeing Board
----------------------	------------	--

17/9/Comm Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 March and 25 May 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/10/Comm Public Questions

There were no public questions.

17/11/Comm 2016/17 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Streets and Open Spaces Portfolio

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report presented for the Streets & Open Spaces Portfolio:

- i. A summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2016/17 (outturn position).
- ii. Revenue and capital budget variances with explanations.
- iii. Specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets & Open Spaces

Approved carry forward requests:

- i. Totalling £41,140 revenue funding from 2016/17 to 2017/18, as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- ii. Of £728k capital resources from 2016/17 to 2017/18 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D.

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 Principal Accountant (Services).

In response to Councillor Austin's question the Principal Accountant (Services) said £200,000 of funds were allocated to the University Arms for phased work over a period of years until 2017-18.

In response to Councillor Austin's question the Executive Councillor said:

- i. Historic Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) projects were delayed due to delivery issues from third parties. It was considered better to delay the projects and get them right rather than rush them. Newer EIP projects were delivered faster as they were not reliant on third parties. Delays were not caused by staff capacity issues
- ii. Rephased/uncommitted funding would go back to area committees for reallocation. It was hoped historic problems would not lead to funding being carried over into the next financial year.
- iii. Area Committees would be given guidance on how to select faster delivery projects. In July they would also receive information on projects seeking funding and budgets available.

The Head of Environmental Services said there had been uptake issues for area committees as projects were not coming forward to seek funding, so some was not allocated. This would carry over if not allocated.

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.

17/12/Comm Streets and Open Spaces Service Review and Development Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Streets and Open Spaces (S&OS) review identified the service enjoyed continuing high residents' satisfaction rates and generally delivered a range of high quality frontline services. However, the review also identified a number of areas where the service needed to improve. S&OS would need to respond to these issues in order to make the service fit for purpose and resilient for the

future; and be able to respond to the ongoing financial and growth challenges and opportunities, which the city faces.

As the Council's largest frontline service, the review included the need for S&OS to make a £600K net revenue budget reduction by 2021, as a contribution towards the wider corporate savings target the Council needs to make as a result of the ongoing reductions in Central Government grant funding.

In response to the review findings, S&OS proposed to pursue a service development strategy, which delivered against the corporate vision – "One Cambridge: Fair for All" and the following specified corporate objectives.

The proposed strategy would be delivered through an implementation plan, which would set out a programme of proposed projects and activities, and associated capital and revenue budgetary implications. Subject to the wider strategy being approved at Committee, the proposed implementation plan would be researched and developed and then presented to a future committee meeting(s) for consideration and approval.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets & Open Spaces

- i. Noted the key findings of the Streets and Open Spaces service review.
- ii. Approved the proposed future service vision and development strategy (2017-21) for Streets and Open Spaces.

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 Environmental Services.

Councillor Austin asked for the minutes to show her concern regarding the need for the S&OS Service to make a £600,000 net revenue budget reduction by 2021. She asked for clarification on why this needed to happen.

Opposition Councillors expressed concern about the damage done to Mid Summer Common and Jesus Green after events eg Mid Summer Fair. Revenue from events had to be balanced against maintenance costs. The

Strategic Director undertook to discuss issues including parking restrictions outside of committee.

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

- i. The S&OS review was led by the principle of "what's best for the service".
- ii. The S&OS service shape/structure had to be fit for purpose to respond to demands by the city within resources available. The S&OS Strategy set out how to do this eg through the use of technology.
- iii. Area Committees received environmental data reports to give information about the public realm and general street cleanliness. Intelligence was sought at Area Committees on 'hot spots' where action needed to be taken. As a result of feedback in the Opposition Councillor briefing, the intention was to take a breakdown of local performance data to Area Committees.
- iv. The reference in the Officer's report that cleansing of the city centre may happen at the detriment of outlying areas reflected a snapshot in time. It was being investigated what the data actually showed. The city centre needed a lot of resource due to high service demand. A good service was also given to city outskirts. The S&OS Strategy should lead to prioritisation and smarter working to identify where to allocate resources.
- v. Management plans were in place to use resources appropriately eg types of plants to use in areas so they were lower maintenance.
- vi. Management were careful to ensure staff were able to input into the process at the start of the S&OS review. Staff supported the strategy, lots of opportunities to engage had been taken up. Staff would be involved in the delivery of the implementation plan.
- vii. Management plans covered the need to balance revenue from events against maintenance costs. An events review in 2017 would also cover the issue. Event organisers were required to repair or pay for repairs to open spaces, to put areas back into their pre-event condition.

The Strategic Director said the S&OS Strategic Review would look at how to deliver services in future. There would be a separate Event Review. These would look at the overall headline/strategic level of detail, not at individual events. Councillors and Officers could discuss details about individual open spaces outside of committee.

The Executive Councillor said that events on green spaces would continue to go ahead. Events were temporary and generated sufficient benefit to mitigate any damage that needed repair.

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.

17/13/Comm Tree Maintenance Framework

Matter for Decision

The current framework agreement for tree maintenance services has expired.

Officers sought permission to commence a formal tender process for the provision of tree maintenance services for a period of 3 years from November 2017.

This framework approach followed the previously agreed format approved by the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places on the 11th July 2014.

The new framework would be a continuation of current working practice and continue to cover a wide range of tree maintenance services for existing trees as well as tree planting and establishment services for new trees.

The value of the framework agreement over its 3.5 year life was estimated at £825,000 inclusive of VAT.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets & Open Spaces

Authorise the:

- i. Head of Environmental Services to invite and evaluate tenders for contractors to provide tree maintenance services for 2017 to 2021;
- ii. Strategic Director to award the contract(s) to the most favourable tender(s), in accordance with pre-determined evaluation criteria.

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 Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

In response to Members' questions the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said:

- i. Open data on tree species and location was outside the scope of the report.
- ii. The City Council were working with the County Council to release open data.
- iii. The timeline for release of data was set by the County Council and IT department. Detail would be discussed post meeting.

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.

17/14/Comm City Centre Accessibility Review: Advertising 'A' Board and Sign Policy

Public Question

Councillor Bick raised the following points as a Market Ward Councillor:

- i. **Welcomed the City Council taking ownership of 'A' board issues as the County Council/Highways Authority had not taken action although they had responsibility to do so.**
- ii. **'A' boards blocked pavements for all users and caused crushes where people unexpectedly stepped into streets to avoid 'A' boards, usually without looking for traffic.**
- iii. **The highway should be for public use and no business had the right to do so. Suggested the County Council had chosen not to take action against businesses who put 'A' boards on the highway (pavements).**
- iv. **There were better alternatives to 'A' boards for signposting businesses. Queried why these were not used eg discreet signs.**
- v. **'A' boards were a hazard and street clutter. The City Council should have a default position of no 'A' boards. They should be implemented by exception not default.**

- vi. **The proposed policy appeared to give permission for 'A' boards near buildings and so could lead to greater numbers.**
- vii. **Queried if officers had the time or resources to take enforcement action on top of their other duties.**
- viii. **Expressed concern that people who dropped litter got a fixed penalty fine whereas inappropriate 'A' boards got a warning and 48 hours to take remedial action before further penalties were imposed. This seemed unfair.**
- ix. **Queried when the 'A' board policy would be reviewed to see if it was effective.**

The Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) responded:

- i. Businesses were surveyed to ascertain why they used 'A' boards (eg to signpost businesses) and if they would voluntarily remove them. Respondents had not looked at alternatives.
- ii. The policy tried to balance business and highway user needs.
- iii. There was an enforcement team of 7 officers to cover all duties. 'A' board enforcement work would complement other duties. The 'A' board policy would also allow enforcement work to be undertaken by City Rangers, which was not currently possible.
- iv. 'A' boards were not given a fixed penalty like dog fouling as they were not a crime that could be penalised in the same way.

Matter for Decision

In 2014, the City Centre Accessibility Review was commissioned to gain a fuller understanding of the issues affecting ease of access in and around the city centre for a range of users, but particularly pedestrians, disabled people. The review report was considered at the March, 2015, Community Services Scrutiny Committee, and in July, 2015, a plan of action was developed and approved at committee to take the next steps to bring about the identified changes needed. This plan included the development of an advertising board policy. A progress update of the actions undertaken from the action plan was presented to committee in July, 2016. In March, 2016, a survey of advertising signage use in the city centre was undertaken and the views of local business users sought on the voluntary removal of advertising signs, such as A-boards. In January, 2017, a draft city-wide policy for Advertising Boards was approved at committee for consultation with relevant stakeholders.

The June 2017 Officer's report reviewed the consultation findings and set out a proposed final policy for Advertising Boards and timetable for implementation.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Streets & Open Spaces

- i. Approved the Policy for placing of Advertising Boards, as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- ii. Approved the implementation timetable for the policy, allowing for officers to undertake a three-month education programme and engage with key stakeholders including Cambridge BID and trader associations.

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 Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement).

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

- i. Shop curtilage extended 1m into the pavement, so they could do what they like in this area.
- ii. Queried if the policy would lead to an increased number of 'A' boards.
- iii. Streets and pavements should be accessible. 'A' boards, blocked drains and parking on pavements were all factors to consider.
- iv. 'A' boards blocked pavements. This was a historic issue. Shops would not survive if people could not access them due to blocked pavements.
- v. 'A' boards were of greater importance to small businesses who had less brand recognition than larger ones, so smaller businesses needed a way to attract customers.
- vi. 'A' boards were of more use to visitors than local residents.
- vii. Alternatives to 'A' boards should be considered.

The Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. A review of the impact of the policy would be brought to committee circa June 2018. This should include 6 months of enforcement data.
- ii. It was unclear what percentage of 'A' boards could have enforcement action taken against them hence the education first approach.

The Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The City Council would work with businesses and review the impact of the 'A' board policy if implemented. Ward Councillor feedback was also welcome.
- ii. Feedback from Councillors was welcomed outside of the meeting on alternatives to 'A' boards.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Austin formally proposed to amend the 'A' boards policy as follows:

- To hold a review after 4 months.
- To bring back a report to committee in June 2018 that would include enforcement data.

The Committee approved this additional recommendation nem con.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations. She asked for the minutes to record the work undertaken by Councillor Bird and Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement) to get the 'A' board policy in place.

The 'A' board policy report focussed on access, other reports looked at other issues such as City Council support for local businesses.

The 'A' board policy aimed to reduce the number and size of 'A' boards to ensure they were appropriate, or enforcement action would be undertaken. 1.5m of accessible pavement would be protected for people.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/15/Comm 2016/17 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Communities Portfolio

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report presented for the Communities Portfolio:

- i. A summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2016/17 (outturn position).
- ii. Revenue and capital budget variances with explanations.
- iii. Specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2017/18.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Approved carry forward requests:

- i. Totalling £20,600 revenue funding from 2016/17 to 2017/18, as detailed in Appendix C of the officer's report.
- ii. Of £74k capital resources from 2016/17 to 2017/18 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D.

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 Principal Accountant (Services).

In response to Members' questions the Head of Community Services said that an underspend in Clay Farm finances occurred for contractual reasons.

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.

17/16/Comm Building Stronger Communities: Community Centres Strategy**Matter for Decision**

In October 2015, the Executive Councillor for Communities, Arts & Recreation made a decision to undertake a strategic review of community provision. A full review was undertaken, including: an audit of existing facilities provided by a wide range of organisations; mapping of access to facilities across the city and analysis of where the greatest needs for community support exist.

In January 2017, the Executive Councillor for Communities approved a draft community centres strategy for consultation with stakeholders and the wider community on the draft proposals. This strategy set out to deliver a programme of support with the overarching theme of 'Building Stronger Communities.'

The Officer's report considered the results of that consultation exercise and set out actions to be carried out in pursuit of the strategy.

The Council would use the Building Stronger Communities Strategy and the data collected throughout this review, to inform future considerations for Section 106 / CIL funding.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

The Executive Councillor agreed to:

- i. Adopt the proposals relating to six centres as set out in the draft strategy, as follows:
 - 2.1.1 Ross Street Community Centre – seek to lease the centre to a voluntary organisation, with an agreement to safeguard community use. If a suitable organisation cannot be found the Council will retain management of the centre. In order to deliver this proposal a delegation is proposed at 2.4.
 - 2.1.2 Nun's Way Pavilion – explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative space is found options for leasing the pavilion to a voluntary organisation will be explored. If none are viable, then the pavilion could be used for sports use only.
 - 2.1.3 37 Lawrence Way - explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative community space is found the premises will be returned to Council housing stock.
 - 2.1.4 82 Akeman Street - replace the community space as part of the proposed new housing project in this location in consultation with the community.
 - 2.1.5 Brownsfield Youth & Community Centre - retain as a Council managed community centre, ensuring community access.
 - 2.1.6 Trumpington Pavilion - continue to work with Trumpington Resident's Association towards greater sustainability and independence.
- ii. Modify the proposals set out in the draft strategy for two centres, as follows:
 - 2.2.1 The Meadows Community Centre and Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre – approve the completion of a full feasibility study for both centres, to explore with local groups, partners and centre users whether it is possible to deliver the community hub at the

- Meadows and to further explore options for Buchan Street. This feasibility work will need to consider:
- practical development constraints, planning issues and financial feasibility;
 - detailed analysis of current uses of both centres and potential future partnership arrangements.
- iii. Adopt the proposals as originally outlined in relation to meeting identified needs where there are gaps in provision
- 2.3.1 Abbey - continue to support County Council led work on redevelopment of a new centre on the East Barnwell Community Centre site.
 - 2.3.2 Queen Edith's - explore opportunities to work with existing facility providers in the north of the ward.
 - 2.3.3 East Chesterton - explore opportunities in the north of the ward for new facility provision through growth.
 - 2.3.4 Cherry Hinton - support the development of a community hub in Cherry Hinton Library with local partners, with the proviso that the County Council continue library services there and a sustainable management solution is found.
- iv. Delegate the authority to deliver the proposals as required.
- 2.4.1 **Ross Street:** Approve delegated authority to the Strategic Director following consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes to approve the selection process for a voluntary organisation to take on the management of Ross Street Community Centre (including community use requirements) and to approve the selection of a voluntary organisation in accordance with this process.
- v. Report back to the Committee on progress with delivering the strategy, as described in the actions set out in Section 5 of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Community Funding & Development Manager.

Councillor Gillespie made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. People had expressed frustration they could not say all they wanted in the consultation. This put some off. Future consultations should be braver in seeking information in future.
- ii. There should have been a specific question asking if more facilities were required.

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

- i. People had lots of opportunities to comment on community facilities such as email and face-to-face. This was in addition to the consultation. Officers encouraged people to respond as much as possible. The last consultation question was open to allow any other business.
- ii. The aim of the consultation was to align resources with areas of high need and include the voluntary sector in the delivery.
- iii. Results suggested that people valued existing facilities and there was not high demand for new ones. There was not a specific question asking this as the consultation did not wish to encourage demand for a service the City Council could not deliver due to lack of resources.
- iv. Officers were working with the Web Team to produce an interactive map of facilities availability/location. This would be advertised when ready. Information ownership and management to ensure it was up to date would be looked at in future. Open data was another future consideration.
- v. Market was not identified as an area of high need for community facilities before or during the consultation, but Petersfield was.
- vi. Ross Street was identified as a valued facility. Management criteria would ensure the voluntary sector had the capacity to deliver or the City Council would retain management responsibility.
- vii. Organisations could apply to become community facilities if they wished. Officers would review to ensure they did not compete with each other.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/17/Comm Review of Strategic Partnerships: Health and Wellbeing Board and Children's Executive Partnership

Matter for Decision

A report giving an update on the key external partnerships the Council is involved with was provided to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 March 2017. It was agreed at this meeting that Community Services Scrutiny Committee be given the opportunity to consider the partnerships relevant to its work – Cambridgeshire’s Health and Wellbeing and the Children’s Trust - and to also take into account how growing concerns about homelessness in the City presently fed into these partnerships.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Agreed to continue to work with key external partnerships to ensure that public agencies and others can together address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge, including the growing homelessness issue in the City, and that the concerns of Cambridge citizens are responded to.

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 Community Services.

In response to Councillor O’Connell’s question the Executive Councillor said the impact of homelessness on mental health was being considered by the Health and Wellbeing Partnership and Cambridge Local Health Partnership.

In response to Councillor Sinnott’s question the Head of Community Services offered to liaise outside of the meeting on how the strategic partnership worked.

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.

17/18/Comm Outdoor Sports Awards To External Sports Facilities

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided an update on sports facility grants for projects originally allocated S106 funding from Strategic S106 funding in January 2015, and were also reported back to this Committee in June 2016, because they had not been able to move their projects forward.

The report sought approval for increasing the levels of devolved S106 grant funding to a project previously approved by North Area Committee in 2015/16.

- Cambridge Rugby Club.
- Kings School.
- North Cambridge Academy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Confirmed approval of the provisionally allocated £200,000 grant to Cambridge Rugby Union Football Club for new changing rooms, subject to a community use agreement and officer approval of the business case for the grant under delegated authority.
- ii. Allocated and approved an additional £25,000 of outdoor sports S106 funding to the existing £100,000 grant for a total award of £125,000 to North Cambridge Academy for the provision of four floodlit tennis courts, subject to a community use agreement and officer approval of the business case for the grant under delegated authority.
- iii. De-allocated the £75,000 of indoor sports S106 contributions and £50,000 of outdoor sports S106 contributions currently earmarked to the King's College School sports hall and changing rooms, following withdrawal of the grant request by the grant applicant.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Sport & Recreation Manager.

In response to the report the Committee commented that community use agreements ensured that funding was allocated to organisations who committed to publicly accessible facilities.

In response to Members' questions the Sport & Recreation Manager said that funding allocated to King's College School (recommendation iii) would be

returned to the strategic level funding pot not a local one. Funding was not time limited so it would not be lost.

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 7.35 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank