

Public Document Pack

Environment Scrutiny Committee Env/1

Tuesday, 3 October 2017

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

3 October 2017

5.30 - 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Gawthrope (Chair), Bird (Vice-Chair), Ratcliffe, Sargeant, Sheil and Tunnacliffe

Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Kevin Blencowe

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Strategic Director: Fiona Bryant

Commercial Operations Manager: Sean Cleary

Project Manager, Environment: John Richards

Cycling & Walking Officer, Environment: Clare Rankin

Senior Planning Policy Officer, Environment: Bruce Waller

Planning Consultant: Ian Poole

Committee Manager: Claire Tunnicliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/26/Env Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Bick; Councillor Adey attended as the alternative.

17/27/Env Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Ratcliffe	17/31/Env	Personal: Council representative to the River Cam Conservators
Councillor Tunnacliffe	17/31/Env	Personal: Council representative to the River Cam Conservators

17/28/Env Minutes

Councillor Tunnacliffe referred to the minute 17/20/Env; which made reference to further analysis being presented to the Waste Board in three months' time and asked if this had been done.

The Strategic Director confirmed that the further analysis had not yet been reported but would be presented to the Waste Board in November. This would then be put forward to the Environment Scrutiny Committee in January 2018.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2017 were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

17/29/Env Public Questions

There were no public questions.

17/30/Env Procurement of a Security Contract for the Car Parks and Mill Road and Cowley Road Depot

Matter for Decision

To consider a new tender for security services for both car parks and the new Cowley Road sites.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

- i. Approved the recommendations as out in the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Commercial Operations Manager, Environment which referred to the expiration on March 31 2018, of the current contract for static and mobile guarding of City Centre car parks and Mill Road.

The Commercial Operations Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Confirmed that TUPE would apply to the contract. There would a clear reference made in the specification of the Council's expectations that TUPPE arrangements were managed in accordance with Council policy.
- i. Would bring in additional services to other assets of the Council and would be considering the end dates of those contracts.
- ii. It was expected there would be savings to the Council due to the new corporate wide contract which would go out to tender. It was not

possible to say what that saving would be until the tender process had been completed.

The Committee **resolved (unanimously)** to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/31/Env Cycleways Capital Programme

Matter for Decision

To consider the principle achievements of the Cycleways Capital Programme since it was last considered by Environment Scrutiny Committee in October 2014; along with forward investment proposals for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 years.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

- i. Noted the progress and achievements of the Cycleways Capital Programme (PV007).
- ii. Supported the expenditure of capital funds up to 2019 as outlined in the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Project Manager, Environment, which referred to the City Council's joint working with Cambridgeshire County Council on developing and promoting cycling. The work included the introduction of new facilities and the improvement of existing facilities used by cyclists.

The Project Manager and Cycling Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There had been an under spend in the capital cost which had been rephased in to this financial year, in addition to the budget, therefore there was additional funds to be spent.
- ii. The bulk of Cambridgeshire County Council's spending on cycling was now funded through the Greater Cambridge Partnership. This allowed projects that had previously been postponed to take place in partnership working with the City Council such as the work to Cherry Hinton high street.
- iii. The County Council had completed the first phase of the Arbury Road cycling corridor with the second phase due to start.
- iv. The County Council were also completing Hills Road and Trumpington Road.
- v. A small proportion of the annual budget was allocated for minor schemes which might include follow up work on completed projects if required following the standard review process.
- vi. Noted the comments regarding safety on the Green Dragon Bridge. The restriction of the space available had proved difficult to make further adaptations so improvements had been made to visibility. Further funding could be considered if required.
- vii. The installation of a new bridge proposed further up the river from the Green Dragon Bridge should reduce the volume of cyclists.
- viii. As schemes were developed, dedicated Officer resources were allocated to scrutinise the proposals whether they were led by City or the County Council to ensure that they met the same standards.
- ix. Noted the safety concerns to cyclists at the double roundabouts by the Royal Cambridge Hotel. There had not been a viable solution agreed over the years on the best solution to this problem. This matter would be considered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- x. Two thirds of the commitment to install 1000 cycle parking spaces had been met. However no agreement had been reached with the magistrate courts to give permission for access to the proposed remaining spaces.
- xi. The proposal to install further bike parks would be investigated by the Greater Cambridge Partnership as part of the City access plan.
- xii. The installation of the solar studs on Midsummer Common had been County Council lead and could not comment on the consultation (if any) that took place.

The Committee **resolved (unanimously)** 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.

17/32/Env Withdrawal of Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

Matter for Decision

To consider the withdrawal of the Council's submitted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) draft charging schedule.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport

- i. Resolved to approve the activation of Regulation 18 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (amended) and withdraw the Council's submitted CIL draft charging schedule.

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 Planning Consultant, Environment, which referred to the proposed CIL draft charging schedule that was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in March 2014 in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Since the draft charging schedule was submitted, there had been a number of factors which would have a detrimental effect on the likely success of the CIL examination and future operation of the proposed CIL.

The Planning Consultant and the Senior Planning Policy Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Once CIL had been introduced there was an allowance for the local authority to make a year on year increase based on the rate of inflation.
- ii. S106 monies could be required from developments for matters to be put in place that would make it possible to approve a planning proposal that might not otherwise be acceptable in planning terms; collecting up to a maximum of five contributions towards a particular piece of

- infrastructure, such as funding to improve an access road to a site, to ensure that access would be safe once the development was completed.
- iii. CIL monies was a general levy (worked out per square meter of the development) held in a 'central pot' which was for the charging authority to determine what those contributions could be spent on, generally as a result of an increase in development in the area.
 - iv. It was not possible to spend contributions from CIL and S106 on the same piece of infrastructure.
 - v. The requirement for the introduction of CIL was to have an up-to-date Local Plan where the infrastructure requirements could be calculated, the cost of delivery to assess the viability of the project.

The Committee **resolved (unanimously)** to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.00 pm

CHAIR