

**ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

15 March 2011  
9.30 - 11.35 am

**Present:** Councillors Ward (Chair), Kerr, Newbold, Pogonowski, Saunders, Tunnacliffe and Znajek

**Executive Councillors:**

Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth, Councillor Blair  
Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services, Councillor Pitt

**Officers present:**

Director of Environment, Simon Payne  
Historic Environment Manager, John Preston  
Accountant (Services) Richard Wesbroom  
Accountant (Services) Karen Whyatt  
Head of Planning, Patsy Dell  
Head of Corporate Strategy, Andrew Limb  
Senior Planning Policy Officer, Nancy Kimberley  
Waste Strategy Manager, Jen Robertson  
Head of Street and Open Spaces, Toni Ainley  
Head of Refuse and Environment, Jas Lally  
Planning Policy Manager, Sara Saunder

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**11/13/env Apologies**

The committee received apologies from Councillors Herbert and Kightley.

**11/14/env Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2011 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**11/15/env Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Saunders:

- Items 13, 14, 15, and 16 – Personal – Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Councillor Pitt

- Item 14 - Personal – Member of Churchill College

Councillor Ward

- Item 14 - Personal – Member of Churchill College and wife is a fellow of St Edmund's College.

Councillor Shah

- Item 15 – Personal –Trustee of the Indian Community and Culture Association that manages the Bharat Bhavan (old Mill Road Library).

Councillor Pogonowski

- Item 14 – Personal – Member of Fitzwilliam College

### **11/16/env Public Questions (See information at the end of the agenda)**

**Sally Fletcher on Behalf of NHS Cambridgeshire made the following statement.**

- The characteristics of the Romsey area do not apply to the Brookfields Hospital site which is surrounded by areas of potential redevelopment such as Seymour Court, the Robert Sayle warehouse and the former garage site.
- The character of this part of Mill Road will be changed by these developments and there would be little benefit from Conservation Area Status.
- A 1990's study by English Heritage found nothing of significant interest about the site.
- The buildings within the site are not fit for their current purpose and when existing users vacate they will be hard to let.
- Access to the rear of the site is poor with no pedestrian footpaths.
- Redeveloping the site would bring benefits to the area.
- The large trees to the front of the site are already protected.
- The Mill House building could be listed as a building of local interest allowing the rest of the site to be developed.

**Response from the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth, Councillor Blair.**

The area has potential for redevelopment and Conservation Status will not prevent this. However, this would protect the character of the area and allow

development to be managed. Further consultations would allow interested parties to feed into the process. This matter would be discussed at a future meeting of this committee.

**Ms Fletcher explained that:**

NHS Cambridgeshire would welcome a visit from Councillors to view the site to gain a better understanding of its relationship with the surrounding area.

**Allan Bringham, East Mill Road Action Group made the following statement:**

- East Mill Road Action Group has worked with the Council to enhance Romsey, surveying residents about improvements to Romsey Rec and about the development of the Robert Sayle Warehouse site.
- In the last two years we have held two very successful local meetings looking at the pros and cons of including Romsey in the Mill Road Conservation Area. This culminated in another packed meeting arranged by the City Council in November when the present consultation was launched.
- We support the inclusion of Romsey in an enlarged Conservation Area and this includes Brookfields Hospital and Burnside, both integral parts of the area.
- Brookfields Hospital and Ditchburn Place are both important Victorian institutional elements in the story of Mill Road.
- Brookfields acts as a Romsey counterpart to Ditchburn Place on the other side of the bridge, and as the Isolation Hospital it is a 'destination' in the story of Victorian Cambridge.
- These distinctive buildings played a significant part in the lives of very many local people.
- While the spaces around them, and the trees which front the buildings, are equally significant in relieving the otherwise urban nature of Mill Road, just as the gardens of Ditchburn Place do in Petersfield.
- The nearby Burnside is still a refreshingly rural destination in an area of very high housing density just as it was in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.
- The late Victorian cottages are the same style as all the others in Romsey and were historically an integral part of the area, while the

outlook of trees and greenery are features that make the very high density housing of this part Cambridge an attractive area to live in. A gateway to the countryside for Victorian residents and for today's.

- Together with Parkers Piece it successfully 'bookends' Mill Road, just as Ditchburn Place and Brookfields Hospital mirror each other on either side of the bridge and create a successful balance to the townscape.
- We hope you will accept the recommendations before you today.

Handouts circulated. These included maps showing the 19<sup>th</sup> century development of Mill Road. These also show Brookfields Hospital and Burnside as integral parts of Romsey.

### **Response from the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth: Councillor Blair.**

Councillor Blair thanked Mr Brigham for his informative comments and for the work local groups contributed to the debate.

### **Richard Taylor**

Have members considered the impact and additional costs to local residents who would find them-selves living in a conservation area? Had the additional officer time that would be required been accounted for?

### **Response from the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth, Councillor Blair**

Conservation status would introduce an additional layer of permissions for any development. The trick would be to get the balance correct. Conservation status would be of huge benefit to those who are working to retain the character of the area and features of the City. The additional protection for trees will impact on the community in a positive way. In balance the decision is appropriate.

No costing of officer time has been carried out.

### **Change to Published Agenda Order**

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

**11/17/env Annual Portfolio Plans for 2011/12 (Environmental and Waste Services)****Matter for Decision:**

Approval of the Environmental and Waste Services Portfolio Plan setting out strategic objectives and performance measures for 2011/12.

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

Approved the Portfolio Plan.

**Reason for the Decision:**

Portfolio Plans allow Executive Councillors to set out, in agreement with lead officers, their key priorities for delivery in the year ahead.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Executive Councillor introduced the Annual Portfolio Plans 2011/12 and highlighted the need to maintain standards while achieving value for money in difficult times.

Councillor Pogonowski proposed an amendment to the plan.

EW 1.2 to read as follow (changes underlined):

*Carried out litter picks and clean-up campaigns within every area committee assisted by the Probation Service who operates a community payback scheme.*

The committee agreed the amendment.

The Committee resolved unanimously to approved the plan.

The Executive Councillor approved the plan.

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

Not applicable.

**11/18/env Revenue and Capital Project Appraisals and Requests to Carry Forward Funding from 2010/11 to 2011/12****Matter for Decision:**

The report presented details of any anticipated variances from revenue budgets where resources were requested to be carried forward into the 2011/12 financial year in order to undertake or complete activities previously approved to take place in 2010/11.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services:**  
Agreed the provisional revenue carry forward requests, totaling £23,860 as detailed in Appendix A of the report, to be recommended to Council for approval, subject to the final outturn position.

**Reason for the Decision:**

The financial implications of approving the provisional carry forward of budget from the current year into 2011/12, would result in a reduced requirement in the use of reserves for the current financial year, with a corresponding increase in the use of reserves in 2011/12.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

A decision not to approve a carry forward request would impact on officers' ability to deliver the service or scheme in question and this could have staffing, equal opportunities, environmental and / or community safety implications.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Service Accountant regarding the carry forward requests.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report unanimously.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/19/env Kerbside Battery Recycling Collection**

**Matter for Decision:**

The introduction of a kerbside recycling collection of batteries to houses in the city.

The proposed kerbside collection would be carried out in conjunction with a battery compliance scheme acting on behalf of battery producers to fulfil their obligations. There would be no cost to the council and a small income would be generated. The proposal is for residents to be issued with small bags to put their spent batteries in, which they would then stick onto their green bins for collection.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services:**  
Approved the introduction of a kerbside recycling collection of batteries to houses in the city.

**Reason for the Decision:**

As part of the Medium Term Programme and under the vision statement 'Towards a city in the forefront of low carbon living and minimising its impact on the environment from waste and pollution', the council is proposing a kerbside collection of portable household batteries. The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 requires producers to arrange for collection of batteries and sets UK targets for recycling of 25% by 2010 and 45% by 2016.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**  
N/A

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Head of Refuse and Environment regarding the introduction of a kerbside recycling collection of batteries to houses in the city.

Members were concerned that other areas had experienced problems with youths using the bags and their contents as 'sling shots'. The officer responded by saying that Cambridge residents were very conscientious about recycling and that the wider community, along with Recycling Champions, would be fully involved. The situation would be closely monitored and should problems arise, appropriate action would be taken. Councillor Pogonowski asked if there would be any question of liability if the bags were misused. The officer agreed to investigate this issue.

Members raised the following issues:

- I. The initial instructions need to be very clear of how the bags are adhered to the bins.
- II. Non reusable plastic bags are the cheapest solution but are not the greenest approach.
- III. Could the scheme be rolled out to include collections from shops?

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by unanimously.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/20/env Implementation of Route Optimisation outcomes for change in April 2012.**

**Matter for Decision:**

The procurement of a route optimisation software capability, in conjunction with the other districts from the RECAP (Recycling for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough) Partnership, is in its final stages, with a fully operational system anticipated to be in place by 1<sup>st</sup> June 2011.

The Executive Councillor was asked to approve the next stages of the project.

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

- I. Approved the decision with the Head of Refuse and Environment and in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to implement changes to refuse and recycling collections service as a result of the route optimisation project.
- II. Agreed to provide a briefing at a later date to committee Members and other interested Councillors about the changes to be implemented.

**Reason for the Decision:**

- I. Routing of collection rounds had not been undertaken since the introduction of alternate weekly collections in October 2005; and the City has changed, evolved and developed significantly since this time. The use of software for route optimisation is now considered best practice. It is anticipated that fuel and carbon savings can be achieved by undertaking this project as well as a potential for a rationalisation of the collection vehicle fleet.
- II. As a result of the route optimisation project we would undertake comprehensive communication with residents and stakeholders hence



the advanced timeline for this project. The planning and Union negotiations that may be required will mean that the time frame for the project will not fit with the scheduled Environment Scrutiny Committees.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The Head of Refuse and Environment introduced the report. Two additional documents were tabled to add clarity to the decision.

In response to member's questions he explained that the four-day week would achieve savings in a number of ways: working Tuesday to Friday avoided additional payments for Bank Holidays, allowed time for vehicle maintenance and had resulted in higher productivity in area where it was in operation. Working four longer days was also thought to be more attractive to employees.

Councillor Pogonowski requested a breakdown as to how the savings targets would be achieved. The officer responded that this information would become clearer when the modelling work had been completed. There had been no comprehensive review of routes for some years and the growth of the City, both past and future would impact on the savings achieved. Cross authority working could also produce savings in the future. The improved data collection would be used to identify the unique characteristics of the City and would improve efficiency.

Councillor Pogonowski asked what would happen and if job losses could be expected if the savings targets were not achieved. The Executive Councillor rejected the question as not relevant as the project would achieve the savings targets.

Recommendation one was amended to read:

*To approve the decision with the Head of Refuse and Environment and in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, to implement changes to refuse and recycling collections service as a result of the route optimisation project.*

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 7 votes to 1.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/21/env Amendments to Waste and Recycling Policy****Matter for Decision:**

To agree amendments to the Household Waste and Recycling Policy.

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

Approved amendments to the Household Waste and Recycling Policy to cover waste policy for new housing developments, the proposed kerbside battery collection and other minor additions/changes as per the report.

**Reason for the Decision:**

The Household Waste and Recycling Policy was last amended in 2009 when the council changed to the commingled blue bin collection. There is a need to amend it again in order to include:

- I. Policy information relating to new housing developments throughout the city
- II. The proposed kerbside battery collection service
- III. Additional information explaining policy to make the document more user friendly because it is intended to make it available on our website
- IV. Minor improvements in wording with no change to policy

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Head of Refuse and Environment regarding the amendments to the Waste and Recycling Policy.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations unanimously.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

## **11/22/env Apprenticeships in Environmental Cleansing**

### **Matter for Decision:**

An opportunity has been presented to us to work with Nordic Pioneer, a well established company in the training and environmental cleansing field, to offer opportunities for twelve unemployed young people (ideally 16 – 18 year olds) for a six month apprenticeship in order for them to attain a NVQ level 2 qualification in Cleaning and Support Services.

### **Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

- I. Approved the proposed apprenticeship scheme with Nordic Pioneer.
- II. Approved the use of income from Fixed Penalty Notices issued for environmental crime to offset £10,000 of costs.

### **Reason for the Decision:**

- I. An opportunity exists to work in partnership with Nordic Pioneer, a leading and cutting edge training company in the field of environmental cleansing, on an innovative apprenticeship scheme.
- II. The scheme would deliver opportunities to twelve young people (16-18 year olds) to be employed by Nordic Pioneer and undertake a six-month apprenticeship gaining a NVQ level 2 in Cleaning and Support Services.
- III. The apprentices would be working on projects to clean up areas such as nature reserves, commons and cemeteries as well as undertaking the removal of fly tipping, graffiti and fly posting.
- IV. The Council would be committed to producing a programme of work that meets the criteria of the NVQ.
- V. Funding would come from the receipts from Fixed Penalty Notices issued for environmental crime and existing agency budgets.

### **Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

### **Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Head of Streets and Open Spaces regarding Apprenticeships in Environmental Cleansing.

In response to member questions it was clarified that this was a six month pilot project and that the hope was that it would become an on-going scheme.

Councillor Pogonowski was concerned that the suggested wage of £95 per week would not meet the minimum wage. The officer responded that the apprentices would be paid at least minimum wage for the hours they worked. However, it was not yet clear how many hours a week they would be working and how many hours would be unpaid training hours.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report unanimously.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/23/env Revenue and Capital Project Appraisals and Requests to Carry Forward Funding from 2010/11 to 2011/12**

**Matter for Decision:**

The report presented details of any anticipated variances from revenue budgets where resources were requested to be carried forward into the 2011/12 financial year in order to undertake or complete activities previously approved to take place in 2010/11.

**Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

Agreed the provisional revenue carry forward requests, totaling £45,700 as detailed in Appendix A of the report, to be recommended to Council for approval, subject to the final outturn position.

**Reason for the Decision:**

The financial implications of approving the provisional carry forward of budget from the current year into 2011/12, would result in a reduced requirement in the use of reserves for the current financial year, with a corresponding increase in the use of reserves in 2011/12.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

A decision not to approve a carry forward request would impact on officers' ability to deliver the service or scheme in question and this could have staffing, equal opportunities, environmental and / or community safety implications.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the service Accountant detailing the carry forward requests.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations unanimously.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/24/env Annual Portfolio Plans for 2011/12****Matter for Decision:**

Approval of the Climate Change and Growth Portfolio Plan setting out strategic objectives and performance measures for 2011/12.

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

Agreed the Portfolio Plan.

**Reason for the Decision:**

Portfolio Plans allow Executive Councillors to set out, in agreement with lead officers, their key priorities for delivery in the year ahead.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Director of Environment and the Head of Planning Services.

The Executive Councillor introduced the plan that responds to significant changes in planning and the impact of changes to the county Council and transport planning.

The committee noted the executive councillors plan and did not suggest any amendments.

The Executive Councillor approved the plan.

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

N/A

**11/25/env Informal Planning Policy Guidance on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge**

**Matter for Decision:**

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) had been working jointly to produce Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge. This was in relation to three major development sites; the University site, NIAB sites and Orchard Park.

The guidance was intended to provide an up to date supplement to retail policies in existing plans and help to guide the future planning of the sites in North West Cambridge.

**Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

- I. Agreed the responses to the representations received to the Options Report on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge provided in Appendix A of the report.
- II. Noted that the 'Informal Planning Policy Guidance on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge' had been adopted without change at SCDC's Portfolio Holder's Meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2011.
- III. Agreed to adopt the 'Informal Planning Policy Guidance on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge', provided in Appendix B of the report, as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

**Reason for the Decision:**

The Councils decided that the guidance was necessary because the amount of housing now proposed in this area is nearly 2,000 units greater than was originally envisaged when the Councils were preparing their formal planning policy documents. In addition proposals for foodstore provision have emerged

from discussions with the developers of the three sites. The purpose of the IPPG is to ensure that both new and existing residents of North West (NW) Cambridge have adequate and easily accessible food retailing facilities available and that there is a consistent and coordinated approach across the sites. The County Council had provided input with regards to transport matters.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

An Options Report was produced from an analysis of the evidence base, and presented to the City Council's Development Plan Steering Group Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010, and South Cambridgeshire's Portfolio Holder's Committee Meeting also on 13<sup>th</sup> July. This set out four possible options for foodstore development in North West Cambridge:

- Option A - Planned Development Only i.e. local foodstores in each of the three Local Centres (this is the policy baseline situation, with the committed and pipeline floorspace and no further foodstore provision)
- Option B – Two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one at NIAB and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park.
- Option C – One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace (2,500 sq m net convenience), at the University site and the committed / pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park
- Option D – One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace (2,500 sq m net convenience), at the NIAB site and the committed / pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer regarding the Informal Planning Policy Guidance on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge.

Members were satisfied with the report, having discussed it, in detail during its development. However, Councillor Pogonowski did not feel able to support the proposal as it did not promote local provision of smaller outlets.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations in the report by 7 votes to 1.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/26/env West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal****Matter for Decision:**

Approval of Conservation Area Appraisal for West Cambridge, including designation of extensions to the Conservation Area as detailed in the report.

**Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

- I. Approved the new Conservation Area boundary and the content of the draft Appraisal.
- II. Agreed that the decision on whether to designate an additional area north of Barton Road, and including Barton Close and Wolfson College, will be taken by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokes, after the end of the further consultation period on 24<sup>th</sup> March.

**Reason for the Decision:**

The City Council has an obligation under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to periodically review its Conservation Area designations, boundaries, and consider any new areas, and under Section 71 of the Act to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these areas.

Consultants drafted the Appraisal and propose to extend the boundary, in addition to aligning it with Queen's Road taking in an area currently in the Central Conservation Area. West Cambridge Conservation Area was designated on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 1972 and extended on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 1984. There has never been an appraisal of the Conservation Area, although the area was looked at for the Newnham and West Cambridge District Plan of 1981, revised in 1984. This draft Appraisal provides evidence to illustrate that the area meets current national criteria, in terms of the special architectural and historic interest for Conservation Area designation and in addition that sections outside the existing boundary are also worthy of inclusion.

A period of public consultation had been held and the majority of the responses had been in favour.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**



N/A

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Senior Conservation and Design Officer regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal for West Cambridge. An amendment sheet with an additional recommendation was tabled.

The officer outlined the responses to the consultation.

Councillor Blair suggested the following amendment to section 5.4 of the Draft Cambridge Conservation Area-Character Appraisal. The following sentence to be deleted as it is redundant and this protection is given elsewhere:

*This implies therefore that all buildings marked as 'positive' on the Townscape Analysis Map will be retained in the future unless a special case can be made.*

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the amended recommendations in the report unanimously.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the amended recommendations.

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

N/A

**11/27/env Draft Conservation Area Boundary Review for Mill Road and St Matthews, to include Romsey****Matter for Decision:**

Approval of the designation of Conservation Area extensions to include Romsey, Burnside, and Stone Street.

**Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

The Committee determined the conservation area boundary in accordance with the recommendation and were minded to include an additional area adjoining Argyle Street as suggested by Cambridge Past Present and Future.

(Subsequent to the meeting it has been established that this proposed addition requested by the Committee needs to be subject to consultation with the affected properties. The Executive Councillor has decided that pending this further consultation, and further consideration of the Brookfields Hospital

buildings in the light of the public speaker's comments, the formal decision to designate the Conservation Area extensions should be deferred to the next meeting and following appropriate consultation.)

**Reason for the Decision:**

A review of the 1999 Mill Road and St Matthews Conservation Area Appraisal, and an Appraisal for a potential Conservation Area in Romsey were agreed as part of the 2009-10 Pro-active Conservation programme. It was agreed that separate appraisals should be carried out, with concurrent consultations.

A period of public consultation had been held. The overwhelming majority of the very large number of responses received from Romsey were in favour both of giving Romsey Conservation Area status, and including it in a combined Conservation Area with Mill Road and St Matthews. Suggestions were made that an additional area including Burnside and Brookside be included. Responses to this were in favour.

**Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

Given the support for a combined Conservation Area, the separate draft Appraisals are not being recommended for approval at this time. They will be combined, and the draft revised Appraisal will be the subject of a separate public consultation.

**Scrutiny Considerations:**

The committee received a report from the Historic Environment Manager regarding the designation of Conservation Area extensions. The officer gave an overview of the existing conservation area. The officer noted that the historic Brookfields Hospital buildings were already identified as Buildings of Local Interest.

An amendment sheet was tabled detailing additional responses to the consultation.

Members asked for clarity on the management plan mentioned in the consultation report. The officer confirmed that this was mentioned in the response by Cambridge Past, Present and Future. Both draft Appraisals had included management plans. However, these would not be needed as the Historic Environment SPD would achieve the desired results and would cover all Conservation Areas.

Cambridge Past, Present and Future had suggested a small boundary change to include the area abutting the Southern side of Mill Road Bridge.

Members made the following comments:

- I. The inclusion of Burnside would give a sense of continuity from Parkers Piece to the open space at the end of Burnside.
- II. The inclusion of Argyle Street was welcomed.
- III. Work on this area links well with the planned spending for Cherry Hinton Hall.

The Chair clarified the recommendations for members by reminding them that they were being asked to vote on the proposed extension of the Conservation Area. The appraisal would be brought back to this committee at a later date following further public consultations.

The Committee determined the conservation area boundary in accordance with the recommendation and were minded to include an additional area adjoining Argyle Street as suggested by Cambridge Past Present and Future.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the amended recommendations.

(Subsequent to the meeting it has been established that this proposed addition requested by the Committee needs to be subject to consultation with the affected properties. The Executive Councillor has decided that pending this further consultation, and further consideration of the Brookfields Hospital buildings in the light of the public speaker's comments, the formal decision to designate the Conservation Area extensions should be deferred to the next meeting and following appropriate consultation.)

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

N/A

**11/28/env Pro-Active Conservation**

**Matter for Decision:**

The report reviewed 2010-11 work on the Pro-active Conservation programme which started in 2008-9, together with related unprogrammed projects. The Executive Councillor was asked to agree the future strategy and to approve the carry forward of unspent funds from 2010-11 into the 2011-12 financial year.

The recommendations use the available resources to ensure that Cambridge is as well provided as possible, in terms of historic environment strategy, policies, and guidance. They focus on completion of the Historic Environment Strategy, providing full coverage of up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisals, and extending the Suburbs and Approaches studies programme through using volunteer help.

### **Decision of Exec Cllr for Climate Change and Growth:**

#### **Agreed**

- I. The programme of consultations on completed drafts
- II. The focussing of new work on the Historic Environment Strategy SPD, and on exploring the potential for partnership projects, pending the bringing forward of a detailed programme for 2011-12 to the Committee for approval in July 2011;
- III. Any new project work prior to July 2011 to be subject to the approval of the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair, Historic Environment Champion, and Spokes.

#### **Reason for the Decision:**

The programme had provided an exceptional opportunity to tackle both policy needs and practical issues. The work to date had focused on Conservation Area Appraisals and designation, on Suburbs and Approaches studies, plus some work on buildings at risk. The funds had been used to pay for consultants' work on the assessment and drafting of area appraisals and studies, and for architects' survey and specification work on two war memorials. Completion of the Conservation Area Appraisals would for the first time, ensure that all Conservation Areas have an Appraisal. The Appraisals and Studies together would provide a sound evidence base for the Historic Environment Strategy SPD and Local Plan documents.

#### **Any alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

#### **Scrutiny Considerations:**

N/A

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

N/A

**11/29/env Decision By Executive Councillors**

The Scrutiny Committee noted the decisions.

**17a** Upgrade to Card Processing Facilities within Car Parks

**17b** Project for the Route Optimisation of Refuse and Recycling Collection Services

The meeting ended at 11.35 am

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank