

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 25 March 2021
5.00 - 9.25 pm

Present: Councillors H. Davies (Chair), Collis (Vice-Chair), Barnett, Hadley, Matthews, O'Reilly, Payne and Summerbell

Executive Councillors: Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre) and A. Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway
Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré
Culture and Community Manager: Jane Wilson
Neighbourhood Community Development Manager: Sally Roden
Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston
Committee Manager: James Goddard
Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Others Present:

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye
Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb
Community, Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross
Contract & Projects Manager: Sarah French

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/16/EnC Apologies for Absence

Councillor Collis sent apologies as she would join the meeting late (joined for 21/19/EnC).

Councillor Massey was in attendance although she had no agenda items.

21/17/EnC Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

21/18/EnC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/19/EnC Public Questions

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

1. Raised the following points:

- i. In its recent report the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate states:

In the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) area, emissions are approximately 25% higher per person than the UK average. At this level of emissions, we have only about 6 years remaining before we will have exhausted all our 'allowed' share of emissions to 2050 ...

- ii. Much of the excess in emissions was due to agricultural practices and their effect on the peat. Read the Climate Change Strategy and Carbon Management plan with this in mind. Seen in this light the plan cannot be considered adequate and, in many respects, it can only be viewed as timid. It makes bold claims to leadership yet constantly refers to waiting on central government and the perceived inability of the council to do more than preach or cajole. To fully respond to such news would, amongst other things, require stopping pouring concrete tomorrow which was impractical.
- iii. Credit where credit was due. The Plan sought to set an example by tackling the Council's own emissions and in this it is admirably thorough. Beyond that this proposal is simply supine, seeking to preach rather than engage.
- iv. The Plan claimed to show leadership but constantly shied away from action. Why is there no proposal to influence development of the local plan towards the 15-minute city – reducing the need for cars, promoting active travel and building community? Why is there no initiative to kick-start an energy co-op, that can produce green electricity, share the burden with commerce and generate funds to retrofitting buildings? Why

is there no proposal to establish electric car clubs, helping residents avoid the cost of maintaining vehicles they only use for occasional trips and family visits? Above all where is the willingness to learn from other cities' experience?

- v. Specific ideas may not work, but actions must actively engage communities and test ideas if real change is to happen. Some may never get off the ground, some may fail and that is the price of change, some may produce disappointing results, but many will find support and grow and a few will succeed beyond expectation.
- vi. Above all what is lacking in this piecemeal plan is any sense of systems thinking, any notion that changing the outcome of complex physical and social interactions is not a matter of small local adjustments. Change required real vision, system scale trial and error and above all willingness to take risks.
- vii. Would the Council now pledge to make the very positive proposals to put its own house in order the foundation of something much more ambitious – a plan that shows imagination, the courage to engage and, above all, seeks to take responsibility and show real leadership?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Said she was sorry the public speaker felt the plan was inadequate.
- ii. Would be happy to hear from the speaker about clear examples where action was not being taken.
- iii. The Council was supporting car clubs and electric vehicle uptake in the city (eg encouraging taxis to become electric) and putting in charge points for these.
- iv. The City Council was learning from other authorities' good practice.
- v. The Council could not "stop pouring concrete". Homes were being built in the city. The Council would ensure they were sustainable.
- vi. The Council's Climate Change Strategy set out how the Council would reduce emissions from the city.

Supplementary question:

- i. Car Clubs had not joined up to the '15 Minute City' scheme.
- ii. Individuals had installed photovoltaic panels but there was no joined up scheme to participate in, please ensure one was available.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Council was doing work on the '15 Minute City' scheme eg community provision and Local Plan policy reviews.
 - ii. Was happy to discuss ways to join up initiatives with the speaker after this meeting.
 - iii. An annual update report would be made on the Climate Change Strategy. The Strategy could be adapted if necessary, it was not set in stone.
2. Raised the following points:
- i. The City Council had declared a climate emergency.
 - ii. Would the Council support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill?
Referred to motion text supplied in an email.

Councillor Davies (Chair) said any questions/statements made should be within the remit of the Committee, the motion was better directed to a meeting of Full Council.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Agreed the motion was a question for Full Council.
 - ii. Speaking personally, she supported the aims and principles of the bill. It was similar to the Labour Bill that Central Government rejected.
3. Raised the following points:
- i. Queried if market operating hours were practical for traders.
 - ii. Referred to "Life on Cambridge" website.
 - iii. Queried what the Redevelopment Team do to address operational shortcomings?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. (Market Square report.) Quarterbridge were contracted by Mace Project Consultants and were not employed by the City Council. They did 'blue

sky thinking' and were looking at alternative options before making a decision regarding the market.

- ii. The plan was to facilitate a 7 day general market.
- iii. People would be consulted on how to use the space around the market.
- iv. The intention was to make the best use of city centre space and provide what residents wanted.

Supplementary question:

- i. Alternative locations for the market were unavailable in lockdown and could be constrained afterwards.
- ii. Practical solutions should be reviewed in future.

4. Raised the following points about the market redevelopment:

- i. As part of the Concept presentation people were being asked to assess the qualities of new stall designs.
- ii. Asked that the stall designs in question are erected in the market square where both Traders and the public would be able to judge them in terms of useability and aesthetics.
- iii. Asked that the stalls were erected on the Square to coincide with the full Consultation period.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. 5 stall concept designs had been reduced to 2 as the most practical designs. If these were approved at committee then prototypes would be made for people to look at and comment on in the consultation period. Comments would then go forward to the next stage of the process.

5. Raised the following points:

- i. How was the decision made to engage Quarterbridge as consultants for the development of the vision and concept design for the Cambridge Market Square Redevelopment?
- ii. Was the Council not aware of the questionable integrity of the directors of Quarterbridge as shown in an investigative article published in the newspaper Corporate Watch in April 2019?

- a. Queried the reliability of Quarterbridge.
- iii. Was the Council not informed of the notoriety of Quarterbridge, and its subsidiary company Market Asset Management, for the damaging impact it has had on markets up and down the country? This has been clearly researched, recorded and published in an article (ResearchGate, 2015) by an academic who specializes in local markets, Dr Sara Gonzalez of Leeds University, as well as being reported in various newspapers.
- iv. Could the Council reassure market traders and the people of Cambridge and surrounding areas who love to shop in the market, that Market Asset Management will not be employed or involved in the future management of Cambridge Market?
- v. Reading the Quarterbridge Report it soon becomes clear that the company has little familiarity with either the City of Cambridge or the Market. Just two examples can serve to illustrate this: their remark that more needs to be made of the view of Great St Mary's from the Square – anyone who has spent more than a minute in the Square knows that Great St Mary's completely dominates the scene from wherever you stand! A second example is their remark that food festivals will attract thousands of visitors. Anyone who lives in or visits Cambridge knows that the last thing we need is to attract hundreds, let alone thousands of visitors to the centre of the City.
- vi. Given, then, that it appears that Quarterbridge have supplied a one-size-fits-all proposal for how to improve Cambridge Market that is remarkably ill-informed of the actual trade that already takes place in the market, why is it that the Council appears to have been so influenced by the report in formulating their vision for the future of the market square?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Quarterbridge were appointed by the Council for multi-design work based on an agreed brief. Quarterbridge scored the highest in the tendering process.
- ii. The Council would not outsource market management, the Market Team would do this.

Supplementary question:

- i. Referred to the open letter sent on behalf of Cambridge Market traders, Friends of Cambridge Market, FeCRA and Living Streets Cambridge.
- ii. Why was there no plan to use existing stalls?

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The concept for this project was to future proof the market. The intention was to create a flexi-use space. Stalls were expected to be set up most of the time.
 - ii. High level detail was being considered at present, residents would then be consulted on preferred stall design etc. Options were being kept open at present.
6. Raised the following points:
- i. Why is it that we are at this stage of the project and financial commitment before the Council has actually spoken to the general public?
 - ii. There has been stakeholder engagement, but there had been no engagement with the general public.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Lots of engagement had been undertaken with traders.
- ii. The public would be consulted when more defined concept design details were available. The market square committee report had been delayed from January to March 2021, consultation would occur circa May if the Committee agreed proposals today. We were still early in the process.

Supplementary question:

- i. Suggested the public should have been involved at the 'blue sky thinking' stage.
- ii. Suggested consultation should have been moved on-line, instead of being delayed for 6 months due to lockdown.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Some residents were unable to engage on-line during lockdown. In order to be accessible to all, consultation would be done after lockdown.
- ii. The Council had to focus on how to function in lockdown, so it was unable to consult the public then.
- iii. There would be consultation in future.

7. Raised the following points:

- i. Could Councillors clearly define what they each understand by the terms 'Vision' and 'Concept' in relation to the proposed development of Cambridge Market?
- ii. Could they illustrate how such understanding would ensure that tradespeople experience job security and were able to sustain crucial relationships with local residents who are regular customers?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Vision: Sets out the big picture.
- ii. Concept: Abstract idea and model to first design. A model could be in place by 2023.
- iii. The project would be similar to the current market square but more accessible for users and have more seating. It should help the long term viability of the market, leading to job security and better facilities for traders and customers.
- iv. Affordable rents would continue to support small and independent traders.

Supplementary question:

- i. The city centre was very small and saturated with people ie overcrowded.
- ii. Please consider moving the development out of the city centre, possibly into the Fens.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. It was not within her scope to move the market to the Fens.
- ii. Her remit covered making best use of the market square.

8. Raised the following points:
 - i. What was proposed would adversely affect traders and local residents; there were better ways to provide outdoor events in a public space. For example, the area around Cambridge Leisure Park was under-used.
 - ii. The space between The Junction and the various shops and restaurants is large enough for Christmas markets and events, there is road, bus and train access, plus a multi-storey car park. Perhaps Councillors have not considered the potential for this space to fulfil all the functions that they are now proposing?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The market did not need to move.
- ii. The market square needed work to improve it regardless of proposals for the market (eg stall designs).
- iii. The Council did not own the land outside The Junction so could not influence its use. They were looking at ways to make best use of space.

9. Raised the following points:
 - i. Strongly supported the open letter sent on behalf of Cambridge Market traders, Friends of Cambridge Market, FeCRA and Living Streets Cambridge.
 - ii. Concerned at the leap straight into Concept Design before any real articulation of, or consultation on a 'Vision' for the market, the market square and the central civic space. It was (finally) now possible for the public to be able to see an articulation of the Council's proposed vision. A vision that seemed to be based on the dreams of people looking out of the Guildhall and imagining St Mark's Square in Venice. Rather than our smaller, very beautiful, also very busy medieval square and city. The Council had only made its vision available after it had already spent £158,000 on the project so far, including dismissing BDP, their first set of consultants.
 - iii. In the 2019 Feasibility Study, BDP said "It is ...imperative that a clear vision is set for the square which is in line with the aspirations of Cambridge's residents and businesses. This vision should set the level

of ambition for the change the market square designs should strive to achieve, be based upon community led engagement, and have an understanding of the key challenges the vision would face, including where the required capital investment would come from.”

- iv. In the light of no public consultation or engagement with a project that has been discussed within the council for well over 2 years now, it remains interesting that the Council dismissed those consultants. Following the dismissal of BDP the Council engaged further consultants, Quarterbridge, and then failed to produce the Quarterbridge report at the first Environment and Communities Scrutiny committee meeting in January of this year. The Quarterbridge report (now available as appendix C in the committee papers) features an analysis of the Concept Design, skipping and bypassing the need for any Vision, or for public consultation before Concept Design. So placing the cart firmly before the horse.
- v. Both the Council and by extension the Quarterbridge report, determinedly and relentlessly pushing the replacement of the existing market stalls with ‘flexible’ demountable stalls. And it is on these demountable stalls that the whole of the Council’s vision for large scale events hinges. We are all now able to see the Quarterbridge analysis that small-scale public events may be marginally commercially viable; while they also say that large scale events are definitely not commercially viable. This blows out of the water any justification the Council might have for their insistence on demountable stalls; and so the root stock of the Council scheme for the market square.
- vi. We see our existing traditional market as front stage and centre of our historic market square and city centre. We are now able to see that the Quarterbridge report says that our market is a rarity in being a successful 7 day a week market, one that brings in good returns for the city.
- vii. Our City Council is landlord to the market and the market traders. As landlords the Council have a duty, sadly neglected over successive years, to maintain, and to refurbish. Our market is very well used, it is also much loved. At very recent Full Council meeting an allocation of £320,000 was agreed for further spending on the market square project.
- viii. We are now calling on our City Council to fulfil their role as landlords and use a portion of that agreed allocation to refresh and refurbish our existing market.

- ix. We also call for the Council to spend some of that allocation on a full and wide public consultation on a vision for the market square. One that encompasses keeping front stage and centre our existing traditional 7 day a week market. One that also looks at the whole of our central market square. Our central public space at the heart of our busy, and in non covid times, quite crammed medieval city centre.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. BDP completed phase 1 of the feasibility study contract, the project ended and the City Council moved onto the next stage.
- ii. There was no consultation on how to use the market square as the Council aimed to retain its current use.

Supplementary question:

- i. Needed to ensure the existing traditional market could continue. Demountable stalls were not required for this.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. A traditional market would continue, but with better infrastructure and more space around the fountain.
- ii. A better space was being created in the heart of the city.

10. Raised the following points:

- i. Referred to the range of issues raised in the Open Letter.
- ii. This project needed a reality check. Officers had provided a draft Vision (only after prompting) 3 years in. Took issue with the Vision.
 - a. There wasn't capacity, in space or in time, for the aspirational activities listed on page 32 of the officers' report.
 - b. Too narrow in that the vision doesn't look beyond the edges of the market square in terms of either physical or policy context.
- iii. The chart on page 33 did not show the full impact on market activities, or the residential context. Radcliffe Court has 18 flats, 5 directly overlooking the Square, and there are proposals for 9 flats in the upper floors of 3-4 Market Hill. Caius and Kings have many student rooms overlooking the Square or which would be affected by noise from it. Yet

the Council's plans involve disturbance from large events, compounded by late night or overnight taking down of staging.

- iv. The narrowness of the Vision is highlighted by Peas Hill and Guildhall Street, included in the 2019 Feasibility Study, but now treated only as dumps for cycle parking displaced from the market square.
- v. Any market square proposals must be part of a wider vision for the City Centre, which considers the uses of buildings and spaces post-Covid, and tackles capacity issues including cycle parking. With the SPD postponed, the market square project must take more account of the existing policy context, notably the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal and its Street Analysis for Market Hill, and the belated Historic Core Management Plan on which work is due to start.
- vi. Neither the Vision nor the 2019 Feasibility Study were subject to formal public consultation. The Feasibility Study was biased and flawed, but did at least suggest a range of different options. The proposed temporary stalls have not yet been tested, and the economic basis for them has been scotched by the Quarterbridge report. The consultation strategy proposed in the report doesn't include any physical display in the market square.
- vii. How to move forward?
 - a. Have a full 6-week consultation on 'vision options and feasibility', and not including the current draft Concept Design. (When would this occur?)
 - b. If either 1 or 2 prototype demountable stalls have been ordered and paid for, it would be a waste not to have them tested by the traders.
 - c. It's also vital that any proposals for our market square are exhibited in the market square where all users can see them.
- viii. When the prototype stalls were available, they should be installed for the full 6 weeks. One stall for trialling by the traders, another to house a consultation display of Vision options (including refurbishment as a default) together with information from a revised and updated Feasibility Study, which should be also be put to public consultation. The draft consultation plan, process and questions should be brought to this Committee for approval.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Thought that residents would want a 7 day market preserved with improved facilities.
- ii. The project would focus on consultation after committee today discussed the report on concept design.
- iii. Information on the market would be published in various locations.

Supplementary question:

- i. A market with demountable stalls was not a traditional market. There was failure to take on board heritage aspects in a multi-use area.
- ii. There was a risk that the consultation would be undertaken at the same time a planning application was submitted, so residents' views would not be taken on board.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Council processes were open and transparent.
- ii. The market area had various uses over time such as being a carpark. The intention was to make it fit for purpose as a multi-use area in future.

11. Raised the following points:

- i. Referred to issues raised in the Open letter sent on behalf of Cambridge Market traders, Friends of Cambridge Market, FeCRA and Living Streets Cambridge. She was on the panel that assessed BDP and other consultancies for the Spaces and Movement SPD. The brief included the enhancement of Cambridge market square and it prioritised community engagement. Procurement support was provided by LGSS Procurement.
- ii. In July 2019 the Feasibility Study for the Spaces and Movement SPD concluded that it "is therefore imperative that a clear vision is set for the square which is in line with the aspirations of Cambridge's residents and businesses. This vision should set the level of ambition for the change the market square designs should strive to achieve, and be based upon community led engagement".
- iii. What was the process of procurement of Quarterbridge - after the removal of BDP?

- iv. How did this procurement process relate to the Consortium that included Cambridge City Council, Fitzwilliam Museum Enterprises Ltd (ie the University), Cambridge Bid and King' College. The Consortium's bid for funding for the Wider Cambridge Visitor Project which includes the market redevelopment and the city's green spaces was approved by the Combined Authority Business Board.
- v. What were the Consortium' s governance arrangements?
- vi. The report of the Combined Authority minutes contained two appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. The Mayor asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so. Lewis Herbert was representing the City Council.
- vii. Residents asked if there was a plan to raise matched investment from a fund raised by the Consortium?
- viii. What is the Consortium's definition of public goods? What proportion if any of the funding approved or to be raised by the Consortium will go to support the market traders?
- ix. It was important that residents understood that Quarterbridge's role in other cities and towns seemed to be to prepare councils for the idea of outsourcing their market services and/or to upgrade markets spaces to generate more income. The direction of travel seems to be privatisation of Cambridge city centre, the market square and the city's green spaces.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Was unaware of meetings so could not attend them.
- ii. Empathised that it was a difficult time for traders when the market was closed.
- iii. The Consortium were not involved in the market square project and its procurement. These were two separate projects.
- iv. Visit Cambridge had not survived lockdown. The new group (now known as Destination Management Organisation) had no legal status at present but had a memorandum of understanding. Its focus was managing tourists.
- v. There was no plan for matched investment.

- vi. There was no plan to privatise the market square and outsource management.

Supplementary question:

- i. Referred to Combined Authority minutes.
- ii. £700,000 was allocated for the market square project. It then came up again later as the destination project/Consortium.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Consortium/Destination Management Organisation were not making plans for the market. They were an alternative organisation to Visit Cambridge.
- ii. The City Council had applied for Combined Authority funding to upgrade the market. The Combined Authority Board did not want to support a long term project so the City Council put in a second bid for a separate project. (See 21/6/EnC 28 January 2021 minutes.)

12. Councillor Martinelli raised the following points:

- i. Supported the project and the 7 day market.
- ii. Expected benefits:
 - a. Improved facilities.
 - b. Increased stall size.
- iii. Concerns:
 - a. Reduction of cycle storage spaces.
 - b. The market square could attract anti-social behaviour at night – please manage.

13. Raised the following points:

- i. Referred to lifeoncambridgemarket.com website.
- ii. Given that market stalls were full from Friday to Sunday, queried where extra weekend markets could be placed (such as farmers markets, craft markets, vinyl markets, food markets etc) as highlighted in the Quarterbridge report?
- iii. They could not go on the existing market stalls unless you were planning to displace the current traders and put them out of work.

- iv. Queried what was meant by a '7 day a week market'? Asked if regular traders would still get access to use the market 7 days a week, as they did under current licences which applied 362 days of the year?
- v. Or could these '7 day a week markets' apply to and include the planned visiting markets; would these go in place of regular stalls, as and when decided by the Council?

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The aim was to allow new and existing traders to use the market area for all (7) days in a week. The focus was on regular traders.
- ii. There was no detailed planning on visiting markets. This was the next stage to consider after the concept design.

Supplementary question:

- i. Where would visiting markets go?
- ii. Expressed concern the multi-use area would drive away traders.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. It was not the intention to drive away traders from the market area. The intention was to maintain and improve the market in a multi-use area.
- ii. The market was closed in lockdown due to public health concerns. It was a separate issue to the market square improvement project.

14. Councillor Porrer raised the following points:

- vi. Ward Councillors welcomed the commitment to a 7 day market.
- vii. There appeared to be a break down in trust between traders and the council. Ward Councillors attended meetings with traders.
- viii. Welcomed a transparent and open consultation process. Asked for as much information as possible to be made publicly available for consultation. Asked that Ward Councillors were involved in the process.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Council staff worked hard to maintain and improve the city.

- ii. The market closed earlier in the year due to health and safety concerns. The Council had to abide by guidance that had been made law 29 March.
- iii. Ward Councillors were invited to all workshops except the trader only ones. They would be involved in the consultation process.

21/20/EnC Market Square Project: Consultation Draft Vision and Concept Design

Matter for Decision

The Council has embarked on a major public realm capital project to improve Cambridge's market square, as the city's principal outdoor civic space and venue for the Council's popular seven day a week General and Sunday market.

The market square, its associated outdoor public realm and market infrastructure, was not up to the quality standard befitting the city's international status and profile.

The Council's initial project work has involved an assessment of the issues, needs and opportunities associated with the market square space. Using the site assessment findings, the Council, with the support of specialist design and market consultants, has engaged key organisational stakeholders, including market traders, to develop a proposed vision and supporting concept design plan for the square.

The Council was now seeking to go out to a six-week public consultation on the proposed vision and concept design, as detailed in Appendix A and B of the Officer's report after the local elections in May 2021.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

- i. Approved the proposed consultation draft market square project vision and concept design, as detailed in Appendix A and B respectively, for a six-week public consultation starting in May, as outlined in Section 5 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted the findings of the market square project operational management and outline business case assessment report in Appendix C of the Officer's report.

- iii. Agreed not to proceed to the design work on RIBA Stages 3 and 4 until the public consultation was complete and the results had been brought to and approved by this committee.

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.

The Executive Councillor and Head of Environmental Services said the market square project should deliver the following benefits:

- i. Improved market square space.
- ii. Improved facilities, public realm and waste management.
- iii. Electrics would be improved which would allow food stalls to be grouped together (which was not possible now).
- iv. It would be more accessible and easier to clean.
- v. Should attract more people and so support traders.
- vi. Looking to restore and improve heritage facilities.
- vii. Make better use of space.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Matthews proposed to add the following recommendation to those in the Officer's report:

- (New) 2.3 Not to proceed to RIBA Stages 3 and 4 until the public consultation is complete and the results have been brought to and approved by this committee.

Councillor Moore proposed revised wording (as agreed with Councillor Matthews):

- (New) 2.3 Not to proceed to **the design work on** RIBA Stages 3 and 4 until the public consultation is complete and the results have been brought to and approved by this committee.

The Committee unanimously approved this additional recommendation.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended.

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.

21/21/EnC Climate Change Strategy and Carbon Management Plan 2021-2026**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report presented a revised Climate Change Strategy covering the period from 2021-2026 for approval, following public consultation in autumn 2020. The revised strategy set out the Council's approach to: reducing its own carbon emissions; supporting residents, businesses and organisations in Cambridge to reduce their emissions; and helping the city adapt to the predicted changes in climate. The revised strategy builds on what the Council has achieved to date, but sets out new ambitions in the context of the Climate Emergency, including working more with residents, communities, businesses and institutions.

The report also presented a new Carbon Management Plan for 2021-2026 for approval. The Carbon Management Plan set out in more detail how the Council would reduce its direct carbon emissions from its corporate buildings and fleet vehicles towards net zero carbon.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

- i. Approved the Council's Climate Change Strategy for 2021-2026.
- ii. Approved the Council's Carbon Management Plan for 2021-2026.

Agreed to:

- iii. Commit to ensuring that all future reports aid understanding of carbon emissions by providing: both percentages of total emissions and the absolute denominator in ktCO₂; a definition of the scope of the emissions referred to; and a clear visual representation of the scope of emissions referred to.
- iv. In addition to presenting data on carbon emissions that are within the Council's direct influence, explore the feasibility of quantifying the emissions contained within Council's policy influence and report to Scrutiny Committee in October 2021.

- v. Explore the feasibility of measuring the impact of the Council's future activity on emissions within its direct influence and its policy influence and report to Scrutiny Committee in October 2021.
- vi. The council will prepare a list of existing for gas fired heating systems under council control and their remaining expected service life.
 - a. Scope: All gas consumers included in Appendix 4 Figure 10 (page 123 of reports pack)
 - b. Target date: Next committee cycle
- vii. In addition, the committee notes the already recognised need to complete an asset management plan for all the council's corporate building, and additionally recommends that the council ensure the plan addresses the following points:

For all systems with less than 5 years life remaining prepare a report on the:

- a. Extent of insulation, heating system or other work required to ensure feasibility of low carbon heating
- b. Current gas consumption
- c. Estimated combined costs of remedial work and low carbon heating system

Output: Prioritised (by tCO₂/£) list of urgent works required to avoid future replacement of existing heating systems with gas fired boilers at end of life

Target time frame: 12 months

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 Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

Opposition Councillors made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The Council needed to do more to mitigate/address climate change.

- ii. Needed to take more meaningful action as a city and wider area, to do more than the city could on its own.
- iii. The city should take action and set a good example for other organisations to follow.

The Strategy and Partnerships Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Council had a target to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2030.
- ii. The intention was to reduce direct emissions from buildings and the transport fleet first. Technology options to achieve this were being reviewed eg through the Carbon Management Plan.
- iii. It was not possible to fully decarbonise all buildings with current technology eg the Council had a gas powered crematorium.
- iv. The Council was investing in energy efficient measures for housing.
- v. A report was due in April 2020 looking at how 7,000 council homes could be retrofitted (to various levels) to decarbonise them. (See Housing Revenue Account under remit of Housing Scrutiny Committee).
- vi. Officers were working with 'Climate View' to visualise citywide emissions to break them down into different sectors and then address.
- vii. Community engagement and work with partners was needed to achieve net zero.
- viii. The Council bid for funding where available to undertake work, but would take action regardless. It would use its resources efficiently as work took high levels of capital investment.
- ix. The Council planned to use passivhaus standards from 2021 and net zero from 2030. This was phrased as 'where possible' in the Strategy as there were constraints on sites the Council proposed to use.

The Strategic Director said Housing Scrutiny Committee would review passivhaus standards as it fell under their remit.

- x. The Strategy recognised the Council needed to do more regarding off-setting carbon emissions.
- xi. Depending on what vehicles were available and most practicable, the Council aimed to use electric and ultra-low emission vehicles in its fleet.

The Executive Councillor said:

- i. The Strategy was work in progress and could be added to over time. A report would be brought back to committee. Consultations and workshops had been undertaken to develop the Strategy.
- ii. Green investments were separate to off-setting actions.

Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Summerbell proposed to add the following recommendations (shown in bold) to those in the Officer's report:

Recommendations

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

1. Approve the Council's Climate Change Strategy for 2021-2026.
2. Approve the Council's Carbon Management Plan for 2021-2026.

In addition:

Amendment 1 for item 6 to read as follows:

1. **Commit to ensuring that all future reports aid understanding of carbon emissions by providing: both percentages of total emissions and the absolute denominator in ktCO₂; a definition of the scope of the emissions referred to; and a clear visual representation of the scope of emissions referred to.**
2. **In addition to presenting data on carbon emissions that are within the Council's direct influence, explore the feasibility of quantifying the emissions contained within Council's policy influence and report to Scrutiny Committee in October 2021.**
3. **Explore the feasibility of measuring the impact of the Council's future activity on emissions within its direct influence and its policy influence and report to Scrutiny Committee in October 2021.**

Amendment 2 for item 6 to read as follows:

The council will prepare a list of existing for gas fired heating systems under council control and their remaining expected service life.

Scope: All gas consumers included in Appendix 4 Figure 10 (page 123 of reports pack)

Target date: Next committee cycle

In addition, the committee notes the already recognised need to complete an asset management plan for all the council's corporate

building, and additionally recommends that the council ensure that plan addresses the following points:

For all systems with less than 5years life remaining prepare a report on the:

2) Extent of insulation, heating system or other work required to ensure feasibility of low carbon heating

3) Current gas consumption

4) Estimated combined costs of remedial work and low carbon heating system

Output: Prioritised (by tCO2/£) list of urgent works required to avoid future replacement of existing heating systems with gas fired boilers at end of life

Target time frame: 12 months.

The Committee unanimously approved these additional recommendations.

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendations as amended by 5 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Councillor Smith asked for it to be noted that she had been unwell at the Strategy and Resources Committee (and had informed the chair of that but didn't want to make a fuss by broadcasting it more widely), and this had prevented her from giving as effective an answer as she would have liked at that point.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/22/EnC Cambridge Corn Exchange Heating System

Matter for Decision

This was a report on the heating system replacement for Cambridge Corn Exchange. It summarised why an interim gas-based solution was necessary.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

The Executive Councillor noted the 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 Culture and Community Manager.

Opposition Councillors made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Expressed concern that a gas fired heating system was installed as an emergency measure.
- ii. There was no time to look at other options eg heat source pump) that had a longer lifespan. The gas system would need to be replaced after 9 years.
- iii. Looked forward to cross-party action to address the issue in future.
- iv. Welcomed the opportunity to be briefed by the engineer.

The Culture and Community Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. It was very complicated to get heat pump boilers installed.
- ii. Extensive work would have to be undertaken before another type of heating system could be installed.

The Executive Councillor said that officers had looked at various heating system options.

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.

21/23/EnC Storey's Field Centre Future Management Arrangements**Matter for Decision**

The Storey's Field Centre, on the Eddington Development in the North West of the City, opened to the public in February 2018 and has been managed under a contract for services with the Storey's Field Centre Trust (SFCT) by the City Council since July 2016 when the Centre manager was appointed.

The initial contract was for a 5-year period which comes to an end on 30 June 2021. The SFCT has recommended an 18-month extension to the existing contract whilst it considers recommendations made during a recent review of the Centre and its operations.

The City Council considered this option and recommended approval of this extension to ensure continuity for the Centre and staff during this period whilst changes are considered. It is the officers' view that an 18-month extension is an appropriate length of time for the Trust to make any necessary decisions.

The previous contract was approved by Committee in 2015 and any further decisions after the 5-year period of the contract (which expires on 30 June 2021) required approval by the Executive Councillor.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Approved the extension to the existing contract for services for the Storey's Field Centre for a further 18 months from 1st July 2021 – 31 December 2022.
- ii. Delegated any further decisions in respect of the Council's commitments to the implementation of the contract until 31 December 2022 to the Director of Communities.

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 Neighbourhood Community Development Manager.

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 9.25 pm

CHAIR