

# Public Document Pack

Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee

EnvCm/1

Thursday, 16 January 2025

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** 16 January 2025  
6.00 - 7.45 pm

**Present:** Councillors Pounds (Chair), Nestor (Vice-Chair), Ashton, Griffin, Hauk, Payne, Swift and Tong

Executive Councillors: Holloway (Executive Councillor for Community Safety, Homelessness and Wellbeing), Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Action and Environment), Smart (Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services) and Wade (Executive Councillor for Communities)

## **Officers:**

Director, Communities Group: Sam Scharf

Community Funding and Voluntary Sector Manager: Julie Cornwell

Community, Sport & Recreation Manager: Ian Ross

Environmental Health Manager: Yvonne O'Donnell

Technical & Specialist Services Manager: John Richards

Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield

Waste Policy, Change and Innovations Manager: Rebecca Weymouth-Wood

Waste Policy Officer: Dee Wood

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

## **FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

### **25/1/EnC Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Payne who would arrive after the meeting started.
- Councillor Glasberg, (Councillor Tong attended as an Alternate).
- Councillor Divkovic, (Councillor Griffin attended as an Alternate).

### **25/2/EnC Declarations of Interest**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Councillor Tong	25/7/EnC	Personal: Was a member of Abbey People, which was a community group that received funding under

		this item. Would abstain from voting.
Councillor Ashton	25/8/EnC	Personal: Was a Ward Councillor for Cherry Hinton and there were some projects in Cherry Hinton receiving s106 funding in this item.
Councillor Ashton	25/9/EnC	Personal: Was a Ward Councillor for Cherry Hinton and there were some projects in Cherry Hinton receiving s106 funding in this item.

### 25/3/EnC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Councillor Tong raised a query on behalf of Councillor Glasberg. He referred to agenda P6:

Councillor Pounds said she had received a recent briefing from Officers covering amongst other topics:

1. The Happy Bee scheme.
2. A report on the impact of the Herbicide Free Policy impact, specifically progress of the use of the new machines for clearing pavements and kerbsides instead of using herbicides.

Councillor Pounds offered to circulate details to Committee Members.

Councillors were unable to open the file/report circulated and the expected meeting of the Herbicide Free Working Group had not yet occurred. Councillor Tong requested an update on progress.

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services undertook to liaise with Councillor Tong after committee about any specific queries.

Councillor Pounds said the following:

- i. Officers were looking at alternatives to using herbicides.
- ii. Alistair Wilson was the Officer in charge of this work.
- iii. Officers intended to produce a new version of the update report and resolve the earlier opening error at the same time.

Councillor Hauk ask for update details to be sent to all committee members when available.

## **25/4/EnC Public Questions**

A list of public questions was publishing on the meeting page available via: [Agenda for Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee on Thursday, 16th January, 2025, 6.00 pm - Cambridge Council](#)

Responses to public questions and supplementary questions are included below:

### Question 1

“The Coleridge Dragon will be ten years old this year. Please can it have a clean up, and please could councillors consider whether we could have some sort of celebration - perhaps as part of the Music in the Park series this summer, and combine it with community outreach similar to what Romsey Rec had last year with community groups holding stalls, and possibly with the city council having display boards on big future projects that will affect our part of the city.”

The Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services responded that the speaker was welcome to organise a celebration event if he wished. The Executive Councillor would forward details on to officers if an event request was sent to him.

Supplementary question:

The public speaker made the following supplementary points:

- i. The ‘dragon’ celebrated a local election candidate.
- ii. Hoped to include this event as part of a wider city council events programme to encourage community engagement and outreach.
- iii. Requested outreach stalls be included.
- iv. Community events were ideal opportunities to engage the public on issues such as East/West Rail.

- v. Had met Peter Freeman (Chair of Cambridge Growth Company) to give him a 'wish list' of requests.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Community events were welcome. It was better if they were organised by residents than by the Council, so they were 'bottom up' rather than 'top down' in style.
- ii. Referred to the Coleridge Forum as an organisation to liaise with.

Councillor Pounds referred to the Queen Edith's Forum which did similar activities to those requested by the public speaker.

### **25/5/EnC Review of Methodology of Hackney Carriage Vehicle Fares**

Councillor Payne joined the committee during this item.

#### **Matter for Decision**

In March 2022, the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee agreed that the Hackney Carriage Table of Fares would increase by the CPI each year on 1 April for a period of 3 years. The Officer's report asked that the decision be extended for a further 3 years.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change Environment and City Centre**

Agreed to continue to complete an automatic fare review in line with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for main tariffs, subsequent distance and waiting time, and review this process and extra charges every 3 years, at the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee, following consultation.

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

As set out in the Officer's report.

#### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

See Officer's report.

#### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Environmental Health Manager.

The Environmental Health Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There was a low number of responses to the consultation. This was normal. Responses came from drivers and members of the public.
- ii. Consultation occurred through various ways such as through the City Council website and in person.
- iii. Suggestions on how to improve the consultation process were welcome.

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.

### **25/6/EnC Update on the Costs Associated With the Material Recycling Facility Contract Budget**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided an update on the financial impact of the joint procurement exercise undertaken by the RECAP partnership consisting of five Cambridgeshire Waste Collection Authorities and new contract options from March 2025.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Action and Environment**

Noted the additional MRF contract costs and options being pursued from March 2025 when the existing contract ends. Costs have already been accounted for in the MTFS.

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

As set out in the Officer's report.

#### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

See Officer's report.

#### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Waste Policy, Change and Innovations Manager.

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

- i. Councillor Ashton referred to P6 24/41/EnC minutes and expressed concern regarding the Material Recycling Facility (MRF) contract process. Councillors needed to be informed at the earliest opportunity so options could be considered and debated. He had raised this point six months ago.
- ii. Councillor Tong expressed concern that Councillors were not given the opportunity to scrutinise the MRF contract and there was a lack of information about environmental impacts.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Action and Environment responded:

- i. Reiterated details from her response in September 2024. The procurement process started two years ago.
- ii. The City Council had to follow procurement guidelines. The previous recycling contract ended in August 2024 so items for recycling needed to be sent somewhere since August 2024.
- iii. The South Cambs District Council Liberal Democrat Cabinet Member and Labour City Council Executive Councillor plus Officers had worked on contract options. The intention was to minimise the Waste Service / MRF contract carbon footprint but this could not be measured until action was taken.
- iv. There was no reduction in the number of items that could be recycled, but a number of items had been added, so more items could be put in residents' blue bins for recycling.
- v. The new contract would last five years to allow time for the City Council and shared service to review further options.

Councillor Ashton said the Scrutiny Committee should have been given more information to scrutinise options.

The Executive Councillor undertook to send recycling information via officers after committee.

The Waste Policy, Change and Innovations Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Sixteen other local authorities in Great Britain used the recycling facility in Northern Ireland which the City Council intended to use.
- ii. Undertook to liaise with the contractor in March 2025 to seek information requested such as the carbon footprint of operations.

The Executive Councillor said:

- i. Was happy to bring a report back in future about recycling rates, off-setting waste lorry journey carbon footprint and MRF contract progress.
- ii. Recycling was better than landfill, but the preferred hierarchy was reduce, reuse, recycle.
- iii. Referred to information on the City Council website about recycling and asked Ward Councillors to signpost it to residents. Any specific queries could be directed to the Executive Councillor which could then be put on the website to be publicly available.

Councillor Hauk proposed and Councillor Payne seconded an amendment to recommendation 1.1 from the Officer's report (amendments shown as bold and struck through text):

~~It is recommended that the Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee notes the additional MRF contract costs and options being pursued from March 2025 when the existing contract ends calls on Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Services to defer any new MRF contract until the carbon footprint of alternative suppliers can be fully assessed. Costs have already been accounted for in the MTFS.~~

The amendment was lost by 3 votes to 5.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 4 and on Chair's casting vote to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Councillor Ashdon asked for clarification to be publicised that contract decisions were made in conjunction with South Cambs District Council and were not solely made by the City Council.

The Executive Councillor invited suggestions on how to provide greater clarity. It was clear in press releases, webpages and stickers on bins that recycling was undertaken by a shared service. The City Council and South Cambs District Council were equal partners so both had to agree before a proposal could be taken forward.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

## **25/7/EnC Community Grants 2025-26**

### **Matter for Decision**

This was the annual report for the Community Grants fund for voluntary, community, and not for profit organisations. It provides an overview of the process, eligibility criteria and budget. Appendices 1 and 2 of the Officer's report detailed the applications received with recommendations for 2025/26 awards.

The report also provided an update on the work of the Grants Team carried out to date in 2024/25 and plans for 2026/27.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities**

Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2025/26, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the Officer's report, subject to the budget approval in February 2025 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

See Officer's report.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Community Funding and Voluntary Sector Manager.



The Community Funding and Voluntary Sector Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Strawberry Fair was not an event within the control of the City Council. It was managed by a community interest company who decided whether the event went ahead or not. Any decision to run Strawberry Fair was made by the community interest company and the City Council had no influence over this. Money allocated for Strawberry Fair would be reallocated as the Fair had been cancelled.
- ii. The procurement of a Digital Grants Platform (DGP) was underway, with a preferred supplier now identified. Further details were embargoed until the preferred supplier was announced.
- iii. Some funding was allocated to projects who made year-on-year funding applications, and some funding was allocated to 'new' projects who applied for the first time each year.
- iv. Project monitoring of the impact of year-on-year funding grants to organisations was required and 6 month monitoring was required if the award was for over £20,000. Officers also monitored the impact of funding by attending meetings, events and activities run by applicant groups.
- v. When community grant funding was not allocated, officers looked to support applicants in other ways such as signposting other funding sources.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 and 1 abstention 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.

### **25/8/EnC 2024/25 S106 Allocations for Community and Sports Facility Improvements - Part 4**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report sought investment into local facilities using S106 funding from the Indoor Sports, Outdoor Sports, Swimming Pool and Community Facilities contribution types. It recommended allocating £353,880 of S106 funds to 15 proposals utilising remaining sums of generic S106 contributions, or combinations of both generic and site-specific S106 funds in some instances.

This round of funding for projects included several projects that were not quite ready or developed enough for submission in the previous S106 funding rounds.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Community Safety, Homelessness and Wellbeing**

Allocated generic S106 funding from the relevant S106 contribution types, subject to business case approval and community use agreements (where appropriate) and possible part-funding by specific S106 contributions (where relevant and available, marked (\*\*)) in the S106 type column), to the following project proposals:

	<b>Project proposals</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>S106 type</b>
A	Chesterton Indoor Bowls Club: LED Digital Display and Scoreboard	£25,000	Indoor Sports
B	Chesterton Indoor Bowls Club: Partition works to create community spaces	£50,000	Indoor Sports
C	Kelsey Kerridge Sports Centre: Conversion of Studio into additional climbing and bouldering walls	£50,000	Indoor Sports (**)
D	Netherhall Sports Centre: LED Digital Display and Scoreboard	£12,500	Indoor Sports (**)
E	Parkside Swimming Pool: LED Digital Display and Scoreboard	£12,500	Indoor Sports
F	Parkside Swimming Pools: Poolside Learn to dive platforms	£10,200	Indoor Sports
G	Various Recreation Grounds: New Football Goals at;	£16,230	Outdoor Sports

	<b>Project proposals</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>S106 type</b>
	King George V - £3,155 Coleridge - £2,480 Romsey Rec - £2,480 Nun's Way - £2,480 Coldham's Common £3,155 St.Albans Rec - £2,480		
H	Nuns Way Rec: Upgrade Nunns Way Pavilion Sports Changing Rooms and kitchen area.	£12,500	Outdoor Sports
I	Nunns Way Rec: Upgrade Nunns Way Pavilion kitchen area & Community storage and spaces.	£22,000	Community Facilities
J	Armed Forces Veterans Club - Barnwell: New Vinyl Flooring	£4,000	Community Facilities
K	St. James Church – Queen Ediths: Community Kitchen upgrades	£30,000	Community Facilities
L	Trumpington Pavilion: Upgrade AV kit & Equipment, tables chairs and storage. Secure external space.	£26,700	Community Facilities
M	BrownsField Community Centre: Additional Tables & Chairs and Softplay Equipment. Kitchen Equipment.	£10,000	Community Facilities
N	Guildhall Main and Small Halls: Tables & Chairs	£10,000	Community Facilities
O	Abbey Leisure Complex: Hyprolyser and UV water treatment systems for the pools.	£62,250	Swimming Pool

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

See Officer's report.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

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

Members sought and received update reports on Cherry Hinton and Abbey Pool projects.

Councillor Nestor sought clarification about Nun's Way Pavilion, specifically what could be done to make women and girls safe in parks. The Community, Sport & Recreation Manager said officers were looking at how to utilise research and feedback from the recent work with Women in Sport carried out across three parks in the City including Nuns Way and the work would inform how to target improvements in open spaces and facilities.

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.

## **25/9/EnC S106 Funding - Streets & Open Spaces**

### **Matter for Decision**

The Council helps to mitigate the impact of housing development on local facilities and amenities by using S106 contributions from developers. The Officer's report:

- a. referenced the generic and specific S106 funds that were available in the contribution types within the Executive Councillor's remit (play provision for children and teenagers and informal open spaces);
- b. recommended that the remaining generic S106 play provision funds with time limits in the next few years be allocated to eligible play area improvement projects, supplemented by relevant specific contributions for those play areas;
- c. looked ahead to a range of further projects, funded from specific S106 contributions, which would need to be developed in the coming years as part of a programmed approach;
- d. provided an update on how the business intelligence platform behind the Council's Outdoor Play Investment Strategy was helping to identify options for seeking specific S106 contributions from new developments for high priority play areas.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Open Spaces and City Services**

- i. Allocated, subject to local consultation and business case sign-off, the remaining generic S106 contributions for play provision to the following project proposals alongside the specific contributions already received for those projects:
  - a. Allocate strategic S106 funds from a major development close to the boundaries of South, East and West/Central areas (around £18,300), alongside relevant specific contributions (currently around £7,500), for improvements to Lammas Land play area;
  - b. Allocate the remaining generic contributions from Romsey ward (around £3,800), alongside relevant specific contributions (currently around £8,800), for improvements to the Romsey Rec play area;
  - c. Allocate generic S106 contributions from Queen Edith's (around £6,500), alongside relevant specific contributions (currently around £3,700), for improvements to Nightingale Avenue Rec play area;
  - d. Allocate the remaining generic S106 contributions from Abbey ward (around £5,400), alongside relevant specific contributions (currently around £11,500), for improvements to Ditton Fields play area;
  - e. Allocate the remaining generic S106 contributions from Cherry Hinton ward (around £5,200), alongside relevant specific contributions (currently around £4,700) for improvements to Reilly Way play area.
- ii. Noted:
  - a. The Council would make arrangements for the specific contribution for Kathleen Elliot Way play area (around £4,700) to be used to improve that play area; and
  - b. The current 'target list' being used to seek specific S106 contributions for play area improvements, based on the business intelligence platform behind the Council's new Outdoor Play Investment Strategy (see Section 6 and Appendix D of the Officer's report).

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

See Officer's report.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Technical & Specialist Services Manager.

The Technical & Specialist Services Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Lighting provision/enhancement was not usually funded by S106 as it required ongoing revenue costs. S106 contributions could not fund running costs. If areas such as Chesterton Rec wanted more street lighting they could apply for other funds such as Environmental Improvement Programme.
- ii. S106 could not fund maintenance costs such as areas like Romsey Rec wanting repairs to railings. Nor could s106 be used to maintain surfaces such as Cherry Hinton Hall play area. However S106 could be used to improve facilities.
- iii. There were rules that officers had to follow to allocate S106 funding.
- iv. Was happy to look at issues raised in committee debate after the meeting then liaise with the Urban Growth Project Manager, other Officers and Councillors.

The Urban Growth Project Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Details published on the City Council website included an overview of how the Council uses S106 funding and recently completed S106-funded projects.
- ii. A programmed approach was needed to the use of S106 funding, so that those contributions with more immediate time limits were used on relevant projects first. Projects based on S106 contributions with longer timescales would be developed at a later stage. Referred to section 5 of the Officer's report.

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.

**25/10/EnC Appointment of Cambridge City Council to the Conservators of the River Cam**

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 7.45 pm

**CHAIR**

This page is intentionally left blank