

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

10 January 2012

4.00 - 6.50 pm

Present: Councillors Kightley (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Herbert, Marchant-Daisley, Owers, Tucker, Tunnacliffe, Wright, Znajek

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services: Jean Swanson

Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport: Tim Ward

Sean Cleary (Operations Manager Car Parks), Patsy Dell (Head of Planning Services), James Goddard (Committee Manager), Jas Lally (Head of Refuse & Environment), Simon Payne (Director of Environment), Jen Robertson (Waste Strategy Manager), Richard Wesbroom (Accountant (Services)) and Alistair Wilson (Streets & Open Spaces Asset Manager)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/1/ENV Apologies

None.

12/2/ENV Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Herbert	12/7/ENV	Personal: Works as an associate for the waste consultancy company (M.E.L.) who undertook resident survey, (but no connection to that project)
Councillor Wright	12/9/ENV	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

12/3/ENV Minutes

The minutes of the 4 October 2011 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

12/4/ENV Public Questions

1. Mr Goode raised the following issues in relation to 4 October 2011 minute items 11/54/ENV and 11/60/ENV on behalf of Riverside Residents' Association (RARA) and Petersfield (PACT):
 - (i) Residents welcomed the Council's adoption of the Eastern Gate Supplementary Planning Document (EGSPD).
 - (ii) Residents were concerned that policies in the EGSPD, such as building height, did not appear to have been given due consideration in the consideration of 11/0219/FUL 9 - 15 Harvest Way at the 16 November 2011 Planning Committee.
 - (iii) Queried if future Planning Officer reports would reference EGSPD.
 - (iv) Observed there was no reference to resident associations in the Devolving Decisions to Neighbourhood Planning Briefs report (covered under 12/12/ENV of these minutes).

The Executive Councillor for Planning & Sustainable Transport and Head of Planning Services answered:

- (i) Resident, officer and councillor input had contributed towards EGSPD.
- (ii) The planning process was an evolving system, it would be easier to implement EGSPD measures in future. The 11/0219/FUL 9 - 15 Harvest Way application was taken close to the date when EGSPD was adopted, so the Council aimed to take forward as many principles as possible.
- (iii) Officers recognised that residents anticipated a guillotine from 4 October 2011 Environment Scrutiny Committee, but it was not possible to implement all measures immediately
- (iv) Resident's comments on 11/0219/FUL 9 - 15 Harvest Way were noted at the November Planning Committee.
- (v) Open space in the City was reviewed through the Annual Monitoring report. The new Open Space Strategy would encourage greater provision from developers.
- (vi) The Devolving Decisions to Neighbourhood Planning Briefs report would not affect resident association input into the process, it simply moved scrutiny functions to area committees.

12/5/ENV Draft Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio Plan 2012/13

Matter for Decision:

Approval of the Environment & Waste Portfolio Plan setting out strategic objectives and performance measures for 2012/13.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

Approved the Environment & Waste Portfolio Plan 2012/13.

Reason for the Decision:

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

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Executive Councillor gave a brief overview of the 2012/13 Environment & Waste Portfolio Plan.

Members of the Scrutiny Committee were invited to comment on and discuss the Plan.

The committee sought clarification on the following:

- (i) Details of the Street Pride Scheme.
- (ii) Review toilet provision across the City.
- (iii) If the Council could facilitate community litter picking campaigns more frequently than on an annual basis.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services responded:

- (i) The Street Pride Scheme was a neighbourhood improvement project. Officers would work in a similar way to Recycling Champions.
- (ii) The portfolio plan looked at mapping current toilet facility provision with a view to a possible future scheme, whilst recognising the needs of the night time economy.
- (iii) Rangers undertook an annual litter picking campaign. Other voluntary bodies undertook litter picking campaigns on a more frequent basis. It was hoped that the Street Pride Scheme would co-ordinate/support other organisation's activities to encourage greater frequency.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the Portfolio Plan by 5 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the plan.

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

Not applicable.

12/6/ENV Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio - Budget 2012/13**Matter for Decision:**

The Officer's report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio. The report compared the proposed 2011/12 Revised Budget to the budget as at September 2011 and detailed the budget proposals for 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:**Review of Charges:**

- (i) Approved the proposed charges for Environmental & Waste services and facilities, as shown in Appendix B of the Officer's report.

Revenue Budgets:

- (ii) Approved, (with typographical amendments listed below), the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report) and the resulting revised revenue budgets for 2011/12 (shown in Table 1) for submission to the Executive.
- (iii) Agreed proposals for revenue savings and unavoidable bids, as set out in Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- (iv) Agreed proposals for bids from external or existing funding, as set out in Appendix D of the Officer's report.
- (v) Agree proposals for Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as set out in Appendix E of the Officer's report.
- (vi) Approved the budget proposals for 2012/13 as shown in Table 2, for submission to the Executive.

Capital:

- (vii) To seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2011/12, as detailed in Appendix G of the Officer's report, to fund re-phased capital spending.
- (viii) Approved capital bids, as identified in Appendix H of the Officer's report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.

- (ix) Confirmed that there are no items covered by this portfolio to add to the Council's Hold List, for submission to the Executive.
- (x) Approved the current Capital & Revenue Projects Plan, as detailed in Appendix J of the Officer's report, to be updated for any amendments detailed in (vii), (viii) and (ix) above.
- (xi) Approved the following project appraisals as detailed in Appendix K of the Officer's report: Vehicle replacements 2012/13.

Reason for the Decision:

Service Plans and draft Budgets were key elements of the Councils budgetary and policy framework.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Accountant (Services) regarding the Environmental & Waste Services Portfolio - Budget 2012/13.

As part of his introduction, the Officer stated that the savings detailed in table 2 (Overall Budget Proposals) were incorrect and should read as follows in order to agree with the relevant appendices:

Service Reviews - 2012/13: (£180,000)

Service Reviews - 2012/14: (£218,000)

Other - 2012/13: (£50,500)

Other - 2013/14: (£103,000)

Although the individual lines were incorrect the totals remained unchanged.

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

Councillors sought clarification concerning:

- (i) The public convenience capital programme.
- (ii) The condition of Barnwell Toilets.
- (iii) Concerns relating to the increase in collection charges.
- (iv) The litter bin replacement programme.
- (v) The Recycling Champions Scheme.
- (vi) Typographical errors on P51 of the Officer's report.
- (vii) Whether the Council or Police received stray dog collection fees.
- (viii) Whether the Council's focused on recycling or reducing waste.

- (ix) If moths were covered by pest control criteria.
- (x) If the Council had sought funds made available by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for the purpose of implementing a weekly black bin collection in Cambridge.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services, Director of Environment, Head of Refuse and Environment plus Waste Strategy Manager confirmed the following:

- (i) The capital allocation included repair costs.
- (ii) The Director of Environment undertook to ask the Project Delivery & Environment Manager to provide Councillor Wright with information regarding Barnwell Toilets.
- (iii) Collection charges had not risen for the last 8 years, so the City Council had increased its bulk waste collection charges in line with other authorities.
- (iv) The intention was to review litter bin provision to ascertain what bins were needed and where. Dual purpose bins would be provided for recycling and rubbish.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services would undertake joined up activity with the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sports & Public Places.

- (v) The Director of Environment undertook to ask the Waste Strategy Manager to provide Councillor Owers with information regarding the Recycling Champions Scheme, awareness raising campaigns and how efforts were being focussed in areas of highest need.

The effectiveness of awareness raising campaigns such as door knocking was variable, but valuable as a community engagement tool because it allowed the Council to build up neighbourhood trend profiles.

- (vi) Officer report page 51 reference RB 3837 - This was included in the table as a £37,000 saving but in the detail below as £47,000. This was a typographical error as the figure should read £37,000 in both.

Capital plan appendix on page 63 of the Officer's report - The £150,000 in 2012/13 for the Public Conveniences budget was queried. In last year's budget cycle a capital bid was approved for the refurbishment of Silver Street conveniences at a total of £500,000 phased as £350,000 in 2011/12 and £150,000 in 2012/13.

- (vii) The Director of Environment undertook to ascertain which organisation received stray dog collection fees. Responsibility for the out of hours collection service transferred from the Police to City Council circa 2009. A contractor undertook work on behalf of the Council.
- (viii) The current focus was on recycling rather than reduction, the focus would be reduction in future. Various campaigns, such as Recycling Champions, would help to facilitate this.
- (ix) The commercial review of pest control would determine if moths were covered under the criteria.
- (x) The Council was maintaining a watching brief, but had not sought funds made available by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for the purpose of implementing a weekly black bin collection in Cambridge.

The committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to adopt the recommendation, subject to amendments to typographical errors in the Officer's report.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

12/7/ENV Route Optimisation Project for Refuse and Recycling Collections - Options for Change

Matter for Decision:

The Officer's report set out options for change to the domestic waste service and a methodology for considering these options.

Consultation with staff would be carried out under the council's Organisational Change Policy – October 2010.

The implementation of the agreed scenario would take place in July 2012, with an extensive resident communications campaign prior to this.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

- (i) Instructed the Director of Environment to undertake consultation with the staff and unions about a preferred option based on the scenarios

set out in the foregoing report and subject to modelling data to be provided at the meeting of the Committee on 10 January 2012.

- (ii) Instructed the Director of Environment to implement the preferred option subject to the results of the staff and union consultation and also subject to consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokespersons.

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 Refuse and Environment regarding the Route Optimisation Project for Refuse and Recycling Collections - Options for Change.

The Officer also referred to an addendum document available as part of the fourth circulation agenda.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services plus Head of Refuse and Environment confirmed the following:

- (i) Waste collections for new developments would be introduced wherever possible with the same collection methodology for existing houses. This will standardise the service wherever possible across the city, reducing the need for specific vehicles for specific material and increasing the efficiency of the service.

The Environment Committee authorised Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes, in consultation with officers to take the decision to implement the above in March 2010. As it is a key decision affecting the whole City, it was decided to return it to scrutiny committee.

Informal consultation would be undertaken with refuse collection crews concerning the two options to seek views on which is the most efficient. Formal consultation would then be undertaken on the preferred option. The formal public consultation would reflect feedback from the public survey, and provide a steer if opinions were

- split in the crew's informal consultation. The aim was to ascertain route practicability as opposed to purely cost savings.
- (ii) Officers were in discussion with the contracted recycling company to ascertain if it was feasible to take plastic containers under the current contract. South Cambridgeshire District Council had different contract specifications with another company, which required them to take plastic containers.
 - (iii) The introduction of in-cab technology aimed to provide information on when bins were either put out or not for collection by households.
 - (iv) Planning plus Refuse and Environment Officers were undertaking joint work to model optimum routes for refuse collection services. The software modelled rounds to service properties on new and existing developments.
 - (v) Information concerning waste collection rounds was being compiled from various sources into the model as part of the route optimisation review, to ensure that it would be available in a central resource in future.
 - (vi) Comments from members of the public in the 2011 Waste & Recycling Strategy showed opposition to microchipping bins to monitor recycling. Officers stated there was no intention to microchip bins in future.
 - (vii) A review of waste composition would feed into waste collection scenarios as part of the route optimisation review. This would be the basis of a strategy. For example, a weekly bin collection may not be required if the public favoured green bins (for food waste etc).

Recycling bank location and provision was also being considered as part of the route optimisation review.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The committee approved recommendation (i) unanimously.

The committee approved recommendation (ii) by 5 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

12/8/ENV Advanced Waste Partnership Working

Matter for Decision:

The Officer's report set out a proposal to move Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) to the next level of partnership working in order to gain the maximum advantage for the authorities collectively.

RECAP partnership has been a successful partnership to date. However, members and officers recognised that more could be achieved by an enhanced partnership approach. Independent research work has also helped identify a way forward.

Two types of advanced partnership working have been identified.

These are:

- (i) Joint projects or joint ventures.
- (ii) Joint Waste Committee.

A partnership charter has been drawn up in order to take these options forward, laying out important principles, vision and objectives. The charter would provide partners with a solid basis of agreement and make decisions within a formal framework.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services:

- (i) Adopted the RECAP Advanced Partnership Working Charter.
- (ii) Agreed that outline business cases for any Advanced Waste projects are brought to Environment Scrutiny before a decision is made to proceed.

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 Refuse and Environment regarding Advanced Waste Partnership Working.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services confirmed the following:

- (i) Undertook to provide further information in future to the Environment Scrutiny Committee concerning RECAP partnership activities.
- (ii) The Council was reviewing joint working initiatives with other local authorities. Each was in a different position at present, and so were not involved in each other's financial decisions. For example, the mechanical biological treatment facility undertaken by Peterborough as its own private finance initiative.

The committee resolved unanimously to adopt the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

12/9/ENV Draft Planning & Sustainable Transport Portfolio Plan 2012/13

Matter for Decision:

Approval of the Planning & Sustainable Transport Portfolio Plan setting out strategic objectives and performance measures for 2012/13.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

Approved the Planning & Sustainable Transport 20/12/13 Portfolio Plan.

Reason for the Decision:

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

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport gave a brief overview of the Draft Planning & Sustainable Transport Portfolio Plan 2012/13.

Members of the Scrutiny Committee were invited to comment on and discuss the Plan.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport, Director of Environment plus Streets and Open Spaces Asset Manager confirmed the following:

- (i) A budget allocation was required to ensure funding was available to implement 20 mph schemes. Officers would work up proposals and undertake consultation as required to ascertain stakeholder's specifications and the practicability of these. Work could not be undertaken without funding being allocated, so the budget included an estimated figure.
- (ii) A specific tree work management strategy was being worked up to supplement the review of the Local Plan. This would focus in particular on consultation and canopy coverage. The strategy should be complete by Spring 2013.

Consultees included Councillors, 'Friends' and Neighbourhood Groups, previous tree strategy consultees, plus complementary strategy consultees (eg wildlife strategies). An on-line consultation facility would be available.

- (iii) The planning and delivery of quality green spaces (strategic objective PST2) would be more robustly enforced in future.
- (iv) There were concerns over the direction of national planning policy, particularly its emphasis on growth. The Council should be unaffected as it would have a robust Local Planning Policy process in place to guide its decision making within the next two years; following the Local Plan Review. This would ensure Local Policies covered any gaps left by the retraction of national ones.
- (v) Options to repair or replace the Park Street Car Park were being considered.
- (vi) Pedestrian schemes such as walkways needed to be factored into the design of new city areas. The County Council have a Cycling and Walking Steering Group to facilitate this.
- (vii) The Executive Councillor undertook to report back to Committee on the progress against Portfolio Plan objectives.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the Portfolio Plan unanimously.

The Executive Councillor approved the plan.

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

Not applicable.

12/10/ENV Planning & Sustainable Transport Portfolio - Budget 2012/13**Matter for Decision:**

The Officer's report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Portfolio. The report compares the proposed 2011/12 Revised Budget to the budget as at September 2011 and details the budget proposals for 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:**Review of Charges:**

- (i) Approved the proposed charges for Planning and Sustainable Transport services and facilities, as shown in Appendix B to the Officer's report.

Revenue Budgets:

- (ii) Approved the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix A of the Officer's report) and the resulting revised revenue budgets for 2011/12 (shown in Table 1) for submission to the Executive.
- (iii) Agreed proposals for revenue savings and unavoidable bids, as set out in Appendix C of the Officer's report.
- (iv) Agreed proposals for bids from external or existing funding, as set out in Appendix D of the Officer's report.
- (v) Agreed proposals for Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as set out in Appendix E of the Officer's report.
- (vi) Approved the budget proposals for 2012/13 as shown in Table 2, for submission to the Executive.

Capital:

- (vii) Seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2011/12, as detailed in Appendix G of the Officer's report, to fund re-phased capital spending.
- (viii) Approved capital bids, as identified in Appendix H of the Officer's report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.

- (ix) Approved the removal of item H28 – Park Street Car Park, as identified in Appendix I of the Officer's report, from the Council's Hold List, for submission to the Executive.
- (x) Approved the current Capital & Revenue Projects Plan, as detailed in Appendix J of the Officer's report, to be updated for any amendments detailed in (vii), (viii) and (ix) above.

Reason for the Decision:

Service Plans and draft Budgets were key elements of the Councils budgetary and policy framework.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Accountant (Services) regarding the Planning & Sustainable Transport Portfolio - Budget 2012/13.

The Officer also referred to an addendum document available as part of the third circulation agenda.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport and Director of Environment confirmed the following:

- (i) Income from car park revenue was expected to marginally increase in the next financial year over current levels (£1.9m).
- (ii) Costings for Park Street Car Park work were based on figures for comparable car parks.
- (iii) The budget included estimated figures for Park Street Car Park work and 20 mph implementation schemes to put down markers of intent. If the budget was approved at Council, the figures would be worked up in detail.
- (iv) The Director of Environment undertook to ask the Project Delivery & Environment Manager to provide Councillor Wright with details regarding cycleways.

The committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to adopt the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

12/11/ENV Rule-in

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the late item from the Head of Planning Services be considered despite not being made publicly available for this committee five clear days prior to the meeting.

The reason that this document could not be deferred was that it was impracticable to defer the decision until the next committee.

12/12/ENV Devolving Decisions on Neighbourhood Planning Briefs

Matter for Decision:

The Officer's report set out the processes by which decisions on neighbourhood planning and development briefs will be taken by area committees from 1 April 2012, and sought Executive Councillor approval to adopt these processes. A separate report considering related processes, but affecting non-planning matters; was considered by Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 12 January 2012.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

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 Planning Services regarding the Devolving Decisions on Neighbourhood Planning Briefs.

The Head of Planning Services advised Councillors of a change to the recommendations and Appendix A in the Officer's report.

Previous recommendations:

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport is recommended to:

- (i) Note the proposed process for devolving decision making on area specific planning and development briefs.
- (ii) Adopt these processes and devolve decision making to area committees.
- (iii) Request that the Council's constitution be amended to reflect devolvement of the decision making to the relevant area committee, with the recommendation made to the Executive Councillor who will attend the relevant Area Committee to take the decision.

New recommendations text:

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport and the Environment Scrutiny Committee are recommended to:

- (i) Approve the Principles for involving Area Committees in Decisions on Planning and Development briefs set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report.
- (ii) Request that the Council's constitution be amended to reflect Appendix A.

New Appendix A text:

Appendix A: Principles for involving Area Committees in Decisions on Planning and Development briefs

With effect from April 2012:

- New planning and development briefs (including Supplementary Planning Documents and planning guidance) on non-strategic sites within the City boundary (but not within the Cambridge Fringe sites), whether produced by Planning Services or by a developers agent under the editorial control of Planning Services shall be referred to the relevant area committee for agreement prior to consultation, and prior to final adoption by the Executive Councillor, in place of current pre-scrutiny arrangements, other than:
 - Where cross boundary proposals are involved; the default pre-scrutiny process will be Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee)
- Any Neighbourhood Planning proposals which may be promoted under the provisions of the Localism Act will need to be considered by

Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee because of their relationship with emerging policy development through the review of the Cambridge Local Plan.

In response to Member's questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport plus Head of Planning Services confirmed the following:

- (i) The purpose of the document was to transfer scrutiny functions to Area Committees so that an Executive Councillor sitting at an Area Committee could take them. The intention was to move area committee debate items (such as developer briefings) from the Environment Scrutiny Committee agenda to area committee's. Area committees would not be able to commission work.
- (ii) The Local Plan would provide an overarching strategy document.
- (iii) The Development Plan Scrutiny Sub committee would co-ordinate cross-area committee work such as transport initiatives.

Councillor Tunnacliffe formally proposed to defer a decision on the amended recommendations to a future Environment Scrutiny Committee.

The committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 defer a decision on the amended recommendations to a future Environment Scrutiny Committee.

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

Not applicable.

12/13/ENV Corporate Cash Collection Contract

Matter for Decision:

Cambridge City Council Parking Services currently manages a cash collection contract with BDI, which expires on 31st March 2012 (although it does include an option to extend by 2 year(s)). This contract was for the collection of cash from the city's car parks and a few other service/office areas within the council as well as Cambridgeshire County Council pay and display machines. The City Council also has a separate contract with Loomis for cash collection from some of our other sites. Both authorities currently have a requirement for secure cash in transit services between a number of site offices directly to their bank. Cambridgeshire County Council has given notification of leaving this contract and invited Cambridge City Council to join into their own County wide cash collection procurement for which it is planned a new contract will be in

place and the service go live on the 1st April 2012. As well as joining with County on this collaboration, the City Council would also take the opportunity to consolidate its disparate requirements into one corporate contract.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

- (i) Contract - Undertook to recommend this corporate citywide cash collection contract (which is included in the Council's Forward Plan) for approval by Council. The value of the new Cambridge City Council contract is estimated to be £125,000 (indicative cost) per annum.
- (ii) Procurement - Approved the carrying out and completion of a procurement exercise to award a corporate cash collection contract to commence on the 1st April 2012. The contract will operate for an initial period of three years with the option to extend for up to a further 2 years.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Operations Manager Car Parks regarding the Corporate Cash Collection Contract.

The Officer also referred to an addendum document available as part of the third circulation agenda.

In response to Member's questions the Corporate Cash Collection Contract confirmed the following:

- (i) The scheme would be profitable for the Council.
- (ii) A 20% efficiency saving was expected through the revised contract.

The committee resolved unanimously to adopt the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

12/14/ENV Appointments to Outside Bodies**Matter for Decision:**

The Scrutiny Committee was requested to recommend the appointment of Councillor Ward to the following outside body:

PATROL Adjudication and Bus Lane Adjudication Joint Committee Service

The relevant Executive Councillor with Parking in their portfolio was the anticipated nominee. Membership entitled the Council to attend the PATROL annual meeting and to vote on policy changes.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport:

Approved his appointment as the Council's representative to PATROL Adjudication and Bus Lane Adjudication Joint Committee Service.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any alternative options considered and rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee resolved unanimously that Councillor Ward be the representative for PATROL Adjudication and Bus Lane Adjudication Joint Committee Service for the municipal year.

The Executive Councillor accepted the appointment.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 6.50 pm

CHAIR