

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

City Council Funding for Public Transport Services and Initiatives

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/57
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Key
Matter for Decision:	To agree a forward strategy for the ways in which the City council supports public and community transport services in Cambridge.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	Although not the Highway Authority, the City Council has been supporting a substantial number of public transport initiatives for several years, with a total annual budget of £413,680 in 2005/06, plus £288,330 for the concessionary fares scheme, which is a statutory obligation on the Council. These initiatives have significantly helped public transport accessibility in the City by providing services that cannot be supplied on a commercial basis. This support has been developed largely on an ad hoc basis and is often reactive rather than pro active. There is a need for a more strategic approach in the way in which we support community and public transport services, based on what we hope to achieve from this funding, both in value for money and in terms of benefits to Cambridge residents.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	<p>Agreed:</p> <p>2.1 Dial-a-Ride</p> <p>To continue to work with both Dial-a-Ride and the County to establish a stronger scheme for the future, and to provide Cambridge Dial-a-Ride with a one off payment of £10,000 in the current financial year to help them to overcome their current financial difficulties (for details see section 5.4 of the officer report).</p> <p>2.2 Concessionary Fares</p> <p>2.2.a) To note the changed arrangements for the statutory concessionary bus travel scheme from 1 April 2006 (for details see section 4 of the officer report).</p> <p>2.2.b) To continue with the discretionary half fare arrangement for concessionary pass holders on Cambridge Dial-a-Ride beyond the introduction of free travel on local bus services in April 2006 (for details see section 5.5 of the officer report).</p> <p>2.3 Review of overall funding</p> <p>To review the way in which funding is allocated to Dial-</p>

a-Ride, concessionary fares, Taxicard and local bus services, including:

2.3.a) Investigating other ways of meeting the needs of disabled and older people including investigating the provision of transport tokens.

2.3.b) Investigating the possibilities of integrating Taxicard, Dial-a-Ride and the proposed Romsey/Petersfield social car scheme with the resources of the statutory health and social care sectors (for details see section 5.7 of the officer report).

2.3.c) To investigate direct contracts between the City Council and operators.

Reasons for the decision:

These are contained in the officer report.

Scrutiny consideration:

The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

Report:

Agenda Item 5 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.

Conflicts of interest:

None

Comments:

The Scrutiny Committee proposed changes to two of the recommendations in the officer report as follows (changes highlighted in bold or deleted):

2.1 To continue to work with both Dial-a-Ride and the County to establish a stronger scheme for the future, and to provide Cambridge Dial-a-Ride with a one off payment **of £10,000 in the current financial year** to help them to overcome their current financial difficulties (for details see section 5.4 of the officer report).

2.3.c) To ~~target City Council funding more towards community based transport services and publicity and information, instead of subsidising mainstream bus routes (details in section 6) and to~~ investigate direct contracts between the City Council and operators.

The Executive Councillor accepted these changes.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Taxicard Scheme Review

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/58
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Key
Matter for Decision:	Taxicard is a discretionary scheme that offers a subsidised taxi service to those who cannot use conventional public transport services. The officer report presented the results of the review of the scheme undertaken by officers, including several options for changes to the eligibility criteria. It is anticipated that significant savings can be made through these changes to the criteria, in order that our limited subsidy resources can be used in a more effective way.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	A decision by the Executive Councillor is needed to determine which of the proposed changes are appropriate for further consideration. Changes to the current scheme may lead either to some current users becoming ineligible, and/or to significant increases in budgets, therefore such changes need to have the full support of the Executive Councillor.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	Agreed: 2.1 To consider the four options for changes to the Taxicard eligibility (para 3.24 of the officer report) and to take these forward. 2.2 To consider the scope for increasing the benefits to users (para 3.27 of the officer report) and to take this forward.
Reasons for the decision:	These are contained in the officer report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 6 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Bus Shelter Provision in Cambridge: The Way Forward
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/59
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Key
Matter for Decision:	To define a policy for bus shelter design, provision and procurement and to support a bid for a rolling programme of bus shelter replacement and improvement through increased capital and revenue funding.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	It is officers' belief that the Council and its partners should give a much higher priority to bus shelters and improve the way they are provided and managed. Bus shelters will be central to some of the most ambitious public transport projects to be implemented in Cambridge over the next ten years, such as the Station interchange development, the Drummer Street interchange improvements, Real Time Information, on-street ticketing, Guided Bus and in the major urban extensions. The Council will therefore need to have a more pro-active approach to this item of bus infrastructure and ensure that bus shelters meet the required quality standards to support these important projects and to project a positive image of bus travel in Cambridge.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	Agreed: 2.1 That, as part of the Council's overall budget review, a bid is made to increase the capital budget for bus shelter procurement over a rolling six-year programme to replace the older City owned bus shelters and to provide new ones where there is a recognised need. 2.2 That a new approach to bus shelter design is developed, based on the proposals outlined in section 4.3 of the officer report. 2.3 That, as part of the Council's overall budget review, a bid is made to increase the revenue budget for bus shelters in order to sustain the cleaning and monitoring regime recently implemented by City Services. 2.4 That officers be given direction to investigate ways of improving the performance of the Adshel contract.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report

Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 7 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Cambridge East Area Action Plan
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/60
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Key
Matter for Decision:	<p>The Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP) identifies the site for a sustainable urban quarter of approximately 10,000 to 12,000 dwellings. It establishes an overall vision and a set of development principles to the urban quarter including its relationship with Cambridge and surrounding villages and its countryside setting. It also sets out the proposals to guide all the phases of development.</p> <p>Representations and responses to the pre submission draft AAP are set out in Appendix A of the officer report for consideration and agreement. The draft AAP for submission to the Secretary of State is attached in Appendix B of the officer report and highlights any amendments as a result of the public participation carried out during June/July 2005.</p>
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The City Council has a statutory duty to make plans to enable the provision of homes and buildings, investment and jobs in a way that is consistent with the principles of sustainable development, and to give certainty and predictability to the control of development.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Having considered representations to the draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP), agreed the responses to them set out in Appendix A as amended (see Comments below).2) Agreed amendments to the draft AAP including the late amendment as in Comment below (Appendix B).3) Agreed that the Director of Environment & Planning be authorised to agree any changes subject to the agreement of the Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) and consultation with the Chair and Spokes.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 8 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None

Comments:

The following amendments were tabled at the meeting:

An amendment to paragraph 5 of policy CE26 (Appendix B page 139 Policy CE/26 Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage & Sewage Disposal) was tabled at the meeting. Paragraph 5 to read:

All development in Cambridge East will incorporate water conservation measures including water saving devices, rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling. ~~No dwelling shall be occupied until the local planning authorities have agreed a strategy which will secure at least a 25% reduction in the use of piped water compared to the average water consumption for development which does not have water conservation measures whilst managing the recycling of water, to ensure no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity.~~

A consequent change to paragraph D12.11 on page 142 of Appendix B is necessary. Last sentence to be amended to read:

This important issue should be considered as part of the Cambridge East proposals. ~~, although it lies outside the scope of the planning system.~~

An amendment in Appendix A pages 82 to 84 of the officer report:

10909 - Cambridgeshire County Council Object

The adopted Waste Local Plan identifies all major developments as preferred locations for major waste management facilities but does not identify specific sites. The County Council has begun the preparation of a Waste and Minerals LDF and the issues and options report raised fundamental questions about whether the major development were appropriate locations for waste facilities. It is not know at this time what approach will be proposed in the emerging Waste LDF.

There may be some major developments where it is appropriate to propose general employment areas as part of the proper planning of an area, e.g. Northstowe, where such an area is proposed in order to provide a local range of employment for this entirely new settlement. In appropriate circumstances, this approach may provide an opportunity for waste facilities to secure a suitable site in open competition with other employment uses, but it is not an allocation for a waste facility, which ODPM has confirmed cannot be made in a District LDF document. There is no equivalent general employment area proposed at Cambridge East as most of the employment will be located within the district centre or the local centres as part of mixed use developments.

In the case of Cambridge East, which is an urban extension to Cambridge, there are no proposals for a general employment area. Policy CE/11 provides for small scale industries in use classes B1(c), B2 and B8 (up to 1,850m) which contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, particularly if they contribute to the development of locally-based skills or

expertise. It is not considered that a major waste management facility falls into this definition. The policy also requires that the nature and form of employment provision reflects the high density character of the urban quarter and that it is located at the district centre as part of mixed use development or at local centres comprising small-scale employment. None of these requirements, which are consistent with the Structure Plan, would encompass a major waste management facility. Whilst it is recognised that modern waste management facilities are very different from older operations, they nonetheless involve significant levels of heavy traffic and have some issues of noise, dust, and odours and in principle are not good neighbours to be placed in close proximity to residential uses.

Looking specifically at Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, the AAP identifies the considerable challenge that exists in creating a satisfactory residential neighbourhood ahead of the wider development and specifically adjoining the North Works site, and the relocation of some existing employment uses will be important to help provide a suitable residential environment. It is not appropriate to propose a general employment area in Phase 1. Turning specifically to a waste facility in this location. It would not be appropriate to locate a major waste management facility or a household waste recycling centre in Phase 1. It would significantly undermine the ability to create a successful residential area. This relates both to the nature and scale of the use and the type and level of traffic generation that would be created into an area with a single traffic access.

It appears that this objection is very much opportunity led in view of the County Council's concern that there is an urgent need for a facility, rather than the good planning of this major new urban quarter. There is no suggestion that Cambridge East requires a general employment area and it appears that the proposal to include one is specifically in order to bring forward a waste facility: in effect a waste allocation by another name. This is not appropriate. Achieving a high quality neighbourhood will be crucial to achieving a successful new development in the longer term and this proposal would seriously damage the ability for this to be achieved. The appropriate mechanism to explore whether there may be potential in Cambridge East as a whole for a major waste management facility is through the emerging Minerals and Waste LDF, which would need to identify a specific site allocation, and which could be considered in the context of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Emission abatement – Crematorium

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) I Coleman
Reference:	05/ENV/61
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Key
Matter for Decision:	The submission of an abatement management plan is a precondition for the continuation of an operating licence. If the Council does not put in place such a plan, the consequence would be closure of the facility by the Regulator.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	In January 2005 DEFRA issued guidance that crematoria have until 31 st December 2005 to consider their options for achieving a 50% reduction nationwide in the emissions of mercury, and to inform their Local Authority Environmental Protection Regulator of their decision.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	Agreed <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To join the CAMEO emissions management scheme and share mercury emissions abatement costs2. To charge an environmental surcharge to fund future investment and mercury emissions trading at an amount to be agreed but not less than the recommended national minimum of £253. To retain any surplus from environmental surcharges contributions in a Repair and Renewal Fund4. To undertake a full technical and financial appraisal of all options available to the Council, to include an abatement management plan, to be brought to the March meeting.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 9 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

2005/06 Service Performance Reviews and Revised Revenue and Capital Budgets
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) I Coleman
Reference:	05/ENV/62
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Non Key
Matter for Decision:	The Service Performance Review sets out performance for the first six months of 2005/06, highlighting achievements and also detailing only those actions that will, or could, fail to meet targets by the end of the financial year. This information will enable the Executive Councillor to consider whether service priorities and resources should be refocused to enable objectives and targets for the current year to be met.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The performance of services requires monitoring and Performance Reviews are the way scrutiny committees and the Executive can perform their function as part of the Council's corporate performance management process.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Noted performance against the objectives and targets of the services (shown in the Service Performance Review, Appendix D of the officer report) that report to this committee for the first six months of 2005/06.b) Approved the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix B of the officer report) and the revised revenue budgets for 2005/06 (shown in Appendix A of the officer report) for submission to Council.c) Approve the virement of £30,000 within the Waste Strategy budget as detailed in paragraph 3.5 of the officer report.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 10A of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

2005/06 Service Performance Reviews and Revised Revenue and Capital Budgets
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/63
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Non Key
Matter for Decision:	The Service Performance Review sets out performance for the first six months of 2005/06, highlighting achievements and also detailing only those actions that will, or could, fail to meet targets by the end of the financial year. This information will enable the Executive Councillor to consider whether service priorities and resources should be refocused to enable objectives and targets for the current year to be met.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The performance of services requires monitoring and Performance Reviews are the way scrutiny committees and the Executive can perform their function as part of the Council's corporate performance management process.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Noted performance against the objectives and targets of the services (shown in the Service Performance Review, Appendix D of the officer report) that report to this committee for the first six months of 2005/06.b) Approved the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix B of the officer report) and the revised revenue budgets for 2005/06 (shown in Appendix A of the officer report) for submission to Council.c) Approved the transfer of the Bus Shelters revenue budget from Environment and Planning to City Services as detailed in paragraph 3.8 of the officer report.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 10B of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Local Development Scheme - Update
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/64
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Non Key
Matter for Decision:	To agree the draft Local Development Scheme for submission to the Government Office for the East of England for their consideration.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The Council is under a statutory duty from the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to prepare and keep up to date a Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS sets out a programme for the production of planning policy and guidance documents. Following agreement by the Executive Councillor, the LDS will be submitted to the Government Office for the East of England for their consideration.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	Agreed: 2.1 The draft LDS attached at Appendix A of the officer report. 2.2 That the LDS be submitted to the Government Office and resolved that it be brought into effect four weeks after being so submitted unless the Government Office require changes or ask for more time to consider it. 2.3 That the Director of Environment & Planning be authorised to agree any changes required by the Government Office, subject to the agreement of the Executive Councillor (Environment & Planning) and consultation with the Chair and Spokes. 2.4 That if changes are required by the Government Office, and following the final agreement of the wording of the LDS, to resolve that the LDS shall have effect from a specified date to be agreed with the Director of Environment & Planning.
Reasons for the decision:	These are set out in the officer report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 11 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

Environment Action Programme for 2006/07 - Suggested Priority Areas
--

Decision of:	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
Reference:	05/ENV/65
Date of decision:	8 November 2005 Recorded on: 10 November 2005
Decision Type:	Non Key
Matter for Decision:	To decide what the priority areas for the EAP 2006/07 should be. These recommendations are being made in advance of the Service Planning process for 2006/07, so as to maximise opportunities to embed the priority areas into the Service Planning process and develop realistic project proposals that are in line with the priority areas and can be resourced and delivered.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The Environment Action Programme (EAP) lists the main environmental projects and initiatives that the Council is planning to deliver in any given financial year.
The Executive Councillor's decisions:	Approved the following suggested priority areas for the EAP 2006/07: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Waste minimisation;b) CRed (Carbon Reduction);c) Sustainable procurement;d) Energy supply and management (in Council housing stock and administrative buildings, as well as private dwellings);e) Sustainable construction;f) Building environmental considerations into decision-making.
Reasons for the decision:	As set out in the officer report
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 12 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 8 November 2005.
Conflicts of interest:	None
Comments:	None