

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Service Plans and Revenue and Capital Budgets – Revised 2005/06, Proposed 2006/07 and Forecast 2007/08: Executive Councillor for Environmental Services</b>
--

**Decision of:** Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) Iain Coleman

**Reference:** 06/ENV/01

**Date of decision:** 10 January 2006      **Recorded on:** 17 January 2006

**Decision Type:** Key

**Matter for Decision:** The Service Plans for 2006/07 look at the service proposals, objectives and budget position for 2006/07 and forecast for 2007/08. The Executive Councillor considers whether service priorities and resources should be refocused to enable objectives and targets for the coming year to be met.

The Service Plans of the following services were considered:  
Street Services  
Environmental Health (part)  
Waste Strategy  
Cemeteries & Crematorium

**Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):** Service Plans and draft budgets are key elements of the Council's budgetary and policy framework.

**The Executive Councillor's decisions:**

**Performance Targets:**

a) Agreed the service objectives and proposals for 2006/07 and future years, for services contained within the Environmental Services portfolio as set out in Appendix 1 of each service plan, and the performance indicators and targets as set out in Appendix 2 of each plan.

**Review of Charges:**

b) Approved the proposed charges as shown in Appendix A to the officer report.

**Revenue Budgets:**

c) Agreed proposals for revenue savings and bids, as set out in Appendix B, which have been incorporated into the budgets presented for this portfolio.

d) Agreed the Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as shown in Appendix B of the officer report, for submission to the Executive with the following order of priority (please also see comment section below):

- 1) PPF656 Crew for extra dry recycling
- 2) PPF843 Support for mobile urinals
- 3) PPF675 R&R provision for Crematorium
- 4) PPF681 Streetscene Response Team
- 5) PPF654 Waste/Recycling Outreach Officer
- 6) PPF682 Increase service provided by City Rangers (one ranger not two)

with no priority order proposed for the remaining bids.

e) Approved the revised revenue budget for 2005/06, as shown in Appendix C of the officer report, for submission to the Executive.

f) Approved the budget for 2006/07 as shown in Appendix C of the officer report, for submission to the Executive.

**Capital:**

g) Approved capital bids, as identified in Appendix B of the officer report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.

h) Agreed to seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2005/06, as detailed in Appendix D of the officer report, to fund rephased capital spending.

i) Approved the revised Capital Plan for 2005/06, as detailed in Appendix E of the officer report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

At the meeting of Council on 8 September 2005, individual cash limit targets were identified for each service portfolio. In setting the overall General Fund cash limit a funding provision was made of £500,000 Priority Policy Fund (PPF) to provide funding for developments which can be demonstrated to make a significant contribution to the Medium Term Objectives set out in the Annual Statement.

**Scrutiny consideration:**

The Scrutiny Committee tabled a priority list for the PPF bids and agreed these by 5 votes to 0. The Executive Councillor approved the order of priority. The Scrutiny Committee agreed the recommendations for the Executive Councillor by 5 votes to 0.

**Report:**

Agenda Item 5 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.

**Conflicts of interest:**

None

**Comments:**

An amendment sheet relating to the PPF bids (which had been circulated to the members prior to the meeting) was tabled at the meeting. The Chair ruled that the item could be considered despite not being publicly available 5 clear days prior to the meeting. The paper related to bid PPF682 for a sum of £56,800 for "Increase service provided by City Rangers". The Scrutiny Committee tabled an order of priority for the PPF bids and included PPF682 for one Ranger rather than two so the bid was reduced to £28,400. The Executive Councillor agreed with that order of priority.

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Domestic Refuse Service – Impact on Enforcement relating to Waste Receptacles left on Streets beyond Collection Days</b>
---

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) Iain Coleman
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/02
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	<p>Establishing the principles relating to enforcement action to be taken against persistent offenders who leave waste receptacles out on streets beyond normal collection days. The proposals incorporate offering suitable alternative collection methods where necessary, taking into account special needs of individuals and access to off street storage.</p> <p>The Council already has the legal powers to enforce in this area.</p>
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	<p>In January 2003 the Executive Councillor for Environment approved funding for the appointment of an Enforcement Officer (Streets and Open Spaces) to further strengthen the ability of the Council to meet the Medium Term Objective (MTO) of providing cleaner streets and attractive environment and reduce levels of crime and fear of crime. This included taking necessary enforcement action against persistent offenders who infringed issues such as domestic wheeled bins being left on streets beyond the normal collection days.</p> <p>Alternative methods of collection are available for householders with special needs, subject to meeting agreed criteria.</p>
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>2.1 The programme of action to take enforcement against persistent offenders who leave waste receptacles out on streets beyond normal collection days contained in paragraph 4 of the officer report as set out below:</p> <p>4.1 Any enforcement action taken will take a staged approach in line with the Council's Enforcement Policy and will include educating and informing householders of standards expected of them and what services are available to them. This will precede any formal action being taken.</p> <p>4.2 A comprehensive programme of enforcement action to be implemented, in consultation with ward councillors, in streets where there appear to be a predominance of waste receptacles being left on the street. This programme will be supplemented by action on</p>

individual properties outside these areas as required.

- 4.3 Prior to any enforcement action being taken:
- A property assessment will be made to identify if access to off street storage is or is not available
  - Assistance will be offered to residents who are disabled, elderly or who have special needs
  - Residents will be given information about their responsibilities, including ensuring bins are not left out beyond midnight on the day of collection, and the possibility of legal action being taken against persistent offenders
  - The City Rangers will tape bins stored on the street with the "Think Access" tape
- 4.4 Where receptacles are persistently left out on the street and the property has no access to off street storage
- Residents (including those who are disabled, elderly or who have special needs) will be offered white sack and brown sack collections as a substitute for wheeled bins. This may include offering residents a storage receptacle for sacks.
  - If residents refuse this offer, consequences of continuing to store receptacles on the street will be explained, relevant notices and warnings issued as appropriate, ie if they continue to store waste receptacles on the street, and they are a danger, they will be removed and residents will be required to use sacks for their waste collection and a £50 payment will be levied against the return of the boxes. Where the receptacles do not constitute a danger, a relevant notice will be served requiring the householder to remove the receptacles.
- 4.5 Where receptacles are persistently left out on the street and the property does have access to off street storage:
- Residents who are disabled, elderly or who have special needs will be offered assistances through
    - Offering smaller bins
    - Offering collect and return service
    - Offering white sack and brown sack collections as a substitute for wheeled bins. This may include offering residents a storage receptacle for sacks.
  - Assistance will be offered to all residents to meet their responsibilities, including where appropriate, the offer of smaller bins
  - If residents continue to store waste receptacles on the street, consequences of continuing to do so will be explained, relevant notices and warnings issued as appropriate. If the problem persists, the receptacles will be removed. A £50 payment will be levied against the return of the waste receptacles. Until the waste is offered for

collection in an approved receptacle, no further bin collection service will be offered and only waste put out in approved bags will be collected. Any waste left out in unauthorised containers/bags will constitute fly tipping/littering. Depending on the severity of the offence, the penalty will be either a fixed penalty notice (£75) or prosecution resulting in a maximum fine at Crown Court of £50,000 with 12 months imprisonment.

- 4.6 In appropriate circumstances, enforcement officers may take action under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to reduce the levels of contaminated bins or small quantities of side waste. This could result in a maximum fine of £1,000.
- 4.7 Where sack collections prove necessary this will be done in exchange for the wheeled bins and a storage receptacle will be offered which would be low level for easy removal of sacks. Brown sacks would also be offered for organic waste.
- 4.8 Householders who use white sacks for their domestic refuse collection are currently offered a weekly collection. Currently very few residents put bags out on a weekly basis and it is proposed to change this to a fortnightly service in line with the wheeled bin service.

2.2 Alternative collection methods where there is no access to suitable storage.

2.3 The assistance to be offered to people who are disabled or elderly.

2.4 That the white sack collection should be a fortnightly service and that residents on white sack collections should be offered an appropriate receptacle for storing white sacks until their collection day.

**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, 10 January 2006.

**Conflicts of interest:**

None

**Comments:**

None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Public Conveniences</b>
----------------------------

**Decision of:** Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) Iain Coleman

**Reference:** 06/ENV/03

**Date of decision:** 10 January 2006     **Recorded on:** 17 January 2006

**Decision Type:** Key

**Matter for Decision:** To agree a further capital investment programme for public conveniences within the city over the next 5 years.

**Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):** The Council has undertaken a major capital improvement programme for public conveniences within the city over the last four years.

The officer report summarised the current provision of public toilets, highlighting the improvements that have been made and identifying facilities that are still in need of modernisation.

The officer report also considers the longer-term provision. In particular to determine whether additional facilities are necessary to meet demand in relation to location, type of facility and hours of provision, particularly having regard to the expanding night time economy and the new major developments.

**The Executive Councillor's decisions:**

**Agreed:**

1. A further five-year capital investment programme to improve the public toilets that are not meeting modern standards.
2. To recommend to Council approval for capital funding of £525,000 (£205,500 in years one and two, and £38,000 in each of years three, four and five) with £190,000 being funded from Repairs and Renewals (R & R) fund for the public toilets at Chesterton Road, Cherry Hinton Hall, Arbury Court, Romsey Recreation Ground, Kings Hedges Recreation Ground and Barnwell Road.
3. The priority of the work identified for capital expenditure in years one and two:
  - a) Chesterton Road
  - b) Cherry Hinton Hall
4. To consider the provision of public conveniences to meet the needs of the late evening economy. Capital bid C841 Purchase of male street urinals and the associated PPF bid PPF843 Revenue Implications of mobile male urinals will address the needs. The provision of fixed facilities in the medium term will be considered in the context of future proposals for city centre development.

5. To explore with planning officers, the use of Section 106 money to provide additional public conveniences in new major developments in the City (East Cambridge, the Southern Fringe, Northern Fringe).

**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, 10 January 2006.

**Conflicts of interest:**

None

**Comments:**

None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Recycling Investment and Recycling Performance</b>
---

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Environmental Services) Iain Coleman
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/04
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	To respond to a request from the Labour Group members at the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 8 November 2005 for a report to this meeting to show the investment in recycling in the past few years and the impact this investment has had on the Council's recycling performance.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	See above.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	Noted the impact made by investment in various recycling schemes in the City in the past few years and the consequential improvement achieved in the Council's recycling performance as measured by BVPI 82a and 82b.
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	These are set out in the officer report
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 8 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	The Executive Councillor agreed with a suggestion from the Scrutiny Committee that a similar report on the plastic bottle recycling come to Committee once the scheme has been in place for a suitable period.

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Service Plans and Revenue and Capital Budgets – Revised 2005/06, Proposed 2006/07 and Forecast 2007/08: Executive Councillor for Planning &amp; Transport</b>
--

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) Jenny Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/05
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	<p>The Service Plans for 2006/07 look at the service proposals, objectives and budget position for 2006/07 and forecast for 2007/08. The Executive Councillor considers whether service priorities and resources should be refocused to enable objectives and targets for the coming year to be met.</p> <p>The Service Plans of the following services were considered: Development Services Economic Development &amp; Tourism (part) Parking Services Policy &amp; Projects Customer &amp; Support Services</p>
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	Service Plans and draft budgets are key elements of the Council's budgetary and policy framework.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<p><b>Performance Targets:</b></p> <p>a) Agreed the service objectives and proposals for 2006/07 and future years, for services contained within the Planning &amp; Transport portfolio as set out in Appendix 1 of each service plan, and the performance indicators and targets as set out in Appendix 2 of each plan.</p> <p><b>Revenue Budgets:</b></p> <p>c) Agreed proposals for revenue savings and bids, as set out in Appendix B of the officer report, which have been incorporated into the budgets presented for this portfolio.</p> <p>d) Agreed the Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids for submission to the Executive in the following order of priority: PPF 545 Community Liaison Manager (Nature Reserves) PPF 590 Monitoring Officer Planning Investigation Team</p> <p>e) Agreed the externally funded bids, as shown in Appendix B of the officer report, with the addition of X550 as a High priority rather than a Medium priority bid, for submission to the Executive.</p> <p>f) Approved the revised revenue budget for 2005/06, as shown in Appendix C of the officer report, for submission to the Executive.</p> <p>g) Approved the budget for 2006/07 as shown in Appendix C of the officer report, for submission to the Executive.</p>

**Capital:**

- h) Approved capital bids, as identified in Appendix B of the officer report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.
- i) Agreed to seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2005/06, as detailed in Appendix D of the officer report, to fund rephased capital spending.
- j) Approved the Hold List, shown in Appendix F of the officer report.
- k) Approved the on-going transfer of £5,000 per year from 2006/07 from the Sustainable City Capital programme to the Sustainable City revenue budget.

**Reasons for the decision:**

At the meeting of Council on 8 September 2005, individual cash limit targets were identified for each service portfolio. In setting the overall General Fund cash limit a funding provision was made of £500,000 Priority Policy Fund (PPF) to provide funding for developments which can be demonstrated to make a significant contribution to the Medium Term Objectives set out in the Annual Statement.

**Scrutiny consideration:**

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

**Report:**

Agenda Item 9 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.

**Conflicts of interest:**

None

**Comments:**

None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Approval of Contractor – Static and Mobile Security Services to Cambridge City Council Car Parks</b>
---

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/06
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	To approve the appointment of Brit Sec International to provide static and mobile security services to Cambridge City Council car parks for a period of 3 years from February/March 2006.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	The Parking Services Service Plan for 2005/6 approved the action to establish nighttime customer and security services across all the City Council's multi-storey car parks. A tendering exercise commenced in September 2005 to contract this service. Following the completion of this tender a suitable contractor –Brit Sec International - has been identified to provide a service for Cambridge's car parks for a period of 3 years from the end of February 2006, at an estimated annual contract cost of £152,829.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<b>Agreed</b> to approve the appointment of Brit Sec International to provide static and mobile security services to Cambridge City Council car parks for a period of 3 years from February/March 2006.
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	As set out in the officer report
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The officer report was circulated to members of the committee on 7 January and placed on public deposit on 9 January. At the meeting the Chair ruled that the report be considered despite not being publicly available five clear days before the meeting. The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 9A of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
**Record of Executive Decision**

<b>Concessionary Bus Travel from 1 April 2006</b>
---

**Decision of:** Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) Jenny Bailey

**Reference:** 06/ENV/07

**Date of decision:** 10 January 2006     **Recorded on:** 17 January 2006

**Decision Type:** Key

**Matter for Decision:** To agree the Council's response to the changes to the statutory concessionary travel scheme from April 2006.

**Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):** Free concessionary bus travel for disabled and older people will become a statutory requirement from 1 April 2006. The statutory minimum that the Council has to fund is free travel on scheduled local bus services between 0930 and 2300 within our district boundary.

This requirement applies to District Councils, including Cambridge City Council. In order to offset the additional financial burden to Districts of the new requirement, the Government has assigned a total of £245 million for authorities outside of London and Metropolitan areas.

The Council is obliged by law to notify bus operators of any variations to this statutory minimum by 3 February 2006. The exact details of the reimbursement arrangements have to be notified to operators by 1 March 2006. Any extension of the statutory scheme beyond the minimum requirement is dependent on the level of funding received from central government.

**The Executive Councillor's decisions:**

**Agreed:**

1. That, for the interim period 1 April 2006 to 1 April 2007, the City Council will provide within its district only a statutory minimum free concessionary fares scheme, i.e. free travel only after 0930 – 0400 Monday to Friday and all day at weekends, with no concession at other times.
2. That the City Council will continue to fund cross boundary journeys for the interim period
3. To review, along with other districts in the Cambridgeshire scheme, whether experience from the interim period indicates that a different scheme should be introduced from 1 April 2007, depending on funding and need.

**Reasons for the decision:**

These are set out in the officer report.

<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered the recommendations and suggested an amendment to recommendation 1 to clarify the hours of free concessionary travel by adding – 0400. The Executive Councillor agreed this amendment. The Scrutiny Committee approved the amended recommendations by 4 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 10 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Project Initiation – City Centre Strategy</b>
--

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/08
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	To approve the initiation of a City Centre Strategy to address the needs of the city over the next 15 years.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	Through stakeholder consultation, create a vision, strategic framework and focused <b>action plan</b> that will play a major part in ensuring the City Centre meets the demands of a growing city over the next 15 years.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	Approved the City Centre Strategy Project Initiation to go forward for drafting and consultation prior to further reporting to Committee including the addition of an eighth objective "To review the boundaries that identify the city centre eg so as to include Mill Road and Cambridge Leisure."
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	These are set out in the officer report.
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered the recommendation and suggested an eighth objective which the Executive Councillor approved (see above). The Scrutiny Committee approved the amended recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 11 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
**Record of Executive Decision**

**Cambridge Southern Fringe – Proposed Area Development Framework**

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/09
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	The ADF is a non-statutory statement of planning policy which is intended to act as a guide to the detailed planning and delivery of development in Cambridge Southern Fringe.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	Cambridge Southern Fringe represents one of the “Areas of Major Change” identified in the Redeposit Draft Local Plan.
<b>The Executive Councillor’s decisions:</b>	<b>Agreed</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To approve the “Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Development Framework (January 2006)” as detailed policy guidance for the future development of Cambridge Southern Fringe.</li><li>2. Not to support the request by South Cambridgeshire District Council to delay granting planning consent for development at Trumpington West until the Addenbrookes’ Access road is open.</li></ol>
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	These are set out in the officer report.
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations by 5 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 12 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	<p>The Head of Policy &amp; Projects tabled a letter from South Cambridgeshire District Council about the Addenbrookes’ Access Road which requested that “planning permission for development at Trumpington West is not granted until the Addenbrookes Access Road has been opened to traffic in its entirety as it will only be when it is fully open that there will be any traffic relief on Hauxton Road, Shelford Road, Trumpington High Street, Trumpington Road and Long Road and any prospect that traffic queues within and beyond the built up area will see any benefit”.</p> <p>The officer urged the members to stay with the proposals in the Local Plan and not pre-judge the traffic assessments. Using the Development Control process in this regard was</p>

consistent with the Local Plan. He also pointed out that South Cambridgeshire had not made representation on this matter to the Local Plan Inquiry. He proposed that members not agree to this request and suggested an additional recommendation be added for the Executive Councillor to agree as follows:

“The Executive Councillor is therefore recommended: Not to support the request by South Cambridgeshire District Council to delay granting planning consent for development at Trumpington West until the Addenbrookes’ Access road is open.”

The Committee approved the additional recommendation for the Executive Councillor by 4 votes to 0.

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Review of the Public Art Action Plan</b>
---

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/10
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	This report provides an annual progress update in relation to implementation of the Public Art Action Plan, first approved in 2002.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	The Public Art Action Plan is a key component of the Council's overall Arts Plan for Cambridge that was approved in March 2002. Two reviews and revisions have since been approved in November 2003 and January 2005.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	Approved the review and on-going implementation of the Public Art Action Plan.
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	As set out in the officer report.
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 3 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 13 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Sustainable City Grants to Environmental Organisations 2006/07</b>
---

**Decision of:** Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey

**Reference:** 06/ENV/11

**Date of decision:** 10 January 2006    **Recorded on:** 17 January 2006

**Decision Type:** Non Key

**Matter for Decision:** To approve the grant allocations for 2006/07.

**Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):** The Sustainable City initiative provides core funding to organisations working locally to address environmental issues.

**The Executive Councillor's decisions:** Approved the following grant allocations, subject to confirmation of the budget in March 2006:

Cambridge Green Belt Project	£1,000
Cambridge Preservation Society	£500
Cambridge SOFA	£8,500
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Biological Records Centre	£1,000
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Real Nappy Network	£5,790
Harambee	£500
The Wildlife Trust	£1,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£18,290</b>

**Reasons for the decision:** As set out in the officer report.

**Scrutiny consideration:** The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 3 votes to 0.

**Report:** Agenda Item 14 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.

**Conflicts of interest:** None

**Comments:** None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Pedestrian Crossing Priorities</b>
---------------------------------------

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/12
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	The City Council currently makes an annual capital allocation of £75,000 for the provision of pedestrian crossings. The suggestions received have been assessed and a priority order for implementation suggested. In addition there is a limited carry forward from 2004/5. This reports considers the suggestions received and recommends those locations that should be considered further.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	Any crossings identified as a priority by the City Council would need to be supported by the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) prior to formal advertisement. Any objections to the crossings would be considered and determined by the AJC.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<b>Agreed</b> to support the following crossings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Histon Road/Gilbert Road, pedestrian stage in existing signals</li><li>• Cherry Hinton Road/Coleridge Road, pedestrian stage in existing signals</li><li>• High Street Chesterton by Haymakers</li><li>• Wulfstan Way</li><li>• Vinery Road outside the Recreation Ground</li></ul>
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	As set out in the officer report
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	An updated priority list was tabled at the meeting which removed the proposal for Windsor Road, close to the path from Richmond Road, and replaced it with Vinery Road outside the Recreation Ground. The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the amended recommendation by 4 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 15 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Lime Kiln Road East Pit</b>
--------------------------------

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/13
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	To respond to a request from the Labour members of the Scrutiny Committee for a report on the issues facing the Lime Kiln Road East Pit.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	The Lime Kiln Road East Pit is an important site on the south east side of the City. It is owned by Gonville and Caius College. It is currently unused and may be considered a lost opportunity for Cambridge. In considering its present and future there are important issues to be taken into account, including public safety and abuse of the site, planning constraints, largely due to environmental factors, and the resource implication for the City Council of assuming any degree of responsibility. Action is considered to fall outside the current budget and service planning round.
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<b>Agreed</b> (a) to note the report; and (b) to take no further action now, but give further consideration of the future of the East Pit in the 2007-08 service planning and budget setting round.
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	As set out in the officer report
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 3 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 16 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL**  
Record of Executive Decision

<b>Joint Area Action Plan for North West Cambridge</b>
--

<b>Decision of:</b>	Executive Councillor (Planning & Transport) J Bailey
<b>Reference:</b>	06/ENV/14
<b>Date of decision:</b>	10 January 2006 <b>Recorded on:</b> 17 January 2006
<b>Decision Type:</b>	Non Key
<b>Matter for Decision:</b>	To agree that Council be requested to confirm the decision of the Executive Councillor that the Council prepare a joint development plan document with South Cambridgeshire for North West Cambridge.
<b>Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):</b>	<p>The Executive Councillor agreed our new Local Development Scheme at Environment Scrutiny Committee in November 2005. This includes reference to a joint Area Action Plan for North West Cambridge (AAPNWC). However it has subsequently been revealed that since April 2005, decisions on whether to prepare a joint development plan document (which includes the AAPNWC) must be taken by Council. This is referenced at (SI2000/2853 Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) England Regulations, under the heading: <i>'functions not to be the sole responsibility of an authority's executive'</i>, paragraph 4C. It is therefore necessary to refer this decision to Council in February 2006 for confirmation.</p> <p>The extract from the Local Development Scheme is as follows:</p> <p>North-West Cambridge Area Action Plan: A joint plan with South Cambridgeshire District Council for a large scale urban expansion for Cambridge University and also residential development.</p>
<b>The Executive Councillor's decisions:</b>	<b>Agreed</b> that Council be requested to confirm the decision of the Executive Councillor that the Council prepare a joint development plan document with South Cambridgeshire for North West Cambridge.
<b>Reasons for the decision:</b>	As set out in the officer report
<b>Scrutiny consideration:</b>	The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendation by 3 votes to 0.
<b>Report:</b>	Agenda Item 17 of the Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10 January 2006.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b>	None
<b>Comments:</b>	None