

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

9.30am –2.50pm

PRESENT: Councillors Ward (Chair), Baker, Durrant, Holland, Newbold, Shah, Upstone and Kightley (alternate for Armstrong).

ALSO PRESENT: Executive Councillor Reid (Climate Change and Growth)
Executive Councillor Rosensteil (Environmental and Waste Services)

And: Councillor Herbert for minute numbers 07/Env/66 and 07/Env/67

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL07/ENV/62 **MINUTES**

The minutes of 10 July and minutes of the Special Meeting of the 9 September will be presented for signing as a correct record at the 8 January meeting of the committee.

The Chair agreed to consider some matters arising from the Special Meeting. It was agreed that the County Council's Transport Innovation Fund bid which included provision for so called congestion charging be reconsidered at the January meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

07/ENV/63 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Armstrong and Holness.

07/ENV/64 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Personal interests were declared as follows:

Councillor Baker in minute number 07/ENV/69 as a member of the Wild Life Trust.

Councillor Ward in minute number 07/ENV/72 as his wife works for Cambridge University Press.

Councillor Reid in minute number 07/ENV/72 as Director of a charitable trust that leases premises from Cambridge University Press.

07/ENV/65 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Mr Couzens, Chair of the Cambridge Licensed Taxi Owners Association (CLTOA), addressed the meeting. He spoke of the problems following de-limitation introduced in 2001 – overcharging by some drivers, South Cambs drivers being able to operate in the city, reduced earnings, drivers having to do an eighty to hundred hour working week to pay for their vehicles, that it would be beneficial to have an Enforcement Officer on duty in the evenings and at weekends and that the comparison made to Oxford in the officer report was not a fair comparison as that city was not delimited. He also mentioned the taxi rank at the station and that only some drivers could afford the fees. The rank in Station Road tended to be used as a feeder rank for the station rank.

Mr Couzens welcomed the fact that the Enforcement Officer was currently checking on these problems and said these investigations would be of benefit to the trade. It would be beneficial if all drivers had to pay for their plates and if the number of Hackney

Carriages in Cambridge were limited. Currently there were too many vehicles to police and the public were being overcharged.

The Executive Councillor said that most of what had been said was the result of the licensing and legal framework and it was not a decision of the City Council to limit one part of the sector. He acknowledged that charging drivers to use the taxi rank at the station was a problem. He said he did not approve of restrictive practice of allowing only a small proportion of drivers to use the station taxi rank. With the development of the station area, the taxi rank would be situated on a public highway.

The Director of Environment & Planning said that the Council was in the process of discussing the problems of the taxi rank at the station with Network Rail. However, the taxi rank was on private land and the Council could not use the planning process to resolve this issue.

07/ENV/66 **TAXI LICENSING** (see also record of decision 07/ENV/36)

The Taxi Licensing Officer said he was happy to answer questions on the report which had been prepared at the request of Councillor Newbold.

The Chair invited Councillor Dixon to address the committee in his capacity as Chair of the Licensing Committee.

Councillor Dixon made the following 4 points:

1. Street hailing was not common but was not completely absent. There was no culture of street hailing because taxis in Cambridge tended not to work in this way.
2. All Cambridge taxi drivers licensed by the City Council have to do a knowledge test
3. The current situation seemed to favour drivers from South Cambridgeshire. There was no requirement to sit a knowledge test, the efficiency of the vehicles was not tested and it was cheaper to register.
4. There were also other types of vehicles such as the large American limousines and fire engines available for private hire which currently did not have to conform to the licensing process.

Councillor Newbold made the following points:

- On the issue of safety assessments the report showed no figures, no survey and no detailed information on enforcement.
- There was also no benchmarking information or feed back from the public seven years on from de-limitation.
- Overall the report needed more detail.

Councillor Newbold also proposed that It would be helpful if the City Council and South Cambridgeshire were to harmonise their licensing standards to avoid the issues raised in Appendix A point 2.10 of drivers transferring to South Cambridgeshire to avoid the City's more stringent licensing process.

Members raised the following issues:

- The comparison with Oxford was useful.
-

- It was felt that South Cambridgeshire was undermining the City Council's position. Some felt that the current position of the 'open market' was not working.
- The situation with the station represented a great unfairness with some drivers paying for plates and not being able to pick up from the station.
- Taxis were expensive for the consumer particularly the station routes. There were no measures for better value in the report and for sharing taxi schemes which were available in other European cities.
- Sharing vehicles with other drivers would help share the financial burden that Mr Couzens had referred to.
- It was important to talk to councillors as well as officers at South Cambridgeshire about possible harmonising of the licensing procedures.

Councillor Newbold proposed an amendment to recommendation 2: "That the Executive Councillor explore and implement a process of harmonising the licensing policies of the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to be reported at a specified date."

The Executive Councillor welcomed the recommendation on closer working with South Cambridgeshire Council and informed Members that the situation was improving. He expressed concerns about pollution but felt the position was now more optimistic with South Cambridgeshire coming on board on the issue of transponders, given the limitations of the legislation. Appendix C showed there was a shift from private hire vehicles to Hackney Carriages which were better regulated. The South Cambridgeshire situation was an unanticipated effect of the legislation. It was disappointing that the Station remained a bastion of old restrictive practices.

The Executive Councillor put forward the view that the first recommendation should have the word **agree** in it after 'and'. He stated that the date of the next but one meeting would be the target and asked that the Head of Environmental Services be included.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 7 votes to 0) the amended recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

Note: After the meeting, consultation with the Chair and Spokes and advice from the Head of Legal Services led to the following wording of the Executive Councillor's decision:

"Agreed:

1. To note the report and factual information provided and agree that there is no need to change current policy.
 2. To request the Head of Environmental Services to explore and implement a process of harmonising the licensing policies of the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in respect of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles and to bring the resulting proposals to the meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11 March 2008 for consideration by the Executive Councillor."
-

07/ENV/67

CUSTOMER SERVICES- 12 MONTH REVIEW OF VERGE PARKING PILOT SCHEME FOR MOWBRAY ROAD AND FENDON ROAD *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/37)*

Members received the report on verge parking.

Councillor Baker said he believed that on one level the pilot scheme had been very successful, protecting the verges and that lessons had been learned regarding implementation needing to involve residents. He raised the following:

- Enforcement - The lack of officers available to enforce the scheme. In addition the bye law required a witness to parking in order that the issue be pursued through the courts.
- Legal Costs – To get a new bye law passed there would be a significant new expense.
- The scheme should be rolled out only in a limited form where the road in question made a contribution to the local environment.
- Double Yellow lines could provide an alternative to the scheme as this would allow no one to park there. The Council could use the LAPE parking attendants, which would provide a cheaper means of enforcement. There would be a problem with this in that the County Council Highways Department would only approve this on the basis of safety and access. There was a need to pursue the County Council to approve double yellow lines on environmental issues.

Labour Members tabled an amendment to the officer recommendations.

‘That officers also bring forward proposals to provide:

- 1- Residential streets with grass verges to have the option of a local vote on which verges should be protected with rocks and other barriers, to then be ‘adopted’ by a adjacent residents.
- 2- Local residents on other streets also to have the option to ‘adopt a verge’ where it is immediately in front of them and where they are willing to protect it.
- 3- More of the council’s 2008 environmental budget be spent on verge protection and restoration, including local parking improvement, plus better grass cutting and pressure also on the county council to restore its cut in yellow lining and local parking.’

Councillor Herbert spoke in favour of the amendments saying that the view of the Labour Group was that the Verge Parking Pilot Scheme would bring progress too slowly and that local residents should have more powers. Currently environmental damage was accelerating. The Mowbray Road approach would not be affordable across the City. It would be necessary to develop an approach which enabled the grass on verges to be cut. This matter was of real concern to residents and needed more thought and resources.

Councillor Holland supported the amendment but wondered whether pursuing a new bye law under the new legislation and use of double yellow lines could be carried out in parallel. She pointed out that with more houses in multiple occupation, there were just more cars in some streets.

Councillor Baker felt that the amendment put forward by Labour Councillors would not be acceptable on legal grounds.

Councillor Newbold raised concerns that if verge parking were not tackled by involving local residents then there could be more block paving of driveways which was undesirable from aesthetic and flood risk perspectives.

Councillor Durrant supported the amendment and thought that control using physical barriers was a way forward. He said that the city should take over the revenue costs in the long term.

The Executive Councillor requested that Legal Services provide Members with information as to whether a new bye law under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 could make a fixed penalty the appropriate action rather than court action. There was a need to link the scheme to the environmental improvement process which had been devolved down to the area committees. Residents often wanted small cheap schemes such as this. Physical objects of certain kinds placed on the verges could be appropriate.

The Head of Customer Services informed Members that permissions would need to be given by the County Council before objects were placed on the verges. Although the Police have the powers to enforce byelaws, in practice this would be dependant on what their priorities were at the time. There would be no single fixed response that would be appropriate across the whole City. Local based solutions would be the best option. It would be necessary to look at alternatives other than enforcement. In the pilot areas, it had been necessary to send some warning letters to residents but this had achieved 100% compliance with no requirement for formal action to be taken.

In the discussion that followed Members raised the following points:

- Would the scheme be achieving much if it were not expanded across the City?
 - Not all agreed the Environmental Improvement Budget should be spent on verge parking.
 - Members were concerned about the issue of enforcement and requested further investigation around enforcement powers and improving the bylaws.
 - Residents would need to be presented with clear options and information about enforcement. This would need to be done carefully in order to avoid some residents taking matters into their own hands.
 - The pilot scheme seemed to show some level of success but what was needed was a long term menu for residents. All the information necessary to develop this had not yet been provided.
 - Pilot schemes would be necessary to decide whether to raise areas up, install barriers, posts or white rocks.
 - A simple adopt-a-verge scheme was preferable to some long winded approach.
 - Double yellow lines may be preferable in Windsor Road where there was lots of multiple occupation.
 - One size fits all may not work as in some cases the chief offenders had adopted their 'own' verge to park on, the Council should have the power to deal with those residents wrecking the local landscape.
-

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth agreed that environmental improvements should be driven by area committees.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental & Waste Services said that a 'toolkit' approach containing physical and legal measures was needed and he was happy to consider the points raised in the amendment. His view was that the amendment tabled by the Labour group should be re-worded: 'That officers also bring forward proposals to 'consider' instead of provide.

Councillor Durrant supported the idea of the toolkit and asked that the following be included:

- Officers investigate powers of enforcement under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act.
- The Council consult residents on the issue of verge parking.
- That area committees be encouraged to get involved.

The Chair summed up the discussion saying that he would be happy with this toolkit approach as one size would not fit all in relation to this issue. Further investigations were definitely necessary in connection with powers provided by the new legislation. He suggested that the exact wording of the amendments be worked out in discussions between the Chair and Spokes.

Councillor Baker was not happy with this and so the Chair asked the committee to vote on the recommendation that the exact wording of the amendment be agreed by the Chair and Spokes.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 1) to the Chair's suggestion.

Note: After the meeting, consultation with the Chair and Spokes led to the following wording of the Executive Councillor's decision:

"Agreed:

1. To continue with the prohibition in Mowbray Road and Fendon Road.
 2. The continuation of the annual verge parking budget.
 3. Partnership working with the Highways Authority and Planning to ensure that issues relating to vehicular access are addressed with information available prior to consultation with residents relating to any further roll out in other areas of the city.
 4. The criteria contained within the officer report by which a limited number of streets could be identified which would be consulted as part of extended verge parking byelaw implementation.
 5. That additionally officers investigate a range of tools for addressing verge parking issues including, as appropriate:
 - Pressing the County Council to provide double yellow lines to give environmental protection
 - The use of physical barriers such as posts and rails, rocks (in consultation with the County Council) on which local residents would be consulted
 - Possible new bye laws arising from the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007
 - Schemes whereby residents could be involved in "adopting" or maintaining their verges
-

6. To include Area Committees in the consultation and selection of sites with a view to them considering the allocation of funds for any environmental improvements.”

07/ENV/68 **ENVIRONMENTAL & WASTE SERVICES SERVICE PLAN PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND REVISED BUDGETS 2007/08** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/38*)

The Committee noted the contents of the Service Plan Performance Reviews of the following services:

- Environmental Services
- Waste Management

The Committee commented on the following services:

Street Services

Councillor Upstone requested a feasibility study on hydro-electric powered public toilets. The Head of Environmental Services said he would report back to the next meeting.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/69 **EAST PIT** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/39*)

After the officer had introduced the report, Councillor Newbold reported from the Gypsy & Traveller Steering Group which had discussed this site at its meeting the previous week. The decision of the Steering Group was “In the light of current advice on the suitability of East Pit as a wildlife site and the views of relevant partner bodies, as set out in the report, the Gypsy and Travellers Steering Group are not supportive of advancing East Pit as a potential Gypsy and Travellers site.”

Councillor Durrant thanked officers for the report and said that he welcomed its recommendations. He suggested that the Council should consider adding modest funds for public use of the site if the bid for funding by the Wildlife Trust were successful. He asked that officers report back to the committee on the outcome of the bid.

Councillor Upstone felt the plan for a nature reserve was not necessarily incompatible with having housing. The site could be used for some commercial and education facilities, with limited housing for staff.

The Director of Environment & Planning explained that Go East expected the result of the bid would be announced before Christmas. The bid was part of a block bid and the Joint Strategic Growth and Implementation Committee would discuss this and the decision would be made by the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board. Members would be informed of the outcome.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/70 **STOREY'S WAY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/40*)

Councillor Holland expressed the view that the delay in extension of the Conservation Area highlighted the lack of value placed on conservation work versus the growth agenda. She requested a report to the next meeting on the outstanding Conservation Area appraisals.

Because of the delay in the extension of the Conservation Area, the developer of the Cambridge Lodge Hotel had not had to seek express consent to demolish, which would have been the case if the extension had been in place.

The Executive Councillor explained that the Performance Review and Revised Capital and Budgets Report, Appendix A page123 showed details of the conservation budget. Currently this was £494,900 therefore considerable resources were currently allocated to conservation.

The Director of Environment & Planning said Councillor Holland's point was worth reflecting on. Page 146 of the Service Plan demonstrated the Council placed tremendous emphasis on conservation. The City Council had received recognition for the quality of its approach to conservation. The Director informed Members he was committed to maintaining that quality. It was necessary to maintain a balance between reactive and proactive elements and make choices about how resources were used.

Councillor Holland welcomed the Director's comments but the detail of the Planning Policy and Performance Review 2007/08 (p153, Service Objective 9b) showed delays.

Members then considered the Storey's Way extension to the Conservation Area and sought and were given clarification about

- Why modern buildings were included;
- How the responses to the consultation had been dealt with in the revised Appraisal.

Officers clarified that, for consistency, the wording should include the phrase "for inclusion" on page 21. They also provided maps showing the extension of the proposed boundaries to the Storey's Way Conservation Area.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/71 **PUBLIC ART FRAMEWORK** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/41*)

Councillor Durrant felt this document had no vision.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth stated the purpose of the document was to provide a process where Members can come up with a vision to

decide how to spend the fund. She would be keen to look at the City as a whole as well as considering the role of area committees. There was a need to dovetail or link with the environmental improvements.

Councillor Baker made the following points:

1. Public art was important and needed a jump start to get the process moving.
2. There was a lack of action on public art over the last five years. Little had been achieved by the Public Art Steering Group. They had only come forward with two proposals.
3. The piece agreed for Parker's Piece was not in place.
4. Public art needed to be given a new lease of life. He suggested that the Public Art Steering Group might report to the Planning Committee in a similar way to the Design and Conservation Panel. Public Art proposals could then be given proper consideration at the determination of a planning application.

Councillor Durrant agreed that the process needed firming up and asked that consideration be given to pieces which children could play with being commissioned for shopping areas.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth thanked officers for the report and said that she had great enthusiasm for public art. Two suggestions which might improve the process of promoting public art:

- The Public Art Steering Group to set up a schedule of meetings for the year so that members could attend if they wished.
- The officers to put together a paper on how Members could engage in decisions about public art at different levels. What were the different roles of Environment Scrutiny Committee, the Public Art Steering Group and how would the S106 requirements and the discharge of planning conditions be followed through.

The Urban Design Manager thanked Members for their helpful points. The process and procedures for dealing with public art proposals needed to be more joined up. It might be appropriate to produce an annual report to this committee.

The Director of Environment & Planning requested officers produce a paper for the Chair, Spokes and Executive Members which also took on board the role of area committees in the process of promoting public art.

Councillors Baker and Reid would firm up their suggestions concerning the Public Art Steering Group.

07/ENV/72 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK- EMPLOYMENT AND LAND REVIEW *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/42)*

Councillor Durrant said that he would be grateful if larger scale maps could be provided.

Members raised the following issues:

1. Would a small area of workshops and artists' studios be included in the development?
-

The Research & Information Manager said one area, the Michael Young Centre on Purbeck Road, had been identified as being suitable for creative industries but on some sites there were issues of affordability. Occupiers frequently could not afford market rents. This had to be considered alongside everything else relating to that site. A scheme like this might not be appropriate for the Employment and Land Review itself but could cascade out of it. Officers could research schemes and investigate how to progress.

The Director of Environment & Planning said that in the last month the City Council had been contacted by a company that provided affordable work space in Peckham. However, one implication of including such space was that the Council would have to reduce affordable housing provision. He was putting the company in touch with developers to see what progress could be made. For example, in London there were schemes with housing over workshops. It would be useful for the Council to get involved with schemes like this, especially if it was a means of promoting affordable housing.

2. What was happening with the Cambridge University Press site? Why not use this site for housing?

The Research & Information Manager said that Cambridge University Press (CUP) had been consulted on the results of the Employment and Land Review. They were not strongly interested in relocating. However, there was potential for a move in the future. The CUP was a valuable source of employment for the local area.

3. There seemed to be little warehouse and distribution park provision.

The Research & Information Manager said that there were modest amounts but that large scale distributive warehousing was not encouraged in the Cambridge area.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/73 CLIMATE CHANGE & GROWTH **SERVICE PLAN PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND REVISED BUDGETS** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/43*)

The Committee noted the Service Plan Performance Reviews of the following services:

- Development Services
- Tourism & City Centre Management
- Economic Policy

They commented on the following Service Plan Performance Reviews:

Parking Services

Councillor Upstone asked about the discussions taking place with other Cambridgeshire District Councils regarding the decriminalisation of parking enforcement.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth said that consultants were looking at various options for the District Councils:

- 1 All the District Councils to do their own Parking Enforcement in-house.
- 2 To have a centralised service for the Parking attendants and each District to process the tickets for their area.
- 3 That the districts provide the back office services to the County Council which would provide the main service.

Planning Policy

Councillor Holland raised the issue of resourcing conservation. Was this a result of budget priorities?

Executive Councillor Reid responded that this was due to the unfortunate loss of staff not as a result of budget priorities. The Council were trying to recruit to these posts.

Councillor Durrant enquired whether the use of consultants would be helpful.

The Director of Environment & Planning informed Members that he was committed to filling the vacancies with skilled experienced staff. Conservation was a specialist area and, if necessary, the Council would use consultants.

Members discussed the car club. The Executive Councillor updated Members on the Car Club Steering Group. So far two parking spaces had been provided in the City's Car Parks. This had been a success and there had been thirty two subscribers with a 28% use of the cars. There were plans to roll the scheme out in mid January. A request had been made for one space in the Adam and Eve Street Car Park. Plans included rolling out a dispersed group of on street parking spaces. The key to success would be achieving some fine-tuned co-operation with the County Council.

Members then considered the Budget report.

Councillor Upstone suggested that rather than try and persuade the public to take up the grants for installing solar panels, the Council should divert the funds to use them in-house and use that to make the case for their usefulness.

The Executive Councillor agreed to consider that.

Councillor Upstone questioned the reference in Appendix B of the Budget report to the unavoidable increase of £150,000 in National Non-Domestic Rates for the Lion Yard Car Park due to the increase in the number of car park spaces.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth said that it was unexpected and the Director of Finance was challenging it. The argument seemed to be based on the fact that the car park had been refurbished and so was more valuable.

Councillors raised issues relating to the Environmental Improvements Programme:

- Residents were not interested in larger schemes which was a proposal put forward by officers at a recent meeting.
 - Either area committees could work together or the funds be centralised.
 - More medium sized schemes were desirable.
-

- Was it a problem of criteria for schemes or of funding?

The Executive Councillor informed Members there were currently fifty or sixty small schemes underway and these imposed a considerable burden on the staff. There would be a workshop in January to consider local schemes. She requested that there be a more coherent reporting format for the financial information for each area committee and that the role of the Area Committee Chairs be more specific regarding spending the budgets.

Councillor Baker suggested this was an issue of perspective. The South Area Committee did not consider this to be an under-spend. The Committee had decided to do two allocation rounds, one in June and one in November. This was seen as an opportunity to consider projects later and to spread the load on officers.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/74 **REVIEW OF CORRIDOR ACTION TRANSPORT PLANS**

A paper on the review of Corridor Action Plans was prepared in response to a formal request by Councillor Durrant who introduced the item. He said that it had been an opportunity to explore what was in the Action Plans as this was an area the County Council were too busy to really look at and so nothing was happening.

The Executive Councillor agreed that a report on this from the County Council was overdue and that Members were keen to get a Joint Transport Forum with the County Council started. Councillor Durrant enquired if there would be a target date, as joint working was falling by the wayside. The Executive Councillor said that, to a certain extent, the date was not in the City Council's control. The issue of the Joint Transport Forum had been pursued with her opposite number at the County. She added that if Labour Members were concerned they should request that Labour colleagues at County pursue the issue on their behalf.

The Director of Environment & Planning informed Members that the City Council was in dialogue with the County Council about a Joint Transport Forum and that the draft terms of reference for this body were due in the next few days. If Members were happy with the terms of reference the next stage would be to develop a work plan.

07/ENV/75 **JOINT PLAN MAKING ARRANGEMENTS** *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/44)*

The Director of Environment & Planning said the report set out the position of the three Councils. However, there was an error on page 184 of the agenda in the paragraph which referred to the membership of the joint committee. This should read 3:3:3. He informed members that the structure of the Joint Committee would be important as this body would have responsibility for overseeing the growth of the City fringes. He highlighted paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 in the officer report which indicated further work to be done by the County Council and which would be reported to their cabinet in December.

Members focused their discussion around the proposals on membership of the Joint Committee:

- The 5.5.5 membership would have been a better option.
- The Chair felt it would be possible to make some changes as the final proposal would come back to the Scrutiny Committee. At present it looked like the City Council could lose control to County Councillors who had no stake in the city.
- Would the NIAB site be included in this or had the City Council already done what this body would do on that site?
- This committee would be a policy forum which would be used only if the two District Councils could not agree (see paragraph 3.1 on page 178 of the agenda).
- What would the role of the public be?
- Members felt this was a matter of local interest and that membership should be weighted 3.5.5, with County Councillors drawn from the locality.
- A minimum of 12 members as this was a plan making body should be recommended with the membership weighted towards the City.
- The Executive Councillor informed members the Leader would have preferred a 6.6.4 arrangements. This would have enabled the Council to reflect the political composition of the parties.

The Director informed members that part of the negotiation was that the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) would want the Terms of Reference to be specific about responsibility. This would not be a matter for discretion. There would need to be a dialogue with the other two authorities to find the common ground.

The Chair summarised the discussion and said that these were difficult negotiations and what was needed was greater representation from the District Councils. He proposed that the weighting be changed to either 5:5:3 or 6:6:4 with the County Council having 3 seats or 4. In addition the Scrutiny Committee would prefer the County Council membership to be drawn from the City or South Cambridgeshire electoral divisions.

The Executive Councillor expressed the view that the recommendations should also endorse the following: page 174 of the agenda, paragraph 3.6 “that the County Council places within S29 Committee’s competence the development and agreement of transport policies affecting and arising from designated areas” and support paragraph 3.7.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed the amended recommendations for the Executive Councillor as follows:

1. (Unanimously) That the weighting be changed to either 5:5:3 or 6:6:4 with the County Council having 3 seats or 4 and that the County Council members be drawn from the City or South Cambridgeshire electoral divisions.
2. (Unanimously) that the County Council places within the S29 Committee’s competence the development and agreement of transport policies affecting and arising from the designated areas.
3. By 6 votes to 0 in support of paragraph 3.7 of the officer report.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

07/ENV/76 **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME** *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/45)*

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

07/ENV/77 **SUPPLY, INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, SUPPORT AND UP GRADE OF CAR PARK PAY ON FOOT AND ASSOCIATED CONTROL EQUIPMENT (phased approach).** *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/46)*

The officer introduced the report and said that what was being proposed was an approach to standardise car parking equipment. The alternative option was to do nothing but this would lead to greater costs.

Members discussed the following issues:

- What flexibility would this give to charge cars on CO₂ emissions?
- Will the system have flexibility to deal with future needs and support options such as paying by mobile phone?
- Other Councils using this system according to vehicles registration plates, linking to the DVLA data base, would this be possible?
- Would it be possible to upgrade the system cheaply?

The officers informed Members that while the current system would need quite a leap to undertake these functions, it was not out of the question. Technology would move forward rapidly in the next few years. There was not yet the technology to charge the number plate according to the carbon footprint.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

The meeting ended at 2.50pm.

Chair
