

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

9.30am –11.55am

PRESENT: Councillors Ward (Chair), Armstrong, Baker, Durrant, Newbold, Shah and Kightley

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**08/ENV/01 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting on 8 November 2007 were agreed as a correct record.

08/ENV/02 APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillors Holland and Upstone.

08/ENV/03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared:

Councillors Reid and Ward in minute number 08/ENV/06 as members of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign

The following personal and prejudicial interests were declared:

Councillor Shah in minute number 08/ENV/09 as his daughter is employed by Red2Green. Councillor Shah left the room, did not take part in the debate and did not vote.

08/ENV/04 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mr Martin Lucas-Smith from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign addressed the committee and said the Campaign broadly supported the traffic management measures proposed by the County Council but subject to seeking reassurance on a number of issues. The level of housing growth in the coming decade would result in widespread congestion unless serious alternatives became available. Many transport experts took the view that national congestion charging was inevitable. Locally we should accept this and take the money while it is there rather than find it has been given to some other area of the country. While the County's approach had deficiencies, the proposals did offer a real chance to make improvements

to the traffic problems in the city. Car drivers should benefit from not sitting in traffic jams for so long. Van drivers and business people should benefit financially from not wasting productive time in traffic. Cyclists were offered the prospect of making space on the road for cycling. Bus users would probably benefit most. He urged the committee to read the full 183 pages of the County's document.

Mr Richard Normington addressed the committee and said that the City of Cambridge Conservative party was opposed to the County's proposals. He asked whether the political parties regretted their support of some of the proposals.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth said that the City of Cambridge Liberal Democrats supported a road pricing scheme so long as it was inextricably linked to high quality public transport for all and contributed measures to mitigate the effects of climate change. The County Council's 180-page document did address these issues but with not a high enough priority and the City Council would continue to make representations about these issues.

The Chair drew members' attention to a tabled representation from Nick Maclaren who was unable to attend the meeting. He wrote:
"I strongly support most of it, but it is understated and incomplete.

There is an answer to the last sentence of 4.7 - many residents of the periphery already drive to Royston, Saffron Walden, Newmarket, and even Peterborough to shop. The congestion charge scheme as currently proposed will vastly increase that. That is bad news for the city and bad news for the environment.

4.11 is too understated. The past decade's changes have vastly increased the amount of driving that many residents of the periphery do, by making it quicker to drive several times the distance, or use unsuitable rat-runs, and this will increase that. City residents will get to breathe the emissions as the wind blows.

Lastly, it says nothing about commuting into Cambridge by bicycle. As you know, this is a hobby horse of mine, but the City Council's tacit acquiescence in the County Council's view that it is not worth bothering about (and that IS what its attitude amounts to) has harmed the city by reducing the proportion of people cycling in from the periphery."

**Budgets 2007/08 (Revised); 2008/09 and 2009/2010
(Forecast)** *(see also record of decision 08/ENV/01)*

The Committee considered the Service Plans and commented as follows:

Street Services

Councillor Durrant asked about recycling and waste collection of litter being carried out on local streets.

The Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services explained that PPF 1436 on page 21 of the report was to do with this. A pilot project would give evidence of how effective it was to recycle litter waste using bins on streets and how to avoid contamination.

The Committee then considered the budget.

The Accountant amended a figure on page 25 of the report. The Revised Recycling Budget for January showed an increase of £1950 from that approved at the November meeting. As a result, the total net decrease for the portfolio should be £10,020 rather than the published £11,970.

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

The Executive Councillor for Environmental Services and Waste Strategy agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/06 **KEY DECISION County Council Consultation on
Congestion Charging** *(see also record of decision
08/ENV/02)*

The Head of Planning Policy & Projects introduced the report.

Councillors raised the following to which officers replied (A):

- A review of the locations of Park & Ride sites had been proposed but this had not been properly addressed. For example there was a real need for one in the Bar Hill area. The implementation of the Guided Bus would not totally address the problems of congestion on the A14. Park & Ride sites were needed to serve all the major arterial routes into the city. (Kightley)
 - For Castle Newnham and Arbury residents, the proposed gyratory system which was one way going into town was just going to encourage traffic to travel into town. (Kightley)
-

- Where was it proposed to position the cordon within which road pricing would be activated. Was the M11/A14 boundary proposed? There were some work sites on the periphery where parking was well catered for such as the Science Park. Might it not be advisable to move the cordon further towards the city? (Kightley)
- Citizens should be exempt from any road pricing charges. A request to include a request that the County Council consider exemptions for city residents (Durrant)
- Attended a workshop as part of the consultation with local business people. No opportunity at all to comment on details of the proposed scheme. With regard to orbital bus routes, Andy Campbell, Managing Director of Stagecoach had rejected these because they would not make money. (Ward)
- Also present at such a workshop. Comparison of the proposed scheme with the London one was made where high discounts led to undermining of improvement to bus transport because of loss of revenue due to costs of operating the discount scheme. Maybe a second bus operator would help! (Newbold)
- Any charging of residents may start small and get bigger. The needs of residents with special needs and those making small trips should be taken into account. People travelling to Peterborough, Huntingdon and Ely by car to shop would all increase the carbon emissions. (Shah)
- An excellent report giving the council's initial response. Exemptions are included in "discounts". Re 4.11d in the report - the use of the word "only" in the phrase "and spent only on public transport cycling and walking" implied that surplus revenue could not be spent on other traffic management schemes. (Baker)

A: The Head of Planning Policy and Projects said in relation to that last point that it did include traffic measures. In relation to other points raised by members he made 3 general points:

1. The dilemma about providing Park & Ride sites was whether they simply encouraged people to use their cars. It might be better to improve rural transport.
2. Regarding discounts/exemptions, the council needed to be sure that these did not work against its aspirations and objectives.
3. With regard to public transport there needed to be a fundamental shift in how this was regarded in the overall transport strategy.

He said all the comments had been noted for inclusion in the response to the County's proposals.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth agreed that the dilemma about the provision of Park & Ride sites needed to be addressed. If they were more widely distributed then perhaps journeys would depend on buses rather than on cars.

She anticipated that the physical impact of the proposals would be considered at the meetings of the area committees.

She informed the committee that the Joint Transport Forum had now been agreed with the County Council as was mentioned in the report on the S29 committee later in the agenda.

In addition, the Executive Councillor stated that the city needed to look at the proposals seriously and accept them if they met the city's criteria:

1. **Equity for residents.** Important to provide better public transport for the residents of Cambridge as well as the 20,000 people coming in to the city each day. A clearer assessment of public transport provision across the city was needed so that transport deficits could be addressed. There should be exemptions from road charging for those with special needs and discounts available to other residents depending on the availability of public transport. TIF plans state that 60% of people would have access to public transport 250metres from their home, but this was far from comprehensive and justified the case for resident discounts.
2. **Quality of sustainable transport.** The bus services needed to meet their scheduled timetables and good cycling schemes were required.
3. **Mitigating the effects of climate change.** Differential charging of cars depending on emissions was being introduced in London in the congestion charging scheme and in various residents parking schemes as well as in our own car parks for season ticket holders. A Mori report on road pricing in London and Edinburgh showed that schemes which impact heavily on public transport and address emissions are regarded positively by the public.

The City Council would respond to the County Council on the principles of their proposals based on the comments made at the meeting and on the feedback from the area committees.

The Chair responded to the comments from Martin Lucas-Smith and assured him that no members of the committee were relying on the 6-page report only. There had been several briefings for members on the proposals. The choice presented at those had been either £500m or zero funds. The former was the County's bid and it needed to be borne in mind that a bid was not usually met in full. He said that there were also other funding streams still available.

Councillor Durrant was of the view that a total discount was not the same as an exemption and he cited VAT as an example where discounted rates could go up but exempt rates were exempt. He said that economic modelling was needed to assess the impact of the various schemes. He repeated his request for exemptions for city residents.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/07 **KEY DECISION City-County-South Cambs Section 29 Committee** *(see also record of decision 08/ENV/03)*

The Head of Planning Policy and Projects introduced the report. He highlighted the setting up of the Transport Forum with the County Council and the Terms of Reference and membership (3 councillors from each authority) of the new S29 Committee. He tabled an amendment:

“Add a further bullet point to the Terms of Reference following the 8th bullet point which says, ‘District-wide planning policy which.... ‘ (p.11 of report)

‘In order to ensure consistency of development and standards and respect urban context, within the urban extensions City Council Local Plan and Local Development Framework district-wide policies will normally take precedence across the whole development area.’

This is in practice the approach the local authorities have taken in the joint Area Action Plans and also on the Southern Fringe.

If there is a need for any final adjustments following further discussion with South Cambs and the County, these should be agreed by the Executive Member and Chair in consultation with the Labour Group Leader and Spokesperson.”

He referred to paragraph 3.6 of the report which outlined the timetable - the proposal was under discussion by Go-East and the Department of Communities and Local Government. Depending on the outcome of the discussions with Go-East, the decision would either be made by the relevant Executive Councillor of each authority or by their respective council meetings. If the latter, then a Special Meeting of Full Council would need to be convened.

The Leader said that this was an important committee and its setting up had been approached with caution and care so that the right democratic arrangements were in place such as public speaking rights. The administration of the committee would be carried out by the City's Committee Services. The remit was clear because the committee had new plan making authority. There was appropriate linking of the plans for the city fringe developments and the importance of advance transport planning. It was vital that this be supported by studies.

The Leader referred to the discussions at the November meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee when issues had been raised about the composition of the S29 Committee. He said that a pragmatic compromise had been reached which acknowledged the optimum size for committees. The proportion by political party for each authority would now be allocated by them. He highlighted that the quorum would be 6 members consisting of at least two members from each authority.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth affirmed the importance of linking land use and transport infrastructure. This new committee brought those two aspects together although the final decisions on transport would still be the responsibility of the County Council. She hoped that a cultural shift would be enabled by the setting up of the S29 committee allowing more openness and transparency about transport planning proposals.

Councillor Durrant said he would have preferred the membership to be in the proportions 5: 5: 3 but he accepted the pragmatic result.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/08 NON KEY DECISION Landscape Architects' Fees (*see also record of decision 08/ENV/04*)

Councillor Newbold asked what the net effect of the proposals would be, what outcome was expected and how performance would improve as a result.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth explained that the proposals were for an additional staff post which allowed for a

dedicated senior member of staff for the Environmental Improvements programme allowing the growth agenda work to be undertaken by the existing senior postholder thus avoiding conflicts of work priorities.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/09 **NON KEY DECISION Sustainable City Grants to Environmental Organisations 2008/09** *(see also record of decision 08/ENV/05)*

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to Cambridge Preservation Society as her husband is a director. She left the room and took no part in the discussion. The decision on that grant application was referred to the Leader.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 4 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth agreed the recommendations apart from Cambridge Preservation Society.

The Leader agreed the recommendation on Cambridge Preservation Society on 14 January.

08/ENV/10 **KEY DECISION 2008/09 Service Plans; Revenue & Capital Budgets 2007/08 (Revised); 2008/09 and 2009/2010 (Forecast)**

(see also record of decision 08/ENV/06)

The Accountant tabled an amendment sheet relating to the Review of Charges and to the information on the Local Development Vehicle (LDV) funded consultancy projects. The key points were:

- Review of Charges – Update to Appendix B: Seasons tickets

The following text added to be added:

“Vehicles registered before 01 March 2001 charged according to engine size.

NEW RATES – GRAFTON EAST AND QUEEN ANNE TERRACE CAR PARKS

Car park quarterly charges from 2008/09

Vehicles registered before the 1 March 2001

	Present 2007/08	Proposed 08/09
Engine size under 1549cc	n/a	£250
Engine size over 1549cc but under 2L	n/a	£375
Engine size over 2L	n/a	£475

NEW RATES – CASTLE HILL CAR PARK

Car park quarterly charges from 2008/09

Vehicles registered before the 1 March 2001

	Present 2007/08	Proposed 08/09
Engine size under 1549cc	n/a	£170
Engine size over 1549cc but under 2L	n/a	£260
Engine size over 2L	n/a	£330

- Local Authority Parking Enforcement (LAPE)

A new table was presented to include one additional new approved bid: X1746 – Consultancy for review of Shopmobility services in 2008/09 of £7,500 leaving a surplus of £205,200 rather than the £212,700 in the published report.

- An additional table was presented referring to the footnote about the Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV) funding consultancy projects with a corresponding change in the amount of funding to £504,000 and not the £375,000 referred to in the published report:

Cambridge City Council led (and joint) Consultancy Projects - to be 2007/08		
Study	City / Joint	Value £
Monitoring effects of growth (link in with quality of life indicators and SHMA follow-up work)	Joint with SCDC & County	20,000
GIS integration across County, City, South Cambs	Joint with SCDC & County	118,000
Legal support for planning process / S106 - urgent legal support on new applications and in preparing S106 agreements for the growth sites on the City fringes and Northstowe	Joint with SCDC & County	65,000
Legal advice on procurement to set up framework contract for legal advice to support S106 implementation	City	12,000
Surface water drainage and SUDS consultancy advice on design and health and safety aspects of planning applications for the Southern Fringe and NW Cambridge	Joint with SCDC	10,000
SUDS adoption - Best practice advice and to develop a policy position for the Council on SUDS adoption and maintenance	City	20,000
Open Space Management	City	25,000
Arboricultural Database	City	10,000
Consultancy work looking at planning for childrens services in Cambridge East – this is proposed currently to be part funded by the Local Authorities and part by Marshall. A financial contribution could be made to the LA element of this	Joint with SCDC & County	TBC
Advice on environmental impact assessments submitted as part of the major sites applications	Joint with SCDC	50,000
Advice on retail impact assessments submitted as part of the major sites applications and to provide baseline information	Joint with SCDC & County	50,000
Community Facilities technical expertise and business assessments - develop and design briefs, specs and business cases for facilities in Northstowe and City Fringes sites.	Joint with SCDC	20,000
Air Quality study - to advise on future impact of growth on air quality	Joint with SCDC	32,000
Member training for Joint Development Control Committees	Joint with SCDC & County	15,000
Environmental Health Consultancy	City	5,000
Sports Centre Management Studies	City	2,000
Legal costs of Section 106	City	30,000
Environmental Health GIS link	City	20,000
Grand Total		504,000

Members then considered the report and the tabled amendments.

Councillor Kightley referred to Appendix G of the officer report and asked why there was such a large carry over in the capital expenditure for cycle ways. Why was there no progress with schemes such as the one for Madingley Road?

The Head of Planning Policy and Projects said that there was a major transport strategy for Madingley Road and so it was not wise to spend money there now on cycleways. Two to three years time was a more likely time frame.

Councillor Kightley expressed concerns whether the money would be wasted.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth suggested that, as the prioritising was done by the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) that this issue be raised at their meeting later in the month by Councillor Baker who is the City's main representative on the AJC.

The Executive Councillor then asked for views on a matter of principle from the Committee. Should the money for projects described as "on-going" be kept or should there be a 5-year limit and then a review.

The Chair suggested that the Executive Councillor keep this under review.

The Accountant informed the Committee that a report was going to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee which would recommend that all such projects be reviewed in 2010/11.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/11 **NON KEY DECISION Affordable Housing
Supplementary Planning Document** *(see also record
of decision 08/ENV/07)*

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report. He said that provision of affordable housing was one of the biggest challenges to the future well being of the UK as a whole and for Cambridge residents in particular. He then tabled a revised Appendix A which was a summary of all the representations received on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) along with officer assessment of these. He also pointed out an error on page 52 of 57. There was no funding guarantee for the Cambridge Challenge so paragraph 57 had been amended.

Councillor Kightley questioned that and the Planning Policy Manager responded by quoting from an email from Community Services:

“Re Delivery Mechanisms

It’s just the Housing Corporation whilst supporting Cambridge Partnerships Limited (BPHA) for a 5-year programme are not committing themselves to fund the 3 sites. What they have said is that BPHA will have no competition from other RSLs for grant on these sites. What they have said is the BPHA will have to bid through the normal process as all the other RSLs do; they are not going to get any special treatment. The Housing Corporation are not top slicing any funding from their pot for BPHA and these 3 sites.

However, saying all this, it is unlikely that they won’t give grant to the schemes, but they have to be competitive otherwise they won’t.”

Councillor Newbold referred to the additional representations and to the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee in July where the following had been agreed:

“Agreed Mix of Affordable Housing

39. The agreed affordable housing mix in each development will address local need in terms of its:

- Provision of social rented and intermediate housing.
- Provision of affordable supported housing.
- Provision of flats and family houses categorised by number of bedrooms.

The City Council resolves to achieve 75% social rented housing on qualifying sites in accordance with the provisions of the Cambridge Housing Strategy except as may otherwise be indicated by Annex 2 of this SPD.”

Councillor Newbold tabled proposed additional text with reference to paragraph 43 (Definition of Affordable Housing & Types) and Annex 7 (Glossary) of the draft Affordable Housing SPD. These related to Co-operative Housing, Co-operatives and Mutual Home Ownership.

The Chair asked that the minute show that the Committee broadly supported Councillor Newbold’s enthusiasm in pursuing this matter but that the points he made were more suitable for consideration of policy development in relation to the Housing portfolio holder whose decisions are scrutinised at Community Services Scrutiny Committee.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/12 NON KEY DECISION Cambridge East Area Action Plan (see *also record of decision 08/ENV/08*)

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 Appendix B Cambridge East Area Action Plan incorporating the Inspector's binding changes be considered despite not being made publicly available five clear days prior to the meeting.

The reason why the appendix had not been available beforehand was because it had not been received from the Inspector in time.

The Planning Policy Manager said that much work still remained to be done with South Cambs. Whenever the project began, there was a 20-year development programme of building. He alerted members to the changed maps on display in the committee room.

Councillor Newbold said that the Labour Group had made representations to the Inspector especially with regard to the need for a robust transport base. The transport authority had not brought detailed plans to the Inspector and had delayed publication of these until after the publication of the Inspector's report.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth congratulated the officer team on all their work on the AAP. She said that all needed to be vigilant on transport issues.

The Director of Environment and Planning said that the growth of the city allowed the possibility of addressing the transport and affordable housing issues and making the city accessible.

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

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the recommendations.

08/ENV/13 NON KEY DECISION **Appointment of Historic Environment Champion** *(see also record of decision 08/ENV/09)*

The Scrutiny Committee agreed the appointment of Councillor J Rosenstiel as Historic Environment Champion.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth agreed the appointment.

The meeting ended at 11.55am.

Chair
