

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

**ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**THURSDAY 21 JANUARY 2016 AT 10.00AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Nedved (Chairman), Councillors Bloxham (as substitute for Councillor Mitchelson), Bowditch, Caig, Christian, Dodd and Ms Franklin.

**ALSO PRESENT** Councillor Glover – Leader  
Councillor Mrs Martlew – Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Paton – Petitioner  
Mr Kenyon – Lead Officer, Infrastructure Planning, Cumbria County Council

**OFFICERS:** Deputy Chief Executive  
Director of Economic Development  
Director of Local Environment  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

**EEOSP.01/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Betton and Mitchelson.

**EEOSP.02/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest affecting the business to be transacted at the meeting.

**EEOSP.03/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

**EEOSP.04/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2015 had been circulated.

The Panel were given updates on the following recommendations from the minutes:

*That the issue of Dog Fouling Street Counts in the rural are be raised with the Neighbourhood Enforcement Team.*

The Director of Local Environment assured Members that the rural area received regular patrols and enforcement. The work being undertaken in rural areas would be highlighted in the next Clean Up Carlisle Update.

### *Cost of Crindledyke Cycleway*

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder confirmed that the information was publically available and would be circulated to Members. She added that the cycleway would be constructed in keeping with the nature reserve when it reached that area.

### *Car parking overstay by 10 minutes*

The Director of Local Environment confirmed that the enforcement for car parking was in line with legal requirements and the ten minute waiting time had been programmed into the hand held ticket machines.

### *Memorandum of Understanding with the County Council*

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder reported that the terms for Memorandum of Understanding with the County Council had been agreed. The meeting with the Chairman of the Highways Committee had been very productive and the City Engineer and the Legal Services Manager had worked very hard to finalise the document, she thanked both of them for their work. She added that the document would be made available for Members as soon as it was signed and available.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meetings held on 29 October and 26 November 2015 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

### **EEOSP.05/16 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS**

There were no items which had been the subject of call-in.

### **EEOSP.06/16 STREET CLEANING PETITION**

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Paton to the meeting. An excerpt from Councillor Paton's petition and a report by the Director of Local Environment (LE.01/16) had been circulated for consideration.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder introduced Mr Bowley, the new Neighbourhood Services Manager.

Councillor Paton submitted a petition to the Environment and Economy Panel which complained about the fly tipping and rubbish which was being discarded on the streets and pavements, and in some cases being left for weeks before the Council removed it. The petition signatories wanted to be proud of their area and keep it clean and tidy and not have to worry about vermin and disease.

Councillor Paton congratulated the Council on the cleaning up of disregarded rubbish in the Botcherby Ward but felt it was 'ironic' that rubbish had to be reported before any action was taken. He informed the Panel that the Council had addressed some fly tipping in the area and within half an hour of the clean up more fly tipping had occurred and rubbish had been left in cuts. He felt that this was unacceptable and, although he understood that it was difficult to catch people, he felt that the Council treated Botcherby as unimportant.

Councillor Paton informed the Panel that dog fouling was a major problem and he wanted something to be done to rectify the issue. He suggested that instead of issuing

perpetrators with a fine they should be made to clean up the entire area of the incident as a deterrent to others.

Councillor Paton submitted several photographs of a variety of areas within the Botcherby Ward which highlighted the dog fouling, litter, weeds and blocked gully issues. He strongly believed that harsher punishment would improve the situation. His petition had been signed by a number of visitors to the City and he felt it was important that their signatures were taken into account as tourism needed to be encouraged and this level of dog fouling and rubbish was bad for the city.

Councillor Paton then read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Betton, Ward Member for Botcherby, emphasising that the comments were Councillor Betton's views not his own.

Councillor Betton's statement highlighted the Director of Local Environment's report which drew attention to the successful work of the Council. He felt that the continuous dog fouling and rubbish on school routes and play areas did not tie up with the report. He had reported the issues but they were still there. The statement said there was rubbish, fly tipping and glass in the park areas along with rubbish in the gutters. He asked that the Panel request that the Executive direct more resources to treat the Botcherby Ward as it deserved to be treated. The photographs that had been submitted showed that the Council's claims to be carrying out good work were not true. Councillor Betton felt that the recent clean up in Botcherby was a 'white wash' and the information provided in the report was about two specific areas not the whole Ward. The statement finished by reminding the Panel that the City Council had a statutory responsibility to keep Carlisle clean and it was unacceptable for a clean up to take place just because of a Panel meeting.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Paton for his presentation and commented that a great deal of the problem occurred as a result of irresponsible dog owners and fly tipping, both of which were a drain on public resources.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder responded that Councillor Betton's comments stating that Botcherby did not matter was untrue, it was some of the residents of the area who did not have respect for the area they lived in. Education and enforcement was the way forward in tackling these issues but there needed to be strong evidence to issue Fixed Penalty Notices or to prosecute. The Council did a good job but there needed to be more done by residents to keep their own Ward clean.

The Portfolio Holder commented that she had recently visited the Botcherby Ward and there was a noticeable difference in the cleanliness of different areas. The Council was trying to address the problem but they needed the public and Ward Councillors to encourage residents to be more socially aware of what they were doing and the impact on the Ward. She added that certain areas in the Botcherby Ward received more attention than other parts of the City.

The Director of Local Environment drew attention to the petition which had not specified a particular Ward so her response had been with regard to the whole City. The Clean Up Carlisle campaign introduced cleaning operators, education and enforcement and the Panel had received regular updates on the campaign.

During the recent floods the litter and mobile teams had remained on their usual tasks, however, the street cleaning machines had been redirected to the flood recovery operation. The street cleaning team now had a programme to catch up on the street cleaning and the photographs supplied by Councillor Paton enabled the street cleaning

teams to target problem areas. She added that photographs demonstrated that the litter levels were good apart from certain areas which were mainly on grassed areas. This problem occurred as street cleaning machines could not operate on the grass and this would be better co-ordinated in future.

The Director of Local Environment agreed that the current standards of street cleanliness were lower than normal due to the flood recovery period and work had begun to rectify this. The street cleaning was carried out in regular cycles and Botcherby had a weekly mobile team. The clean up on Monday had taken the area to grade A, unfortunately some areas had returned to grade C within two days. This was not an operational issue but it was an educational issue. The Council was working hard to bring the whole of Carlisle back up to the standard it had been enjoying for the previous three years. She summed up by informing the Panel that there had been a lot of investment in new technology and the 'Billy Goat' machines would address areas that had been highlighted in Councillor Paton's photographs.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that an audit of the clean-up programme was being undertaken to enable the resources to be prioritised. He added that the team relied on intelligence to follow up on education and enforcement. He reiterated that the team was currently catching up on work following the floods and additional resources had been brought in to help with the leaf clean up and had been retained for the flood recovery,

Councillor Paton thanked officers for the information but felt that more could be done to bring about harsher enforcement. He suggested working with the judicial system to impose stronger punishment for offenders as a deterrent and felt cleaning the whole area was appropriate.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder responded that the Council issued statutory fines as enforcement, if the fines are not paid the process moved to the Magistrates Court. Any changes to enforcement would have to be carried out at a national level.

A Member suggested that the Local Government Association be the appropriate organisation to discuss suggestions for changes to statutory enforcement.

In considering the petition and officer's report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member commented that the photographs showed there was a problem with detritus in the area and the weed issues contributed to the problem.
- The City had a number of hot spots where fly tipping was a recurring problem; could investment in CCTV or a media campaign help?

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder understood the issues with the fly tipping hot spots and reassured the Panel that the team took the issue very seriously, however, fly tipping took a lot of time to investigate. One issue the authority had was the expectation that the Council would clear fly tipping from private land. The Council only had the resources to clear areas that they were responsible for.

The Director of Local Environment explained that strict protocols under the RIPA Act had to be adhered to use surveillance and CCTV would also bring issues regarding

maintenance, funding, potential damage to equipment and software issues. She added that the City did not have a lot of fly tipping in comparison to other Cities.

- A Member commented that the Council would not be able to clear fly tipping if they were not informed about it, it had to be reported.
- The Panel was disappointed that the Ward Councillor for Botcherby, and Member of this Panel, had not attended to present his statement in person.
- A Member understood that there were national standards for street cleansing which the Council could strive to achieve. How confident was the authority that the City could achieve national standards?

The Director of Local Environment responded that the national indicators were no longer in place for street cleansing, however, the team continued to use the methodology for street cleaning in the city. Work was underway to produce a mobile application that would enable better mapping of areas to allow the prioritisation of resources. The authority continued to look at new innovative ways to target resources to maintain high standards.

She explained that the Council had undertaken several campaigns to educate and enforce dog fouling offenders; the current campaign was 'we are watching you' which had proved to be successful in other areas. There was also a school education programme and advice sessions were held in the city centre.

The Deputy Leader and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder added that any prosecutions were also published as a deterrent to others.

- The Panel had recently completed a Litter Bin Task and Finish Group, had the litter bins in the Botcherby Ward been considered or moved as a result of this work?

The Director of Local Environment responded that the team was in the process of implementing the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group. There would be an annual review of the litter bins which would look at their location, type, size and usage. There were 700 litter bins in Carlisle and 200 of them had been recently upgraded.

Councillor Paton thanked Members and officers for their positive response to the petition.

RESOLVED –1) That the petition submitted by Councillor Paton and report LE.01/16 be noted.

2) That the next Clean up Carlisle report include an update on fly tipping, the Litter Bin Task and Finish Group recommendations and the Rapid Response Team.

## **EEOSP.07/16 NEW INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FOR CUMBRIA**

The Chairman welcomed Mr Kenyon, Lead Officer, Infrastructure Planning, Cumbria County Council to the meeting.

Mr Kenyon gave an overview of the major infrastructure projects that were taking place in Cumbria which included the Moorside Power Station (NuGen), North West Coast Connections (National Grid) and the Dumfries and Galloway Strategic Reinforcement (Scottish Power Energy Networks).

Mr Kenyon detailed the principals of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) which included an application to the Planning Inspectorate, a decision by the Secretary of State, local authorities' consultation process and Planning Performance Agreements.

#### *Moorside Power Station*

Mr Kenyon presented a diagram of the proposed nuclear reactors which would be built at Moorside and a map of their location. There would be a significant impact on the workforce with a projected requirement of 6,500 workers at peak construction time. There also had to be associated sites in the application to accommodate the workers. This would have a big impact on the area and potential legacy benefits.

The power station site would have a new railway station and a marine off loading facility, the power station had a rail led strategy to move workers to the site and a legacy benefit would be the retention of the railway station on completion.

There had been one round of formal consultation and the County Council had responded with key issues including transport, skills and supply chain, issues with the associated development sites, impact on services, waste, emergency planning, contribute positively and cumulative impacts. Mr Kenyon detailed the NuGen timetable which saw the first reactor operational in 2024. The presentation included a diagram of the NuGen engagement and NuGen's analysis of the consultation feedback.

#### *North West Coast Connections*

Mr Kenyon gave a detailed overview of the purpose of the project which connected Moorside and increased the capacity of the transmission line in West Cumbria. The route corridor started in Harker and followed the west coast down to Morecombe Bay where it would connect to Heysham via a tunnel under Morecambe Bay.

Mr Kenyon outlined the programme for the project which planned to have the Development Consent Order granted in late 2018. The project would potentially have an impact visually, ecology, and on transport as well as social and economic impacts. The County Council responses had made it clear that there would be a need to make local jobs and opportunities for local businesses.

The presentation showed the three alternative pylon designs, one of which was much larger than the existing pylons. The physical mitigation issues included the routing of the line, screening and landscaping, rationalisation of overhead lines, alternative pylon designs, undergrounding and compensation for damage. The social and economic mitigation issues included job opportunities and training, supply chain, engagement with local business and the impact of the incoming workforce.

#### *Dumfries and Galloway Strategic Reinforcement*

Mr Kenyon reported that the purpose of the project was to replace ageing assets, increase capability of transmission, integration of new generation and to enable cross border electricity distribution. The programme for the project ended with the operation of the new grid in 2023.

#### *Cumbria Infrastructure Plan*

Mr Kenyon informed the Panel that the Cumbria Infrastructure Plan was being developed by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and would include the strategic infrastructure, map growth, stakeholder commitments, identify and prioritise schemes and plan with businesses cases.

Mr Kenyon outlined the emerging infrastructure priorities and informed the Panel that the County Council had produced a Skill Plan which focused on Science, Technology, Engineer and Maths subjects.

He summed up by informing the Panel of the legacy benefits that the County wanted from the projects which included improved transport links, local jobs, training, support for local businesses, work with minerals and waste, an ecological mitigation plan, housing regeneration and social care and education.

The Chairman thanked Mr Kenyon for his detailed presentation commenting that it brought into focus the scale of the infrastructure projects in the County.

In considering Mr Kenyon's presentation Members raised the following comments and questions:

- How sustainable would the jobs created during the projects be?

Mr Kenyon responded that a large number of the jobs would be construction based. NuGen had stated that there would be 6,500 jobs at the peak of the build and 1,000 jobs to operate the power station. This would be a huge demand on skills and the operation of the power station would be long term permanent jobs.

- A Member commented that the consultation process was not the same as the democratic process. He asked how Councillors could input into the decision making process.

Mr Kenyon explained that the legal process for a Development Consent Order required developers to formally consult local authorities. The developers had to show how they took on board consultation responses and how they shaped the development. Cumbria County Council had formulated a formal response to the consultation and this had been taken through the Cabinet. The Government had a National Planning Strategy which stated where certain development areas, such as the power station, would be. The principle of the power station was pre set by Government.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that the Government made the deliberate decision to identify development areas to speed up the planning process on sites of national importance.

- When Sellafied was being built the local communities campaigned with BNFL to have local jobs, at the time the campaign was not successful. How could local authorities ensure that jobs were available for local people along with training and supply chains to local businesses?

Mr Kenyon agreed that local jobs and local businesses were very important and the County Council had prepared a legacy document to shape the projects to ensure this happened.

- The plan for the power station showed the cooling tunnels in the sea, was there any chance of contamination from the warmed water which was returned to the sea?
- The Ward Member for Harker expressed concerns regarding the visual impact of the pylons for the North West Coast Connections Project. Residents had been consulted

but they had felt their concerns were not being listened to. He asked if the cabling could be placed underground to minimise the visual impact to the area.

Mr Kenyon sympathised with residents of the Harker area as there would be an increased visual impact from the project. There was a strategy to find alternative ways to connect the cabling where pylons were unacceptable. The underground options had a dramatic impact to the area during installation and cost ten times more than the pylons. He agreed the underground cabling was more resilient but it was far more difficult to repair. The three pylons all had their own benefits, the 'T' pylon had a cleaner look but some people had complained that the column looked like a wind turbine.

- How advanced was the infrastructure in the County to cope with the projects?

Mr Kenyon responded that all of the developers had to demonstrate how they would move freight and workers. NuGen had identified rail as the option and would build new stations and invest in new trains. The concern was how they would ensure workers used the trains.

The Director of Economic Development added that the Local Enterprise Partnership had included Carlisle Station as a priority as the gateway to the north west and there would be improvements to the rail link between Carlisle and Barrow in Furness.

- Was there anything in the public domain regarding an independent review of the design and safety of the power station?

Mr Kenyon explained that NuGen had to obtain licences and undergo assessments of the design to prove safety. Planning authorities did not get to input on that process but there would be information available on the Environment Agency and Office for Nuclear Regulation websites.

RESOLVED –That Mr Kenyon be thanked for informative presentation and professional response to Members questions.

## **EEOSP.08/16      UPDATE ON THE CARLISLE ECONOMIC POTENTIAL REPORT**

The Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Economic Development gave a verbal update on the Carlisle Economic Potential report.

The Deputy Chief Executive reminded the Panel of the background to the Carlisle Economic Partnership (CEP) and its focus on development projects to meet the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) priorities and focus on local need.

He detailed the key issues arising which included working age population issues, skill and academic attainment, comparative low wage economy, geographic perceptions, self-sustaining economy and relative low cost development.

The Director of Economic Development detailed the key projects of the CEP and LEP:

### *Adoption of a sound and progressive Local Plan*

The Planning Inspector had finished the public examination of the Local Plan and there had been no major issues, the overall response had been very positive and some minor modifications would be made. It was important to adopt the Local Plan as it was the

building block to give developers confidence that Carlisle was the place to do business and to support local growth.

#### *Development of Carlisle South, urban extension and employment opportunities*

The development had been included in the Local Plan. Funding from the HCA had been secured to carry out a master plan and Capita would design appropriate road infrastructure to link to the Northern Relief Road and the Motorway. She added that a cross party working group may be required for this work.

#### *City Centre Developments*

##### *Citadel*

Cumbria County Council would vacate the Citadel and surrounding offices when their new build was completed. A development brief was being prepared to present to the LEP but it was very early days with regard the future use of the building.

##### *Public Realm*

The public realm was a central part of the economic partnership and making the city centre in particular easy to use.

#### *Carlisle Ambassadors*

The Ambassadors were part of the economic strategy to raise the profile of Carlisle by making businesses part of the Partnership to promote Carlisle.

#### *Transport hub development activity*

The need to improve the railway links and Carlisle Station had been identified as a key priority for the LEP.

#### *Carlisle Airport developments*

The airport was important not only to Carlisle but to the economy for the Borders. Stobart were working on investment opportunities to develop the route and the Council was working with them.

#### *Kingmoor Park Enterprise Zone*

The details for the Zone being considered included a Local Development Order and business rate and capital investment opportunities.

#### *Kingstown Industrial Estate developments*

The project was moving forward and details regarding the future management of the Industrial Estate and opportunities to grow the Estate and income would come through the scrutiny process.

#### *Durranhill redevelopment*

Funding had been received from the LEP to carry out infrastructure improvements within the industrial estate.

#### *Rosehill development*

H&S were now responsible for the car park and a planning application was expected from them in the near future with regard to the development of the Pioneer site, car park and business units. Carlisle needed a range of facilities for businesses and this development fit in with that requirement.

The Deputy Chief Executive outlined the next steps and the new project development which included the continuation to complete key projects, development of a new range of regeneration and development capital and revenue projects. These included Caldew

Riverside, workforce productivity and health, city skills development and ongoing economic monitoring.

In considering the presentation Members raised the following comments and questions:

- The City Centre developments included retail development in the Rickergate area, how had the recent flood affected this?

The Director of Economic Development responded that the Local Plan was obliged to allocate a site for retail development. Should the development go ahead in the Rickergate area developers would have to make the development resilient to floods. It would add additional costs to the development but the Director believed that a developer would be prepared to make that investment if it was the right site for them.

- Who owned the Citadel?

The Director of Economic Development explained that it was very early days for the future of the Citadel and discussions were taking place as to whether the County Council would retain ownership.

Members felt strongly that the Citadel buildings be retained as they were a tourist attraction within the City.

- A Member highlighted the 4,000 planning permissions for new housing units that the Council gave in 2014. He felt it was important for the Panel to take into account the fact that the Council granted the permissions but there were issues with the number of actual units built.
- In terms of a self-sustaining economy what would attract higher earners to come and live in the City?

The Deputy Chief Executive responded that there were no barriers to stop higher earners living within the City; it had a lot to offer. Senior Officers of the Council who lived out with the City did so because of family commitments and not because of the City.

- Had there been any thought as to how to achieve economic growth without the need to draw people into the City?

The Director of Economic Development stated that there were opportunities to grow the City through improved technology and upskills but ultimately the City would still require people.

- Had potential combined authorities been taken into account with the CEP?

The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that it had been taken into account and should it come forward it would radically change the CEP focus.

- A Member commented that for future updates it would be beneficial to highlight the changes within the review document.

RESOLVED –That the Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Economic Development be thanked for their presentation.

## **EEOSP.09/16      OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.03/16 providing an overview of matters relative to the work of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer reported that the last Notice of Executive Key Decisions had been published on 14 December 2015, included the 2016/17 Budget Process (KD.33/15) which had been considered by the Panel at their last meeting.

The Panel's Work Programme was attached to the report and Members were asked to note and/or amend the Programme as they saw fit.

The Panel agreed that the Skills Audit Task and Finish Group be established after the completion of the County Council's Skills Plan to reduce any duplication of work.

The Chairman had suggested that a Flood Task and Finish Group be established to consider any future response to the flood and to investigate any possible ways that the Council could influence flood prevention measures. The Panel agreed and asked that the Task and Fish Group also look at the Council's first response to the flood and take away any lessons learned.

At the request of the Deputy Chief Executive the Panel agreed to take the Rethinking Waste Project report in March and the Clean Up Carlisle report in April.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report (OS.03/16) incorporating the Work Programme and Notice of Executive Key Decision items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2) That an outline scoping document for the Flood Task and Finish Group be prepared to enable the Panel to consider how to proceed with the Group.

3) That the Carlisle South Masterplan and the Rethinking Waste Project be considered by the Panel in March and the Update on Clean Up Carlisle be considered by the Panel in April.

(The meeting ended at 12.50pm)