

ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY PANEL

27 FEBRUARY 2020 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Brown (Chair), Councillors, Glover (as substitute for Councillor Rodgers), Mrs McKerrell, Meller, Mitchelson, and Patrick (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Atkinson).

**ALSO
PRESENT:** Councillor J Mallinson – Leader
Councillor Ellis – Deputy Leader and Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder
Councillor Christian – Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder
Councillor Nedved – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder

OFFICERS: Corporate Director of Economic Development
Policy and Communications Manager
Neighbourhood Services Manager
Team Manager - Parking and Enforcement
Policy and Performance Officer
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

EGSP.08/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs Atkinson, Denholm, Paton and Rodgers.

EGSP.09/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest submitted.

EGSP.10/20 PUBLIC AND PRESS

It was agreed that the items of business in Part A be dealt with in public and Part B be dealt with in private.

EGSP.11/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED – It was noted that Council, at its meeting on 7 January 2020, received and adopted the minutes of the meetings held on 17 October and 28 November 2019. The Chair signed the minutes.

EGSP.12/20 CALL IN OF DECISIONS

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

EGSP.13/20 BORDERLANDS INCLUSIVE GROWTH DEAL / KEY PROJECTS

The Corporate Director of Economic Development submitted report ED.08/20 which provided an update on the progress of the Borderlands Inclusive Growth Deal and the Key Projects associated.

The report detailed developments in relation to the following projects: the Station Regeneration; Citadels; Caldew Riverside, and the Place project and the Corporate Director advised the following:

- Station Gateway Project – The second stage of consultation had been embarked upon and consultants had been appointed to assess the responses. The consultation feedback would be used to inform the development of the Full Business Case for the project, which was the mechanism for drawing down the necessary funding.
- Citadels – The land was jointly owned by the City and County Councils. Consultants had recently been appointed to develop the Business Case for the project.
- Caldew Riverside – The Council was working with Homes England in relation to the remediation of the site which had formerly been a gas works.
- Place Project – Analysis of the evidence base indicated that Longtown best met the criteria, however, assessment was ongoing.
- Future High Street Fund (FHSF) – was focussed on the high street and had a tighter physical boundary than the Place Project.

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

- Would the £15M earmarked for the Station Project cover all works associated with the project or would match funding be required?

The Corporate Director advised that match funding was being sought to assist with the delivery of the project, and discussion had commenced with Avanti the operator of the West Coast mainline franchise.

In response to a further question from the Member regarding the total cost of the project, the Corporate Director advised that the scheme would be delivered in a phased way, she set out the processes the Borderland Partnership had to undertake to draw down funding from government.

The Panel noted the dual ownership of land at the Station site and sought assurance that all parties involved were signed up to the vision of the project and were committed to its delivery.

The Corporate Director advised that work had been undertaken to ensure that all parties were aware of the project, its scope and vision.

The Deputy Leader and Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder further added that he and the Leader of the Council had set up a cross authority group to aid communication between the two Council's on the project.

A number of Members emphasised the importance of the project to the front of the station, as well as the provision any additional car parking to the rear, which they considered an important gateway to the city.

- Was the methodology used in the Place Programme stipulated by government?

The Corporate Director confirmed that the Borderlands Partnership had agreed a methodology across its area for the development of Outline Business Case for the Place Programme, central government had set out the methodology to be used for the submission of strategic business cases.

A Member asked whether town(s) not selected to be part of the programme would have the opportunity to take part in other schemes.

The Corporate Director indicated that those town(s) would be able to participate in other schemes, subject to meeting their criteria. In response to a question from the Member regarding, the membership of the board of the Towns Fund, the Corporate Director undertook to circulate the membership list to the Panel.

The Deputy Leader and Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder noted that there had recently been a presentation on the proposals related to the FHSF, which he felt Members would benefit from seeing. The Corporate Director undertook to circulate the presentation to the Panel.

- Would the FHSF encourage empty properties to be used for non-retail purposes, for example as places to live?

The Corporate Director stated that the matter had been discussed and it was recognised that modern high streets were not exclusively for retail premises. In terms of the city she noted that there was a lack of desirable, modern office facilities, it was important that a variety of uses were included to maintain the vitality of the high street.

The Panel considered a number of areas in the district which acted as high street for its locality and question whether such areas were eligible for the fund.

The Corporate Director advised that the fund applied to a strict geographical area only, which had been determined by central government.

The Panel discussed the importance of variety on the high street as well as providing support for areas outside of the city centre where trade and retail services were provided.

- Was it likely that recent changes to ministerial personnel would impact the Station Gateway Project?

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder stated that there was no indication that the project would be affected by the change in government personnel. Moreover, local MPs were very supportive and engaged with projects which were now in the process of development.

- Would the University be able to relocate to a single site as part of the Citadels Project?

The Corporate Director explained that the University had contributed funds to the development of the citadels business case, which in her view demonstrated the organisation's commitment to relocating to another site. Consultants had been appointed to draw up the business case as part of which accommodation for the university would be considered.

- How confident were Officers that effective remediation was able to be carried out at the Caldew Riverside site?

The Corporate Director advised that Homes England had been very positive in their approach and had funded a remediation study of the site. Once the study was completed consideration would be given on the drawing down of funds to address the issue identified at the site. Ideas for the future use of the site were at an embryonic stage.

Responding to a further question from the Member regarding the flood resilience of the site, the Corporate Director was of the view that flooding did not preclude development of a particular

site, however, it was essential that any structures were designed in such a way as would mitigate flood risk.

- A Member commented that the report set out a number of projects, each of which had exacting timescales, he asked how confident the Council was that all the elements would be delivered?

The Corporate Director acknowledged the scale of the projects being developed, she highlighted the importance of clear and broad communication for securing buy-in to the projects, and various organisations understanding their responsibilities in relation to each.

The Chair noted that the bidding for funds was via a competitive process, she asked what gave Carlisle advantage over other areas bidding for the same funds.

The Corporate Director responded that the authority had a good working relationship with ministers and civil servants in central government, as well as having a good reputation for delivering on projects which would stand the authority's bids in good stead. However, she recognised that it was unlikely that all the bids would be successful.

RESOLVED – 1 That report ED.08/20 be received.

2) That the Corporate Director of Economic Development circulate the following items to the Panel:

- The Membership of the Towns Fund Board;
- The Future High Streets Funds proposal presentation.

EGSP.14/20 CITY CENTRE BUSINESS SUPPORT

The Corporate Director of Economic Development submitted report ED.04/20 which provided an overview of the provisions of the proposed City Centre Business Support Fund. She highlighted that whilst Carlisle's city centre vacancy rate was below the national average it was prudent to anticipate potential vulnerabilities.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder commented that the Fund consisted of a tangible set of proposals which aimed to keep Carlisle as the sub-regional high street hub.

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

- The Chair asked whether areas outside of the City Centre such as Denton Holme were able to apply to the Fund.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder responded that due to limited resources, the fund was only accessible to city centre businesses currently. However, he also viewed the scheme as a pilot, were it to be successful consideration would be given to rolling it out to other areas.

- How was the fund to be publicised?

The Corporate Director stated that information would be available on the Council's website. Responding to a further question from a Member on the criteria used for assessing applications to the fund, the Corporate Director undertook to circulate them to the Panel.

- Was the city centre a defined area?

The Corporate Director confirmed that from a statutory point of view the city centre was a clearly defined area.

The Panel discussed the potential for a Business Improvement District (BID) in the city, noting the importance of the business community leading on the matter, and reflecting upon the lessons learned from the previous, unsuccessful attempt to create a BID in the city.

RESOLVED 1) That the provisions of the City Centre Business Support Fund be noted.

2) That the allocation of £40,000 from the 2020/21 budget to the City Centre Business Fund be noted.

EGSP.15/20 FREE AFTER THREE PARKING TRIAL

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder presented report CS.08/20 which provided an update on the Free After Three parking trial. The scheme comprised three car parks: Castle, Caldew Riverside and Viaduct and had initially been set to conclude on 31 March 2020. At its meeting of 10 February 2020, the Executive took the decision to extend the duration of the trial to 31 August 2020, the reasons for which were detailed in the report.

The Team Manager - Parking and Enforcement summarised the estimated financial impact of the trial, the analysis of which considered not only the loss of income from the car parks included in the trial, but also the loss of income caused by user drift i.e. car park users changing from non-trial car parks to those included in the scheme to take advantage of the free alternative.

Consultation on the trial had taken place at the beginning of the scheme, and in relation to the extension of the trial. The level of responses received was not sufficient to form any clear views on the effectiveness of the trial as yet, and further views were to be sought both from users of the trial and businesses in the city centre to ascertain whether any economic benefit had been derived from the scheme.

Monitoring and evaluation of the scheme would continue so as to understand its impact, the Executive would be asked to consider options for the future of the trial later in the year. The report outlined some other potential parking initiatives that may be tested and developed in the future.

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

- A number of Members noted that there seemed to be some confusion relating to the scheme with car park users paying to use facilities when it was not necessary or not being clear on which car parks were included in the trial.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager acknowledged there was some confusion amongst users, despite extensive advertising including signage installed at the ticket machines of the car parks included in the scheme.

A Member commented that they had witnessed users paying for tickets after 3pm in car parks in the trial, she asked whether it was possible for that to be prevented, by for example turning off the relevant ticket machines.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that there may be resource implications to turning the machine off, i.e. a member of staff would be required to attend each site to do that. He undertook to look at ways to effectively prevent users paying for the facility when it was not necessary.

Members expressed their support for the extension of the trial as it would enable the Council to more clearly understand the impact of the scheme.

Support for the other potential parking initiatives was also expressed by the Panel.

RESOLVED 1) That report CS.08/2 be noted.

2) That the Panel supported the extension of the Free After Three parking trial.

3) That the Panel supported the investigation of other parking initiatives detailed in the report.

The Panel adjourned from 11:40am and reconvened at 11:45am

EGSP.16/20 LOCAL ENVIRONMENT (CLIMATE CHANGE) STRATEGY

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted report PC.09/20 which set out the background and context within which the draft Local Environment (Climate Change) Strategy was being developed.

The Policy and Communications Manager provided an overview of the various local authority partnership groups and the work undertaken by the Council, he emphasised the importance of countywide planning, action and joint working in achieving the best results in relation to climate change.

Selecting the methodology for carbon accounting going forward had proved challenging: effectively there were two models, production and consumption accounting. The Policy and Communications Manager summarised each and noted that it was feasible for both models to be used in tandem, however it was important to ensure that double counting of carbon did not take place.

The process for consulting on the draft Strategy along with the timetable for its progress through the Council's democratic processes was explained.

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions and comments:

- A Member commented that the timetable for consultation appeared disjointed, he noted that the matter was not scheduled to be submitted to the Panel again.

The Policy and Communications Manager responded that should the Panel wish to scrutinise the matter again it was able to be added to its Work Programme. He added that the Strategy was an aspect of emerging work for the authority, it was intended be a working document that would respond to the evolving understanding of responses to climate change. Moreover, the Strategy would be submitted to Full Council for approval.

The Member added that he had been a member of the Council's Working Group which contributed to the development of the Strategy, however, he had not been advised that a draft document had been completed.

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder apologised for the quicker than anticipated emergence of the Strategy, he had felt that it was important that the matter be progressed, therefore he had instructed Officers to formulate and consult on the draft Strategy. He appreciated the Member's comments regarding the Working Group and indicated his intention to reform the body in the future.

The Member thanked the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder for his comments and stated that he felt it was incumbent upon all Councillors to support the Strategy.

- Would a Citizen's Jury be a useful method for consulting on the Strategy?

The Policy and Communications Manager advised that he was currently following a national Citizens' Assembly to assess the process, a Jury was a scaled down Assembly. The research he had undertaken on the Citizens' Assembly illustrated that they met over a number of weeks or months after which a report on their work was published. There was little information on the outcomes generated by the Juries.

The Corporate Director stated that the Council had a good track record of conducting consultations and it would do its best to ensure that the widest possible audience was reached.

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder added that the consultation, in addition to seeking views also sought to provide information to residents and businesses in the district about the Strategy.

The Panel discussed a number of issues relating to Climate Change: carbon capture; carbon off setting; the global recycling market, and the environmental impact of schemes which supported economic growth, and potential areas of challenge between the two.

- Referring to objective 2, a Member noted the timescale for working with developers to deliver sustainable housing developments was listed as long term, he asked whether the Council was able to impose the requirements of the Strategy on developers?

The Corporate Director responded that the Council was only able to ask developers to comply with the Strategy, it was not in a position to require compliance. However, there was Building Control legislation which stipulated standards within house building which developers had to adhere to.

- Which method of carbon accounting was the Council likely to adopt?

The Policy and Communications Manager gave an overview of the consumption and production methodologies. He considered that the production accounting model seemed most appropriate method of assessment for the Council's operations. It was noted that the Climate Emergency Motion adopted by the Council also stipulated a reduction in the carbon emission of the district. Consideration was being given to the most appropriate accounting mechanisms as it was important to avoid double counting.

RESOLVED – 1) That report PC.09/20 be received and welcomed.

2) That a report on the Local Environment (Climate Change) Strategy be submitted annually to the Panel for scrutiny.

EGSP.17/20 QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE REPORT 2019/20

The Policy and Performance Officer submitted PC.05/20 – Quarter 3 Performance Report 2019/20. The report contained the Quarter 2 performance against the current Service Standards and a summary of the Carlisle Plan 2015-18 actions as defined in the 'plan on a page'. Performance against the Panels' 2019/20 Key Performance Indicators were also included.

The Chairman asked how the Key Performance Indicators were agreed upon and revised.

The Policy and Performance Officer explained the current Key Performance Indicators had been agreed approximately three years ago via a Member Working Group and service planning, they were reviewed on an annual basis by Service Managers and Corporate Directors. Members were able to input into the process via the scrutiny process.

RESOLVED That report PC.05/20 be noted.

EGSP.18/20 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.04/20 which provided an overview of matters relating to the work of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel. The Panel's 2019/20 Work Programme had been attached to the report for consideration.

The report made reference to the most recent Notice of Executive Key Decisions (published on 7 February 2020), copies of which had been circulated to all Members and made available to the public on the Council's website. It noted that there was an item within the Panel's remit: *KD.02/20 - Grant Funding Agreement – Carlisle Southern Link Road, Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) Award*. The matter was to be considered by the Executive of 9 March 2020.

The Executive had also made available the Street Name and Numbering Policy to the Panel. The Panel indicated it did not wish to scrutinise the matter.

The Scrutiny Chairs Group had met on 23 January 2020 and asked that the notes be circulated to each Panel to allow for a discussion on the potential of reducing the number of Members on each Panel, how well the substitution system was working and the timing of meetings.

Member discussed the matter at length and appreciated there were several different approaches that may be implemented. The Chair suggested that the Scrutiny Chairs Group develop a list of options for scrutiny going forward for the Panel to consider. The Members indicated their assent.

EGSP.19/20 STANDING ORDERS

During discussion and pursuant to Council procedure Rule 9, The Chair moved and it was AGREED that the meeting should continue beyond three hours to enable the remaining business to be transacted.

With reference to the items on the Work Programme for the Panel's 9 April meeting, the Scrutiny Officer invited the Panel to set out areas it wished the reports to focus on.

St Cuthbert's Garden Village – housing allocations (e.g. developer / self-build, etc); ideas for different housing types; the involvement of Registered Social Landlords; an update on the Members Working Group timelines.

Local Enterprise Partnership – a presentation from the LEP with a covering Officer report; governance and scrutiny arrangements; European Union funding post Brexit.

Enterprise Zone – the effectiveness of the Zone; jobs and growth created; an invitation for a representative of Kingmoor Park to attend the Panel.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report and Work Programme (OS.04/20) be noted.

2) That the Scrutiny Chairs Group be asked to develop a list of options for scrutiny going forward for the Panel to consider

(The meeting ended at 1:15pm)