

## **ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**THURSDAY 20 APRIL 2017 AT 10.00AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Nedved (Chairman), Betton (from 10.55am), Bowditch, Christian, Mrs Coleman, McNulty (as substitute for Councillor McDonald) and Mitchelson.

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Glover – Leader  
Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder (until 11.50am)

**OFFICERS:** Deputy Chief Executive  
Investment & Policy Manager  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Media & Communications Officer  
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

### **EEOSP.22/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor McDonald, Councillor Southward – Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder and the Corporate Director of Economic Development.

### **EEOSP.23/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **EEOSP.24/17 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.

### **EEOSP.25/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Referring to minute EEOSP.21/17 – Performance Monitoring Options from 2 March 2017, a Member asked if the workshop to consider the proposals as detailed in report PC.06/17 had been arranged.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer reminded the Panel that there were some potential changes to the remits of the Panels in the new civic year and the work on performance management would reflect any changes and as a result the workshop would take place in the next civic year.

**RESOLVED** – 1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman

2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2017 be noted.

## **EEOSP.26/17      OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.10/17 providing an overview of matters relating to the work of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer reported that the most recent Notice of Executive Key Decisions, copies of which had been circulated to all Members, had been published on 10 March 2017; no items had fallen into the remit of the Panel.

The Panel's current Work Programme was attached to the report and Members were asked to begin thinking about the focus for the Panel's work in the next municipal year.

RESOLVED – That the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Key Decision items relevant to this Panel (OS.10/17) be noted.

## **EEOSP.27/17      ST CUTHBERT'S GARDEN VILLAGE**

The Investment & Policy Manager presented an overview of future opportunities to help shape the master planning process for St Cuthbert's Garden Village (ED.15/17).

The Investment & Policy Manager reminded the Panel of the background to the Garden Village as detailed in section 1 of the report. He explained that there would be four main strands to the work programme in order to deliver St Cuthbert's:

- master planning process
- planning process
- Southern Link Road
- delivery and implementation phase.

Work was underway completing the evidence base needed to advance concept planning and therefore the early stages of master planning. Gaps in knowledge of future economic growth sectors, detailed landscape and townscape of the area had been identified. Two studies were nearing completion and once received would enable the identification of key sectors which presented opportunities for investment and growth, and would also aid the identification of broad development parcels.

The Investment & Policy Manager gave a detailed presentation which outlined the background to the Garden Village along with an update on progress and the next steps. He reminded the Panel that St Cuthbert's Garden Village was set out in the Local Plan and would comprise of up to 10,000 new homes with strategic and local employment offers, supporting infrastructure and the new southern link road. The Garden Village had been included in the Government's Garden Village programme with 14 other areas.

The presentation included an indicative map of the proposed area along with the rationale for development. The Masterplan for the site would be embedded in a Carlisle South Local Plan which would guide decisions about important issues including location, quantity and type of development, design of buildings, open space and public realm, location of infrastructure and connectivity.

The Investment & Policy Manager outlined the progress to date which detailed the financial allocation to date and the receipt of the draft landscape/townscape character appraisal. He reported that the Council had received unprecedented attention following Carlisle's inclusion in the Garden Village programme and it had helped to put Carlisle on the map.

The St Cuthbert's Garden Village had buy in from a range of partners and organisations including support from the Local Enterprise Partnership, Cumbria County Council and local MPs. The Investment & Policy Manager added that it was crucial that the Garden Village had a robust vision and objectives, effective planning and Master Planning, showed innovation and quality and had clear Governance and delivery strategy.

The Investment & Policy Manager set out the vision for the Village and the Planning/Masterplanning Strategy and reported that the Council had to think of new innovative ways to engage with the local community which would include some facilitated sessions. He gave an overview of the risks and benefits of different delivery approaches adding that the Garden Village had to have a different planning approach to ensure delivery.

The Investment & Policy Manager concluded by informing the Panel that the project was a corporate project which would involve skills from across the authority. The Executive would be asked on 8 May to approve the release of funding and approve the proposed Governance arrangements which would include a Member Advisory Group, Project Board and Project Group.

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

- The Panel welcomed the Garden Village and, although it was in its infancy, there was real momentum for the development.
- The Panel asked that Members were involved in the Members Advisory Group at the earliest opportunity.
- How would engagement with landowners, developers and other key stakeholders be developed and carried out?

The Investment & Policy Manager responded that consideration was being given to how engagement would be carried out and officers would access information and support from the HCA. The traditional method of engagement had its place but there needed to be more innovative ways to engage with stakeholders. Facilitated sessions would give the Council the opportunity to ask thought provoking questions to help refine and develop the vision for the development. The Council needed to know what was important to people and what they perceived as a problem.

The Investment & Policy Manager had given a presentation to St Cuthbert's Without Parish Council as the proposed development site was within their Parish. They raised lots of interesting matters which affected people living in the area which needed to be considered as part of the master planning.

- A Member felt that the political direction for the development was unclear and there needed to be clarity that the development would be led by the Council.

The Leader agreed that it was important to have clear political direction for the development and reminded the Panel that the bid to move the master plan forward had come from the City Council. The concept was led by and embedded in the Local Plan and had been ready to move forward when the opportunity arose. The expression of interest was approved by Government and showed that there was confidence that Carlisle was capable of delivering the development. It was critical that the Council led the masterplan and the interest taken in

Carlisle by organisations and partners showed confidence in the City. He reiterated that the master plan must be and would be City Council led.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder agreed that the City Council was in control of the masterplanning process but added that it was at a very early stage where details were not yet being determined. She was confident that, with strong Governance and the support of the HCA and partners, the Council would deliver the masterplan.

A Member commented that it was recognised that the masterplan was a long term project which was Council led and not a political project and it was important that the Council had the lead and managed the process.

- A Member asked for clarity regarding the relationship between the southern link road and the masterplan.

The Leader assured the Panel that Cumbria County Council had been involved in the masterplan discussion from an early stage along with the HCA. Options and concepts for the link road would be drawn up along with the impact of the proposals to ensure that the link road fit with the overall masterplan vision.

- In the masterplan process it was important to plan for the future with regard to the growing need for good fast internet connection and electronic communications.

The Leader agreed that the masterplan needed to be future proofed wherever it could be and the Garden Village needed to capture best practice from smart cities and implement or pilot the ideas. How internet connection was built into the masterplan was critical to ensure that the development attracted businesses, the masterplan had to be challenging and innovative and had to push boundaries.

- The development needed to be sustainable, at what stage would employment opportunities in the South of the City be looked at?

The Investment & Policy Manager responded that a Growth Sectors study had been undertaken by Regeneris and a key aspect had been to look at Carlisle South. The draft report had been received and the final report would be made public in the near future.

- Would the masterplan include affordable housing?

The Investment & Policy Manager confirmed that the masterplan would be for mixed tenure and type and had to push boundaries. Affordability and viability would be included and the masterplan would include a range of homes to enable residents to stay in the community for their entire lifecycle. He added that the size and scale of the development meant that there would be no excuse not to achieve a good mixture.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that a meeting had taken place with Registered Social Providers who were interested in being involved in the masterplan.

The Leader commented that this was the beginning of an exciting journey which a lot of people would contribute to and influence. It was a new area which enabled the authority to be innovative with the concept which would include homes, infrastructure, employment and education. It was a real opportunity to create something special for Carlisle.

- The masterplan covered a 20-30 year period, would there be enough funding available to complete all the work that was required?

The Investment & Policy Manager explained that funding had already been allocated in the budget for the masterplan process. The funding received from the Government enabled some additional added value and some of the work to be accelerated. The Government had stated that there would be £3million available in 2018 but how that would be allocated was unknown.

A Member commented that he hoped to see continued support from Central Government to move the process forward.

- Would there be an opportunity to make a bid to the HCA to buy land?

The Investment & Policy Manager responded that it was too early in the process for consideration of land purchases but the Council would use the HCA for support and advice on the matter.

- Was there any indication of the role of Scrutiny in the masterplan process?

The Investment & Policy Manager explained that the Governance arrangements would be considered by the Executive on 8 May and confirmed that Scrutiny would be involved in the process at the appropriate time.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder confirmed that Members would be involved in the Member's Advisory Group adding that the Group would need Members who had excellent planning knowledge, financial knowledge and local knowledge. The Group would be convened on an ad hoc basis and Members would need to ensure that they were available to attend the Group meetings.

The Investment & Policy Manager added that following approval by the Executive, the Group would likely be convened to discuss the concept of the masterplan, what would be required of the Group and draft terms of reference. Following that, the Group would be convened as and when required.

RESOLVED –1) That the overview of St Cuthbert's Garden Village (ED.15/17) be welcomed.

2) That the Panel supported the proposal to establish a Members' Advisory Group.

3) That the Panel looked forward to seeing how it was proposed that this Scrutiny Panel be included in the ongoing Governance arrangements for the Garden Village.

*The Panel adjourned for a short break at 11.15am and reconvened at 11.20am.*

## **EOSP.28/17      DRAFT CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The Policy & Investment Manager submitted the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (ED.14/17).

The Policy & Investment Manager reported that the SCI was a statutory document which every planning authority was required to prepare and maintain and set out how, when and

where the Council would consult with the community and local and statutory stakeholders on all matters in the process of planning for the local area, both in producing development plan documents and in carrying out its development control function.

The current SCI had been in place since 2013 and it was considered that a refresh of content was required. In line with the current Local Development Scheme it was considered necessary to have a revised SCI in place which was relevant to the next wave of new plans and documents which the Council was committed to producing to ensure that its content remained relevant in providing guidance on how the Council would engage with stakeholders and in the production of the current and future work programme.

Key changes that had been made to the SCI:

- Updated to reflect changes in planning legislation
- Current practices in community engagement including the use of electronic communication and social media
- Detail in respect of the Community Infrastructure Levy consultation process
- Greater detail in respect of Neighbourhood Plans
- Refresh of the key stages in the preparation of Development Plan documents
- Update to the notification procedures for Development Management

The draft Statement of Community Involvement was attached as an appendix to the report.

In considering the draft document Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Why had the decision been taken to combine the three previous documents into one document?

The Investment & Policy Manager explained that the three documents had been combined to make the document more accessible and easier to use

- The SCI did not make reference to the opportunities for consultation through electronic means.

The Investment & Policy Manager responded that the SCI set out the minimum consultation that the authority had to undertake and the Council exceeded that minimum. He agreed that the section on Social Media should be broadened to ensure that the authority embraced innovative ways to maximise consultation.

- Why had the SCI not gone out to consultation when a number of other authorities had consulted on their SCI?

The Investment & Policy Manager reminded the Panel that there was no legal requirement to consult on the SCI and it was felt that there was no value in opening the SCI up to consultation as it would be difficult to manage expectations about the level of discretion and changes that were possible. He agreed that some Councils did go out to consultation but many did not and there was debate about how much value it would add.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder felt that the authority already went beyond what was legally required of them and the SCI set out what the Council did and what it planned to do. Officers were open to suggestions and used Scrutiny as consultation on a highly technical document.

The Panel discussed the consultation process in some detail and felt strongly that some degree of consultation should take place for the SCI. They understood that the document was technical but felt that there would be opportunities to learn of different forms of consultation that the Council was missing out on. They stressed that consultation should take place with hard to reach groups, disability groups, parishes and young people.

The Deputy Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the SCI was a comprehensive document which detailed how the Council consulted, should the Panel have an issue with the document or feel that anything was missing then this was their opportunity to input into the SCI.

The Leader asked the Panel if there were any fundamental problems in the document which needed to be consulted on reminding the Panel that the document could be re-visited at any time. He added that too many consultations meant the Council ran the risk of not getting the responses they required and consultation became less effective.

- The report mentioned the development of an Energy from Wind Development Plan Document, what would be included in the document and was there a timescale for the production of the document?

The Investment & Policy Manager explained that the document was a recommendation from the Planning Inspector but there was no pressing need for the document and at this time was not a priority so the document would not be developed in the near future.

- The document was very technical and the Panel asked if it would be possible to produce a summary of the document.

The Investment & Policy Manager agreed that he would look at producing a summary document which would be more user friendly. He informed the Panel that the draft SCI would also be considered by the Local Plan Working Group.

RESOVLED – 1) That the draft Statement of Community Involvement be welcomed (ED.14/17).

2) That the section on Social Media in the Statement of Community Involvement be broadened to ensure that the Council engaged in the most innovative ways possible;

3) That the Executive be requested to carry out some degree of public consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement;

4) That a summary of the Statement of Community Involvement be produced to ensure the document is accessible to all.

## **EOSP.29/17 FLOOD UPDATE REPORT**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report CS.13/17 which provided the Panel with an update on flood recovery activities and future programmed work.

The report outlined the City Council's Asset Recovery Programme which had a final target date for all completion of all assets as June 2017 and the Deputy Chief Executive gave a detailed overview of progress on the Civic Centre and Customer Contact Centre, The Sheepmount and Bitts Park.

The Deputy Chief Executive set out the figures for the flood grants and household payments as set out in section 3 of the report and drew Members attention to section 4 of the report which detailed the ongoing work of the organisations involved in the flood recovery.

The Deputy Chief Executive reported that the insurance settlement figure had been agreed in principle and the final offer statement was due. When the final offer had been received recovery work on the remaining Council sites could progress.

In considering the Flood Update Members raised the following comments and questions:

- What was the timescale on the plans for the Civic Centre and Bitts Park to be considered by Scrutiny?

The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that the design stage for the Civic Centre and Bitts Park would begin when the final settlement letter had been received from the insurers. It was expected to begin in July and would go through the Executive and Scrutiny process.

- The Environment Agency had previously discussed upstream flood management with the Panel, would they report back to the Panel on this work?

The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that the Panel invite representatives of the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council back to the Panel for an update on their work and the work of the Cumbria Strategic Floods Partnership Board.

- The Panel thanked the Deputy Chief Executive for his detailed and informative reports and asked how future matters would be reported to Scrutiny.

The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that a final comprehensive report be submitted to this Panel then each of the matters included in the report be split into the relevant Scrutiny Panel remits in the future, adding that there would be no further value in providing updates on the grants.

- A Member commented that he had raised several issues over the last 18 months which he felt had not been addressed. He had attended a flood meeting at Cumbria County Council which had been arranged with the Environment Agency and had been poorly attended by City Councillors. The City Council had riparian ownership of the River Patteril and the banks had been narrowing and there was rubbish and debris in the river. Members of the public had complained about the issues and although he had raised the issue it had not been minuted or responded to.

He asked what the Environment Agency and the Council were actually doing, commenting that many people had not yet returned to their homes and questioned whether they were still receiving a Council Tax discount.

The Deputy Chief Executive referred the Member to an email conversation they had in February 2017 which he felt addressed the issues raised.

The Chairman stated that the Panel had taken steps in addressing issues by inviting representatives of the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council to attend the Panel and answer Members questions. They gave very detailed presentations on their progress and the Section 19 report and answered Members questions thoroughly. Representatives would be asked to come back and update the Panel on resilience matters.



The Vice Chairman responded to the comments made reminding the Member that four very detailed reports had been submitted for consideration by the Panel and the Member had only attended two of the meetings due to his role as a dual hatted Member. He commented on the Member's attendance at meetings and his prioritisation of another authority over this one. He felt strongly that the minutes taken at meetings were an accurate reflection of the meeting and the Member's criticism of City Council officers was unfounded.

The Leader informed the Panel that the Council Tax relief scheme had been scheduled to end in December 2016, however, he had written to the Minister asking for an extension due to the number of people who had yet to return to their homes. The Minister had responded positively and agreed that the relief scheme would stay in place as long as it was needed.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Flood Update report CS.10/17 be welcomed.

2) That representatives of the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council be invited to attend a future meeting of the Panel to provide an update on their work and the work of the Cumbria Strategic Floods Partnership Board.

3) That a final comprehensive Flood Update report be submitted to this Panel at a future meeting then each of the matters included in the report be split into the relevant Scrutiny Panel remits future for future scrutiny.

## **EEOSP.30/17      UPDATE ON CLEAN CARLISLE**

The Neighbourhood Services Managers submitted an update on the Clean Carlisle initiative (CS.11/17).

The Neighbourhood Services Manager reported that the Clean Carlisle initiative had recently been re-branded as Keep Carlisle Clean and the branding would run through the Council's signs and posters as work was undertaken to change behaviour and attitudes.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager updated the Panel on enforcement action which had been taken as well as the various activities which were included in the initiative as detailed in the report. He added that the Council continuously looked to work in new innovative ways to keep the streets clean.

He gave a detailed overview of the Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) which was designed to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in a particular area that was detrimental to the quality of life within the local community. The proposed content of the PSPO was set out in section 8 of the report subject to consultation.

The Panel were shown photographs of the new street cleaning equipment and the rebranding for the Keep Carlisle Clean initiative along with an example of the new dispensers that had been installed in Rickerby Park to give out free dog waste bags to dog owners.

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

- What was the criteria for the Neat Streets initiative?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that the street had to be unadopted and there had to be a persistent problem there to warrant Council intervention.

- A Member was concerned that the number of fixed penalty notices (FPN) issued for dog fouling had decreased when the problems with dog fouling was on the increase.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that the number of notices issued was not necessarily the best way to view the effort and commitment put in to tackling this stubborn problem; it was very difficult for enforcement officers to catch the dog owners who were responsible as they had to be caught with the dog. There was a perception that incidents of dog fouling was rising however evidence showed it was decreasing. Carlisle had very clean streets maintained to an exceptional standard and this meant incidents of dog fouling stood out. There were issues in taking the offences forward as people might complain but were not always prepared to sign a witness statement to support enforcement action for understandable reasons.

- Was there any out of hours patrols for dog fouling?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that out of hours activity and plain clothes patrols had been use but they were not necessarily more effective as people's behaviour often changed when they knew they were being observed. There were five enforcement officers within the authority and they needed good intelligence to target areas. The focus was shifting to behaviour change and it was hoped that the new focus would encourage more people to clean up after their dog.

- Why had the rebranding been necessary and what were the cost implications of the changes?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that there had been no cost implications and although it was stated that it was a re branding the only change was the 'Keep Carlisle Clean' slogan.

The Media & Communications Officer informed the Panel that the slogan would be used consistently in all Council campaigns including dog fouling, littering and fly tipping in a variety of ways. The designs were created internally and all connected together as one brand.

- When did the PSPO come into force?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager reported that the PSPO would come into force in September/October 2017 and he would confirm the date with the Panel.

- How would the PSPO be promoted?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that there would be notices setting out the prohibition and fines.

- A Member asked for clarity on the restrictions to commercial waste within the City Centre.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that the Council was trying to encourage responsible behaviour within the City Centre. The PSPO would ask commercial refuse collectors and businesses to stop putting rubbish out or collecting rubbish at times when it posed a risk to people or the reputation of the City.

RESOLVED – 1) That the update on Clean Carlisle be welcomed (CS.11/17)  
2) That an update on the Keep Carlisle Clean initiative be brought to the Panel in September. That the report include an update on the consultation responses to the Public Space Protection Order and details of the final list for inclusion in the Order.

### **EEOSP.31/17      RETHINKING WASTE PROJECT**

The Neighbourhood Services Manager submitted a report updating the Panel on the progress of the Rethinking Waste Project (CS.12/17).

The Neighbourhood Services Manager reported that the Rethinking Waste Project was approaching its end. Key target dates had been met and the service changes would be implemented from June 2017 when refuse and recycling collection arrangements would change. In light of the Internal Audit report on the project and as an important step in closing down the project the objectives, performance and outcomes from the project would be reviewed.

The report summarised the progress made since October and detailed the work officers would be undertaking from April.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager gave a detailed presentation on the changes made to the recycling collections which would come into force in June 2017.

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

- Member were pleased that recycling collection would be extended to new properties who previously did not have recycling facilities and asked if future new builds would be included.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager confirmed that capacity had been built in for future projected growth. If Carlisle continued to grow then the matter would be reviewed.

- The Panel welcomed a review of the recycling centres and asked that consideration be given to sites which were frequently full as well as those not used. Members asked that relevant Ward Members be involved in the discussions regarding recycling centres in their Wards.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager agreed to involve Ward Members and drew the Panel's attention to section 5 of the report which set out a timeline for the communication of the proposed changes. Officers would meet with Ward Members to ensure everyone had a clear understanding of the changes to enable a clear message for residents.

The Media & Communications Officer showed the Panel an example of the communications that would be used which had a key message that the change affected everyone. The promotional information included a newsletter to all households, revised refuse and recycling timetables, an article and advert in the Council's residents' magazine. There would also be posters, bill board and bus shelter adverts. Information would be sent to Members, Parishes and Community Centres. The Council had used every available resource including an email to everyone who had signed up to on line Council Tax billing.

In response to a Member's comment the Media & Communications Officer agreed to circulate promotional information to schools throughout the City.

- Was there any projected impact on recycling rates as a result of the changes?  
The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that the recycling rate was expected to increase as more households had facilities to recycle; he added that it would be closely monitored.

RESOLVED –1) That the update on the Rethinking Waste Project (CS.12/17) be welcomed;

2) That the Panel thanked the Neighbourhood Services Manager, his team and everyone involved in the Rethinking Waste Project and the promotion of the new service;

3) That relevant Ward Councillors be involved in the review of recycling centres;

4) That an update report be submitted to the Panel six months from the launch date.

### **EEOSP.32/17      SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During consideration of the above item it was noted that the meeting had been in progress for 3 hours and it was moved,seconded and RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 9, in relation to the duration ofmeetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time limit of 3hours.

(The meeting ended at 1.20pm)