

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

**THURSDAY 1 DECEMBER 2016 AT 10.00AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Nedved (Chairman), Councillors Betton (until 12:40pm) Bloxham (as substitute for Councillor Mitchelson), Bowditch (until 1:10pm), Christian, Mrs Coleman (until 1:35pm), McDonald, McNulty (as substitute for Councillor Dodd).

**ALSO PRESENT** Councillor Glover – The Leader  
Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Southward – Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder.  
Mr J Ratcliffe (Eden Catchment Director – Environment Agency)  
Mr A Brown (Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Cumbria and Lancashire Area – Environment Agency)  
Ms A Jones (Assistant Director of Economy and Environment - Cumbria County Council)

**OFFICERS:** Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services  
Corporate Director of Economic Development  
Chief Finance Officer  
Contracts and Community Services Manager  
Development Manager  
Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Policy and Communications Manager

### **EEOSP.70/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Mitchelson, Councillor Dodd and the Deputy Chief Executive.

### **EEOSP.71/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **EEOSP.72/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

### **EEOSP.73/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Referring to Minute EEOSP.55/16 of 15 September 2016 and EEOSP.62/16 of 27 October, a Member asked had there been any progress on proposals for the ground floor of the Civic Centre, and when would the Panel see them?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development drew Member's attention to Flood Update Report (SD.31/16) which contained information regarding the development of proposals for the ground floor which would be considered by Officers in December 2016. The item was likely to be considered by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel as it

fell under its remit, however, the information would be provided to Members as soon as it was available.

The Leader added that he understood that options were being worked up with a view to incorporating further resilience into the building, and that the options would be presented to both the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny in due courses.

RESOLVED – (1) The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

(2) That the minutes of the meetings of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on 27 October 2016 be noted.

### **EEOSP.74/16 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS**

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

### **EEOSP.75/16 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Policy and Communications Manager presented report OS.24/16 providing an overview of matters relating to the work of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Policy and Communications Manager reported that the most recent Notice of Executive Key Decisions, copies of which had been circulated to all Members, had been published on 21 October 2016. The following items had been referred to the Panel:

KD.21/16 – Budget Process 2017/18

The item had been included on the Panel's agenda.

Members raised no questions or comments on the Notice of Executive Key Decisions.

The Panel's current work programme was attached as Appendix 1 to the report. Members were asked to note and/or amend the programme. The following items were to be considered by the Panel at its meeting on 19 January 2017: Local Enterprise Partnership; Business Support Task and Finish Group; Tourist Information Centre; Tourism Draft Plan.

The Policy and Communications Manager advised Members that a review of performance data quality had been conducted following the reporting of inaccurate data relating to recycling performance in Quarter 1 of 2015/16. A data check had been conducted in October 2016, the findings of which were accepted by Senior Management Team in on 8 November 2016. A number of recommendations had arisen from the data check which was detailed within the report.

A Member noted that the Local Development Scheme had been included on the Panel's Work Programme for March 2017 with a view to programming planning policies for the coming three years, he sought clarification on this matter.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that following the adoption of the Carlisle and District Local Plan 2016 -2030 (CDLP), the Council was required to produce a Local Development Scheme as the next stage of development of the CDLP.

The principal areas for development would be the Community Infrastructure Levy and the Carlisle South Masterplan.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that the development of the Local Development Scheme was an important aspect of strengthening the CDLP and the Council's capacity to assess planning applications accordingly.

The Chairman asked if there had been any indication as to when the Local Plan Development Working Group would be reconvened to enable it to consider the Local Development Scheme.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development informed Members that discussion had taken place with Group Leaders regarding nominations, and once the membership of the Group had been agreed the necessary arrangement to convene a meeting would be made.

A Member asked whether it was intended that the current members of the Local Plan Working Group would participate in the new group.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development responded that nominations were a matter for political groups.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report (OS.24/16) incorporating the Work Programme and Notice of Executive Key Decision items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2) That the following items be included on the agenda for the Panel's meeting scheduled for 19 January 2017:

- Local Enterprise Partnership;
- Business Support Task and Finish Group;
- Tourist Information Centre;
- Tourism Draft Plan.

## **EEOSP.76/16      BUDGET 2017/18**

### **(a) Budget Update - Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.35/16 providing a summary of the Council's revised revenue base estimates for 2016/17, together with base estimates for 2017/18 and forecasts up to 2021/22 for illustrative purposes. The base estimates had been prepared in accordance with the guiding principles for the formulation of the budget over the next five year planning period as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and Charging Policy; Capital Strategy; and Asset Management Plan approved by Council on 13 September 2016.

The report set out known revisions to the MTFP projections, although there were a number of significant factors affecting the budget that were currently unresolved, details of which were recorded at Section 1.3. A summary of the outstanding key issues, together with the resource assumptions was also provided at Section 4.

Turning to the issue of savings and additional income proposals, the Chief Finance Officer added that the current MTFP included a savings requirement to be found by 2018/19 of

£3.475 million. Further savings / additional income had already been identified in the budget process for 2017/18, details of which were set out at Section 6 of the report.

Also summarised were the movements in base budgets; the updated MTFP projections; the projected impact on revenue balances; together with a summary of the financial outlook and budget discipline 2017/18 to 2021/22.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.98/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the revised base estimates for 2016/17 and base estimates for 2017/18.
2. Noted the current Medium Term Financial Plan projections, which would continue to be updated throughout the budget process as key issues became clearer and decisions were taken.
3. Noted the initial budget pressures / savings needing to be taken into account as part of the 2017/18 budget process.”

In considering the Revenue Estimates Report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Why had the recurring £96,000 shortfall in revenue from car parking not been incorporated into the MTFP?

The Chief Finance Officer explained that the shortfall had been identified as a potential new spending pressure following the production of the MTFP in September 2016. Were the Executive to accept the shortfall, the pressure would be included in the Executive Budget Proposals to Council in February 2017. Should the Council adopt the Executive Budget proposals, the pressure would be incorporated into the MTFP?

- Was part of the £91,000 potential new spending pressure relating to Clean Up Carlisle funding for the Rapid Response Team.

The Chief Finance Officer undertook to provide a written response to the question.

- Was the £47,000 new potential spending pressure relating to the Enterprise Centre attributable to decreased income or an increase in the maintenance budget?

The Corporate Director of Economic advised that the potential new spending pressure £47,000, was as a result of decreased income and was separate from the maintenance budget.

- Would the Economic Regeneration Team consider further uses for the Centre?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that the Economic Regeneration Team would be tasked with developing an overarching strategy for the Central Plaza, Citadel and the Enterprise Centre.

- What was the current occupancy rate at the Enterprise Centre?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development responded that the rate of occupancy was currently 60 – 65%, the level of take up varied within the Centre with some areas being more easily to let than others. Promotion and marketing of the Centre was ongoing to increase the level of occupancy.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that an advert for the Enterprise Centre had been included in the latest edition of the Council's Focus magazine.

- Where would the costs associated with the establishment of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) arrangements be recovered from?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development informed Members that the £80,000 set up cost related to research, viability assessments, and necessary software, she advised Members that costs were able to be recovered once the CIL was in operation.

- How confident was the Council that it would achieve the inflationary savings identified in the budget?

The Chief Finance Officer informed Members that the MTFP was based upon an inflation remaining at 2%. Officers maintained a watching brief on the level of inflation; however she was confident that the proposed savings were achievable as these related to the cumulative impact of previous year's inflation increases.

RESOLVED – That the Budget Update - Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22 (RD.35/16) be noted.

#### **(b) Review of Charges 2017/18**

The Chief Finance Officer presented the Review of Charges reports informing the Panel that there was a 3% increase on the overall level of income in line with the Corporate Charging Policy.

#### **Community Services**

Report SD.27/16 was submitted setting out the proposed fees and charges for 2017/18 relating to those services falling within the Community Services Directorate.

The charges highlighted within the report would result in an anticipated level of income of £2,775,200 against the MTFP target of £2,835,200. That represented a shortfall of £60,000 against the MTFP target. The Panel were asked to consider the areas which were in their remit as set out on the agenda.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.99/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive:

- (i) Agreed for consultation the charges as set out in the body of Report SD.27/16 and relevant appendices with effect from 1 April 2017, noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.
- (ii) Delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Chief Finance Officer, the agreement of discounts on the car parking permit process within agreed limitations.
- (iii) Delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Chief Finance Officer, the agreement of variations to car parking ticket charges within parameters agreed by the Executive.”

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

- How often did the Council levy a fee for the cancellation of events?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager explained that the fee levied for cancelling events was not used regularly as, in the main, the Council was advised of event cancellations well in advance. The levying of the charge was designed to prevent the Council losing money should an event be cancelled at short notice.

- What proportion of the event fee charge, was the cancellation fee?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised that the cancellation fee charged varied depending on the event and the length of notification provided to the Council.

In response to a further question from the Member, the Contracts and Community Services Manager advised Members that in relation to events at the Old Fire Station, specific contractual arrangements relating to particular events outlined the details of charges that were able to be levied by either party in the event of cancellation.

- Did the Council apply its charges for pavement cafes when the cafes were on private land?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised that the charge for pavement cafes was only levied when the café was situated on the highway, and was not applied where the café was situated on private land.

- What was the rationale for the level of increase proposed for the Annual Membership Parking Permit at Talkin Tarn?

The Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager stated that uptake of the Annual Membership Parking Permit for Talkin Tarn had been very good, whilst recognising the proposed charge increase was significant in percentage terms, the cost of the proposed charge would enable those who purchased the permit to park use the car park at Talkin Tarn and its facilities for a cost of £2 per week.

The Member acknowledged that the proposed charge still amounted to good value for money for permit holders, however, he remained concerned that the increase would make the permit cost prohibitive for residents with a limited budget, and that the proposed charge may reduce the amount of people who purchased the permit.

The Chairman noted Appendix B of the report detailed proposals for increasing charges for car parking at all of the Council's car parks, he noted the proposed increase in charge for the Annual Membership Parking Permit was significant increase and beyond those proposed at other sites. Increases in charges had been proposed universally at Talkin Tarn and encompassed facilities such as the Education Hut, whereas no proposal had been put forward to levy a charge for the use of facilities at Hammond's Pond. He felt that the proposed addition of 10p to hourly tickets across the Council's car parks which levied different charges may cause some confusion amongst car park users.

The Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager responded that an aspect of the rationale behind the proposal was the management of the car park at Talkin Tarn, the Annual Membership Parking Permit operated well, and was in fact oversubscribed. In order to enable a broad mix of users of the car parking facilities at the Tarn, it was

intended to limit the number of permits issued so that the car park remained able to cater for day use visitors.

A Member expressed concern that the proposed charge would increase the number of vehicles parking on the verges along the boundary of the site.

The Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager felt that the proposed charges was not likely to increase the number of vehicles parking on the verges surrounding Talkin Tarn, and that the behaviour of those using the verges surrounding the park would not be altered by the proposed charge.

- Why had Officers not proposed to increase the car parking charges at the Marks and Spencer car park?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager explained that the Council was in a contractual relationship regarding the management of the Marks and Spencer's car park which limited the Council's capacity to alter the charges levied at the car park.

- A Member sought clarification on the proposal to delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive to agree variations to car parking ticket charges.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services explained that as part of the Council seeking to implement a more commercial approach to the management of its car parks, it was recognised that prices may need to be altered to manage demand at individual car parks. The proposed charges set out in the report would not be exceeded, the proposal to delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder and Chief Finance Officer would enable the authorisation of a reduction in fees at individual car parks, were it deemed expedient.

- A Member expressed concern that the proposed increase in allotment charges would be detrimental to those in low incomes.

The Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager responded that the charge for allotments had remained static for 2 number years at 25p/sq.m, whilst recognising the proposed charges was an over-inflationary increase he considered that the proposed charge better reflected the cost to the Council of administering the service. The proposed charge when applied to 100.sqm plot would generate a £5 increase in cost for the allotment for a year, the Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager considered the increase to be of a reasonable level.

The Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager explained that poor health was a primary reason people gave up allotments, rather than cost, he suggested that if people struggled to manage their plot and wished to reduce the costs associated with them, allotments may be subdivided.

A Member commented that she considered the charges levied by the Council for allotments to be very reasonable when compared to prices charged in the private sector.

- A Member expressed concern that the proposed increase in charges for bulky waste collections would increase the number of fly tipping incidence in the District. He asked if Officers had considered increasing the number of items permitted per collection as a way to help minimise fly-tipping.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that fly tipping was a criminal offence which was likely to occur were the bulky collection service offered free of charge. As part of its efforts to reduce flytipping in the District, the Council had installed cameras in flytipping hotspots with the aim of catching and prosecuting perpetrators. The inclusion of signage at particular sites known to experience flytipping had brought about a 100% reduction in flytipping.

In addition, a featured had been included in the Council's Focus magazine providing residents with information regarding how to manage the disposal of waste items appropriately. This was welcomed by Members.

A Member commented that it would perhaps be helpful if small amounts of waste could be accepted by businesses at the local household waste recycling centres operated by Cumbria County Council and this message communicated widely to help reduce some of the fly-tipping.

RESOLVED – (1) That the comments and concerns of the Panel be referred to the Executive, in particular concerns regarding the Annual Permit for Talkin Tarn.

(2) That Charges Review Report 2017/18 – Community Services (SD.17/16) be noted.

### **Economic Development**

Report ED.45/16 was submitted setting out the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate.

The proposed charges in relation to Planning Services included Development Control income; Building Control income; and Local Plan income.

Acceptance of the charges highlighted within the report, with the exception of Building Control which was self-financing, would result in an anticipated level of income of £662,600 against the Medium Term Financial Plan target of £662,600.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.100/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive agreed for consultation the charges, as set out in Report ED.45/16 and accompanying Appendices, with effect from 1 April 2017; noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.”

The Members raised no comments and questions on the report.

RESOLVED – That Charges Review Report 2017/18 – Economic Development (ED.45/16) be noted.

### **Governance and Regulatory Services**

Report GD.62/16 was submitted concerning the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Governance and Regulatory Services Directorate.

The report set out the proposed charges relative to Environmental Health and Housing; Homeless, Prevention and Accommodation Services; and Legal Services. The introduction of the proposed charges was forecast to generate income of £893,300 in 2017/18 as summarised in the table at Section 5.16 of the report.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.101/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive agreed for consultation the charges as detailed within Report GD.62/16 and accompanying Appendices, with effect from 1 April 2017; and noted the impact thereof on income generation as detailed within the report.”

The Members raised no comments or questions on the report.

RESOLVED – That Charges Review Report 2017/18 – Governance and Regulatory Services (GD.62/16) be noted.

### **(c) Revised Capital Programme 2016/17 and Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.36/16 detailing the revised Capital Programme for 2016/17, now totalling £10,440,000, together with the proposed method of financing. The report summarised the proposed programme for 2017/18 to 2021/22 in the light of the new capital proposals identified, together with the estimated capital resources available to fund the programme based on the announcements by Government in the spending review.

Section 4 which provided details of the current commitments and new spending proposals. Any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved. The Chief Finance Officer advised that the principal pressure on the Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 was the replacement of the Council’s fleet of vehicle and plant which were essential in the provision of service delivery.

A summary of the estimated resources compared to the proposed programme year on year was also provided.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.103/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the revised capital programme and relevant financing for 2016/17 as set out in Appendices A and B of Report RD.36/16;
2. Had given initial consideration and views on the proposed capital spending for 2017/18 to 2021/22 contained in the Report in the light of the estimated available resources;
3. Noted that any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved.”

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

- A Member sought clarification on the purpose of the Planned Enhancements to Council Property.

The Chief Finance Officer explained that the enhancements related to projects undertaking major repairs to Council properties, for example, the reparation of the roof at the Market Hall. Such works were essential but beyond the scope and budget of programme of regular maintenance works.

- Had the Council had any indication of the level of Disabled Facilities Grants funding it would receive?

The Chief Finance Officer responded that the Council had not formally been advised of the level of funding it would receive in respect of Disabled Facilities Grants. In 2016/17 the Council had received £1.4M of Disabled Facilities Grants funding, the Medium Term Financial Plan assumed a similar level of funding going forward.

RESOLVED – That the Revised Capital Programme 2016/17 and Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 (RD.36/16) be noted.

## **EEOSP.77/16 FLOOD UPDATE REPORT**

The Chairman welcomed Mr J Ratcliffe (Eden Catchment Director – Environment Agency) Mr A Brown (Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Cumbria and Lancashire Area – Environment Agency), Ms A Jones (Assistant Director of Economy and Environment - Cumbria County Council).

The Corporate Director of Economic Development presented report SD.31/16 which updated Members on: the recovery of Council assets; the provision of grants and relief to households and businesses and; the activities undertaken by the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council. The report also provided details of the Carlisle Flood Response Plan.

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

- A Member understood that the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) had not imposed a deadline for Councils to draw down payments in relation to Flood Resilience Grants, he asked why the Council had imposed a deadline for the submission of applications at the end of March 2017.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development responded that whilst DCLG had not imposed a deadline for the submission of applications for Flood Resilience Grants, it had advised local authorities that funding for the grants could be claimed back until the end of July 2017. Therefore, the Council had imposed a deadline of the end of March 2017 to receive applications so that it could ensure it was able to recoup all the funds it had dispensed on the grants.

The Member responded expressing concerns that problems regarding the drying out of properties and engaging contractors remained in the city which had increased the time taken for residents to return to their property.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development acknowledged that there had been a log jam in the progression of recovery works. The Council had sought to promote uptake of the Flood Resilience Grants by conducting letter drops and the inclusion of features in the Focus Magazine. Officers would assess take up of the grants in early 2017 to identify whether further promotion was required, however, the Council needed to be mindful of the end date stipulated by DCLG.

- How would Officers access the Carlisle Emergency Plan in the case of a power outage in a future flood event?

The Policy and Communication Manager explained that the Plan was now hosted on an external server that did not rely on the Civic Centre having power, in addition hard copies of the document were also in storage.

The Chairman stated that Members had found the report extremely helpful, and that the Panel wished to see another Flood Update report at its March 2017 meeting.

Mr Ratcliffe (Environment Agency) delivered a presentation which covered: winter preparations in Carlisle; recovery works undertaken by the Environment Agency; the siting and deployment of temporary flood defences; the Carlisle area flood risk project delivery programme; the catchment approach and; Cumbria Flood Partnership pilot areas.

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

The Chairman asked for further information regarding the consultation on the siting and deployment of temporary defences the Environment Agency (EA) planned to conduct in relation in early 2017.

Mr Brown (Environment Agency) advised that plans in relation to the consultation were very much at a developmental stage with proposals being worked up to identify a way forward. The main focus of the work was a technical analysis, he was mindful that the deployment of the temporary defences should not make the impact of flooding worse in other locations. He added that in the case of a nationwide flood event to occurring, central government would assume responsibility for the deployment and siting of the temporary defences.

- As part of the Carlisle area flood risk project delivery programme, did the EA have any plans to create a run-off lake outside the city to reduce the impact of flooding?

Mr Ratcliffe responded that the EA recognised it was not the only agency involved in the delivery of the Carlisle area flood risk project delivery programme, although it owned many of the structures involved in the Plan, other public authorities also owned assets and were responsible for linked structures, for example bridges. Therefore it was important that the work outlined in the plan was seen against that background, and the work of other agencies would be required.

In terms of works on the ground commencing in Carlisle it was expected that this would begin in 2019, however, the EA were keen to move that timing forward, and in the case of individual projects may be able to undertake work prior to 2019. In planning and preparing for those works, the EA was adopting a catchment approach which comprised an options appraisal of works would benefit the city, including large engineered works, however, no decisions had been yet been taken.

Mr Brown added that all three projects for the District (Carlisle, Low Crosby and Warwick Bridge) were in the Flood Risk Modelling and Mapping stage of project development which included Scheme Options and Testing, Outline Design, Ground Investigations and Consultations and Scheme Approvals, which taken together was time consuming work. However, the EA's priority was to ensure that the work carried out as part of the programme was correct and also offered value for money. Future work would be planned in a holistic way to minimise the risk of flooding occurring in other areas.

- A Member commented that it would be beneficial for the EA's Catchment Plans, currently available on their website to be updated so that the public had access to the most up to date information.

Mr Ratcliffe agreed with the Member's suggestion and added that the agency had been formally instructed by government to update their Catchment Plans by summer 2017, however, it was hoped that the Plans for the Carlisle and Eden Catchment Area would be update before then.

- How did the EA feel the Catchment Approach would improve the future flood protection of the city?

Mr Ratcliffe explained that the Catchment Approach considered long timescales of managing water flows to benefit the city. The approach comprised consideration of science, funding, and the practicalities of developing agreements between the necessary parties in identifying opportunities to reduce the risk of flooding.

Funding was a crucial aspect of the Approach, it was noted that the government had recently announced the availability of £15M for national flood actions, which he hoped the Council would receive a good settlement from. However, in real terms the level of funding was essentially a pump primer and authorities would need to give serious consideration to organisations that would be required to be involved in the delivery of future projects.

A further aspect of the Catchment Approach was the strand which comprised practical considerations such as securing the buy-in of landowners, who were pivotal to the delivery of future projects.

- Had reparations been undertaken to items of key infrastructure such as pumping stations?

Mr Brown advised that repair and improvement works had been undertaken to the pumping stations on the Little Caldew (Willowholme) and at Durranshill that enabled the facilities to operate for a longer time without power being supplied from the National Grid. Electricity North West who owned and operated the facilities was working with the County Council to develop a baseline of infrastructure resilience across the county which would be used to identify areas where further investment was required.

Ms Jones (Cumbria County Council) covering: the multi-agency co-ordinated recovery response including an overview of works undertaken in relation to infrastructure (including bridges and roads), environment, and communications, and the winter resilience programme for roads and bridges; gully cleansing; the management of flood risk outlining the areas of responsibility for a range of public bodies; the governance arrangements of Cumbria Strategic Flood Partnership (Lead Local Flood Authority) and Cumbria Flood Partnership and proposals to bring the two bodies together; the development of Cumbria Flood Action Plan and; measures being taken to increase community resilience.

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

A Member raised a series of questions as follows:

- Following an amended motion at Council on 13 September 2016 what action had the Council carried out in terms of reclamation on the river Petteril and adjacent footpaths;

- He requested an update on agencies plans for flood protection at Melbourne Park;
- Was the EA publicising its flood alert text messaging service;
- Was any information available on how the agencies involved in flood risk management were working together to address issues;
- Were Officers able to provide an update on working being undertaken with the County Council;
- What plans were in place to reduce the impact of flooding on parks, lights and drainage systems?

Another Member commented that many of the issues raised had been addressed in the previous Flood Update Report (SD.18/16) which had been presented at the 15 September meeting of the Panel and that the discussion of the report had been recorded in the Minutes.

The Panel held a discussion on what questions were appropriate to put to Officers at Scrutiny and which issues should be raised with Officers directly, outwith the Scrutiny process.

Responding to some of the questions raised by the Member, Ms Jones stated that in attending the meeting it demonstrated partnership working, was clearly taking place, and she was happy to liaise directly with the Member regarding Highways matters, outwith the meeting.

Mr Brown replied to the questions posed by the Member as follows:

- Promotion of the flood alert text message service was ongoing and had included features in the Council's Focus magazine;
- Works to bridge crossings was a longer timescale piece of work that required input from the Highways Authority regarding possible improvements and enhancements.
- Future plans for Melbourne Park were being developed to identify suitable options for upstream management, the correct standard of design for defences, and how best to work with local authorities. It was likely that this area would see early activity in terms of raised and extended defences.
- Officers from the EA were working closely with Council Officers, particularly Green Spaces in relation to work being undertaken on river beds and banks.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development added that she hoped the Panel had been reassured by the presentations of the work being undertaken in the District, and she was happy to speak with the Member to provide him with the detailed technical information relevant to the issues raised by him.

- A Member commented that he felt the public authorities should be thanked for their work and that good progress had been made, by all involved, on the recovery. He welcomed the proposal to combine the Cumbria Strategic Flood Partnership (Lead Local Flood Authority) and Cumbria Flood Partnership, he asked if there was a proposed governance structure for the combined body?

Mr Brown informed Members that work on the governance structure of the combined body was well under way, the draft Terms of Reference were being developed, which he offered to circulate to the Panel.

- A Member noted that attenuation ponds were increasing as a measure of flood protection on new building developments. How would public authorities ensure that

these facilities would be managed and maintained properly in the future to prevent the silting up and possible failure of the ponds?

Mr Brown replied that attenuation ponds posed a real challenge and work was required in conjunction with Local Planning Authorities, the Highways Authority and Councils to develop areas of responsibilities and management going forward.

- What progress had been made regarding the Public Right of Way (PRoW) grant fund?

Mr Brown advised that draft proposals had been drawn up regarding the management of the fund which would dispense grants to communities to undertake works to flood affected PRoWs. Community involvement was an important feature of the dispensing the fund, and further work needed to be undertaken to develop a programme of engagement.

- What work did the County Council do to inform farmers of the responsibilities to clearing highway of debris from their vehicles to prevent it collecting in gullies?

Ms Jones noted that it was a criminal offence for farmers not to clear the highway of debris from their vehicles, she undertook to provide the Member with a detailed response of the work being undertaken to address this issue.

In a question from the Chairman in relation to the publication of the Carlisle Section 19 report, Mr Brown advised that it was expected to be published in mid-January 2017. The Chairman requested that the Section 19 reports be included as part of the Flood Update Report due for consideration by the Panel at its March 2017 meeting. The Chairman thanked Ms Jones, Mr Ratcliffe and Mr Brown for their presentations, which had been very informative.

RESOLVED –(1) That Ms Jones, Mr Ratcliffe and Mr Brown be thanked for their presentations.

(2) That the Carlisle Section 19 report be included in the Flood Update Report to the Panel in March 2017.

(3) That Flood Update Report (SD.31/16) be noted.

## **EEOSP.78/16      NORTH WEST COAST CONNECTIONS PROJECT – S42 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

The Development Manager presented report ED.42/16 which set out issues relating to the National Grid's consultation on the North West Coast Connections Project (NWCC). Appended to the report was a Preliminary Environmental Impact (PEI) Headlines report from consultants WYG which detailed issues regarding the preliminary environmental assessment of the Project and proposed mitigation measures.

The National Grid had put forward plans to build a 400 kilovolt (kV) connection from the proposed new nuclear power station at Moorside in West Cumbria, to the national electricity grid at Harker, near Carlisle, and Heysham near Lancaster. NWCC was a nationally significant infrastructure project which would be decided by the Secretary of State through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.

The report outlined the principle elements of the project including proposed new pylon, the routing of the infrastructure, and the expected timetable for the project. The Development Manager summarised the headline issues which had arisen through the S42 Consultation process and had been identified in the PEI report, which included: Landscape and Visual impact; Historic Environment; Construction and Operational Noise & Vibration; Traffic and Transport; and Community Benefits. The report contained a full consideration of the headline issues and put forward a number of recommendations in response to the consultation.

The Development Manager identified the following aspects of the consultation as having particular relevance to Carlisle:

- The suitability of the proposed routing and frequency of the new 400kV pylons;
- Proposed landscaping and visual impact mitigation measure;
- Impact on rivers and protected environments;
- Impact on tourist sites such as Hadrian's Wall (World Heritage Site);
- Impact on Listed Buildings and their settings;
- Impact on agriculture;
- Lack of cumulative assessment of the proposals with the existing vertical infrastructure within the District;
- Impact on Skills and Employment

The Development Manager presented a number of slides to the Panel containing plans illustrating the project proposals contained within the report, an explanation of which was provided for Members.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder noted that the Development Manager was part of the Officers' Technical Group, and that the Council was very fortunate to have an Officer so involved in the project. She had confidence in the Officer's developing recommendations in relation to the proposal and felt that the Panel's role in considering the report was to validate the Officers' professional view, offering guidance or commentary where Members considered it necessary.

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

- A number of Members expressed concern regarding the gaps of information contained in the PEI report.

The Development Manager informed Members that the consultation was the first time details had been provided to local authorities to enable an assessment of the information, therefore, it was the first opportunity afforded to the Council to formally comment on the detail of the project. He acknowledged that much work was still needed to be undertaken in terms of survey work and the like to inform the Project. Local Authority Officers would continue to work with the National Grid on the Project via the Planning Performance Agreement Group (PPA).

- Was the Secretary of State able to consider responses to the consultation from individual Councils?

The Development Manager informed Members that all responses submitted to the consultation would be incorporated as part of the consultation report to the Secretary of

State. The National Grid would have to justify decision it had taken on the project in relation to the response received via the consultation.

- A Member felt that Harker and Rockcliffe were the two areas of the District that would experience greatest impact from the proposal, he asked why it was not proposed that all the transmission lines were undergrounded in those areas.

The Development Manager explained that laying the transmission lines underground would have significant cost implication for the NWCC project, he noted that whilst there was not a defined budget for the Project, the cost of the work would ultimately be borne by energy customers.

The Member responded that he was aware of concerns amongst residents at Rockcliffe regarding the proposed new route of the transmission lines and the larger 400kV pylons, he asked why it was not proposed that the existing route continued to be used.

The Development Manager acknowledged the concerns of people who lived along the proposed new route of the transmission lines, he noted that the proposed 400kV pylons were larger than the 132kV used in the current transmission line. The distribution of the 400kV pylons along the proposed transmission lines would be less frequent than of the 132kV pylons current transmission lines, therefore the distances between individual pylons would be greater providing the opportunity for alternative alignment.

- Had alternative pylon designs been considered?

The design of the 400kV pylons' differed from 132kV as they were taller, the alternative "T" design had more solid appearance, similar to that of wind turbines, therefore the visual impact of the structures may be greater than with existing models. The Development Manager advised that no assessment had been undertaken of the proposed transmission lines and their cumulative impact with existing vertical structures such as turbines. In some areas of the district, for example, Little Orton, the cumulative effect of the structures had the potential to cause significant impact on the visual landscape.

- Had details been provided regarding the species of trees to be used when providing landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of new pylons?

The Development Manager advised that no details of the species of trees had been provided and clarified that Members were being asked if the proposed mitigation measures, overall, were acceptable.

- Was compensation payable to residents who experienced direct visual impact as a result of the siting of pylons in the vicinity of their property?

The Development Manager responded that residents would not necessarily be compensated if a pylon affected their visual amenity, it was a difficult matter where a number of factors would be considered, for example, whether the pylons was to be erected within the curtilage of a property. Landowners would be provided payment for the siting of pylons on their land.

- What consideration had the Project given to the impact of heritage sites?

The Development Manager informed Members that the Project had proposed undergrounding the transmission lines in the vicinity of Hadrian's Wall to reduce the visual impact of the Project on the World Heritage Site. The PPA Group had identified a number of concerns in relation to the Project's assessments relating to the site, which it considered a serious limitation.

In terms of impact on Listed Buildings, the Development Manager advised that the Project's consideration of the setting of historic assets, as detailed in the PEI was too narrow, therefore the likelihood of impacts upon setting would have been missed was an area for concern. The report recommended that the National Grid provide further detailed information on this aspect of the project as part of the Environmental Statement submitted with the Development Consent Order.

- Was it possible that the stone excavated from the undergrounding works at Hadrian's Wall would be available for use by local communities?

The Development Manager responded that the Project had not provided details on the proposed use of the excavated stone, however, he understood that consideration had been given to incorporating the stone into flood defence measures.

- A Member commented that he fully supported the report and that he hoped the Executive would fight for the city in every area of the project.
- The Chairman asked if any aspects of the Project may be influenced, affected or stopped in response to concerns raised by the authority.

The Development Manager advised that the Project would not be stopped as the connection of the proposed Moorside Power Station to the National Grid at Harker was essential. The authority needed to endorse acceptance of the principle of the Project and work with the project providers to ensure that the Project and its impacts within the District were acceptable.

RESOLVED – (1) That North West Coast Connections Project - S42 Consultation Response (ED.42/16) and its recommendations be endorsed to the Executive.

(2) That the comments and concerns of the Panel be referred to the Executive, in particular concerns regarding the impact of the visual landscape of the project in the Rockcliffe area.

## **EEOSP.79/16 STANDING ORDERS**

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 of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time limit of 3 hours.

## **EEOSP.80/16 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT 2016/17**

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted report PC.24/16 which updated the Panel on the Council's service standards relevant to the Panel and included updates on key actions contained with the new Carlisle Plan.

The Policy and Communications Manager reported that the table at Section 1 of the report illustrated the cumulative year to date figure, a month by month breakdown of performance and, where possible, an actual service standard baseline that had been established either locally or nationally. Only the service standard relevant to the Panel had been included in the Report.

The updates against the actions in the Carlisle Plan followed on from service standard information in Section 2. As many of the key actions contained within the outgoing Carlisle Plan had been completed, actions and projects had recently been refreshed in the 2015 - 18 Carlisle Plan. Work was continuing on the future report content and the best way of presenting the information to future Panels and Members.

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

- A Member commented that he felt the importance of reporting recycling targets would increase with the implementation of the new Carlisle Plans, and a report providing further details in relation to this would be required at a future meeting of the Panel.

Another Member felt it was important for Members to understand the purpose of the national targets relating to Waste and Recycling which is reported to be 50% by 2020. He suggested that Officers conduct a review, in conjunction with the County Council on the reporting of national target information.

- A Member felt it would be of benefit to Members if future performance reports contained information in relation to the content of Freedom of Information relating to the Service Standard reported to the Panel.

The Chairman felt the issue of the presentation of performance management information should be considered as part of the work being undertaken regarding new remits for the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Panels. He requested that proposal on the presentation of performance information be presented in a report to the Panel at its meeting of 2 March 2017.

Resolved (1) That proposal for the presentation of Performance Management information be submitted to the Panel at the 2 March 2017 meeting.

(2) That 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Performance Report 2016/17 (PC.24/16) be noted.

(The meeting ended at 13:40)