

ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 19 JANUARY 2012

7.00 PM

Forli Room - Town Hall

AGENDA

	Page No
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations	
<i>At this point Members must declare whether they have an interest, whether personal or prejudicial, in any of the items on the agenda. Members must also declare if they are subject to their party group whip in relation to any items under consideration.</i>	
3. Minutes of meetings held on:	1 - 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 8 September 2011• 3 November 2011	
4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions	
<i>The decision notice for each decision will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision may then be implemented on the expiry of 3 working days after the publication of the decision (not including the date of publication), unless a request for call-in of the decision is received from any two Members of a Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Commission. If a request for call-in of a decision is received, implementation of the decision remains suspended for consideration by the relevant Scrutiny Committee or Commission.</i>	
5. 2012/13 Local Transport Plan Capital Programme of Works (CPW)	Report to follow
6. Environmental Enforcement Performance	9 - 16
7. Parking on Grass Verges	17 - 24
8. Forward Plan of Key Decisions	25 - 38
9. Work Programme	39 - 42
10. Date of Next Meeting	

Thursday, 22 March 2012



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Paulina Ford on 01733 452508 as soon as possible.

Committee Members:

Councillors: D Day (Chairman), N Arculus (Vice Chairman), N North, B Rush, J Peach, J A Fox and N Sandford

Substitutes: Councillors: F Benton, C Ash and A Shaheed

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Paulina Ford on telephone 01733 452508 or by email – paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the Cathedral. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM - TOWN HALL
ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillors D Day (Chairman), N North, J Peach, B Rush, J A Fox
and N Sandford

Also Present: Councillor Sam Dalton, Cabinet Member for Environment
Hannah Reid, Youth Council Representative

Officers Present: Paul Phillipson, Executive Director for Operations
Teresa Wood, Sustainable Environment Manager
James Fisher, Wildlife Officer
Mike Heath, Commercial Services Director, Enterprise
Claire Boyd, Lawyer
Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny
Dania Castagliuolo, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Arculus.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

The following declarations of interest were made:

Item 5 - Biodiversity Strategy – Progress Report 2010/2011

Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest in that he was an employee of the Woodland Trust and Councillor Fox declared a personal interest in that she was a member of the Friends of Cuckoo's Hollow Group,

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 July 2011

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2011 were approved as a correct record.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

5. Biodiversity Strategy – Progress Report 2010/2011

The report provided the Committee with information on the progress that had been made against actions and targets contained in the Biodiversity Strategy which had been agreed in 2010.

Questions and observations were raised around the following areas:

- Cuckoo's Hollow was referred to in the report as a nature reserve. Can you advise if this has been renamed? *The officer confirmed that there had been no change in status and it was still called Cuckoo's Hollow.*

- Many parts of Peterborough have conservation areas but sometimes planning applications were approved which allowed development on green sites. Was there anything that could be done to stop this happening? *The Wildlife Officer advised Members that he had been closely involved with the planning department and was consulted on protected sites and that his role was to do everything to protect those spaces.*
- Councillor Sandford highlighted that over the past twelve months several major reports had been published; Making Space for Nature by Professor Sir John Lawton and the Government White Paper on Biodiversity 2020. Both of the reports highlighted the need for a more integrated landscape-scale approach. This approach had been reflected in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy of 2010 but did not appear to show that it was being adopted in the progress report. What was the Council doing to reflect the changes in government policy? There was a need to adopt larger scale thinking. *The Wildlife Officer advised that he was aware of the new policies and had taken them into account. Councillor Dalton informed members that the document had not just focused on the odd site but that there was a commitment to focus across the city and that there were many examples of wildlife habitat. In the Sustainable cities report the Council was ranked 1st out of 21 cities for biodiversity.*
- Councillor Sandford advised of a report produced by the Woodland Trust advising of regimes where by short mown grass in woodland areas would be left to grow. Councillor Sandford felt that the regime should be adopted by the Council. *Officers advised Members that the recommendations in the report from the Woodland Trust had been taken into account within the Trees and Woodland Strategy but that public safety also had to be taken into account.*
- What has happened to the nesting bird's policy? *The costs of the regime that had been proposed were excessive in terms of the work that needed to be done. There was now a blanket ban in place on work to shrubs from the end of February to September. The only exceptions to that would be where there was a concern for safety and emergency work would need to be carried out.*
- Why are the grass verges on the dual carriageways cut and was it possible to have wild flowers instead of spending money on mowing? *Officers advised that in certain circumstances it may be safer not to have to cut the verges and that the idea would be considered.*
- Members wanted to see a mapping of the connecting habitats across the City with the key designated sites shown and have this overlaid on to the Core Strategy. The Planning Committee would find this of benefit. *Officers advised that a mapping exercise was already in progress with the idea of developing a GIS layer. Work was being carried out with the Environmental Records Centre to record a data set of protected species in the area. Councillor Dalton advised that she would speak to Simon Machen in planning regarding the suggested mapping.*

ACTION AGREED

The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Wildlife Officer consider the new Government White Paper on Biodiversity 2020 and advise the Committee on how it will be implemented by the Council.

6. Environment Capital Performance Update

The report provided information on performance against the Council's Sustainable Cities Index as measured by the Forum for the Future through its Sustainable Cities Index 2010. Peterborough was measured amongst some of the largest cities in the UK including Newcastle, Edinburgh, Bristol, Liverpool and Birmingham. Peterborough had dropped in overall ranking from 10th to 11th out of 21 cities. Three baskets of indicators had been used to measure performance:

- Environmental Performance

- Quality of Life
- Future Proofing

The environmental performance indicator had improved the cities ranking from 11th to equal 7th. The quality of life indicator had dropped in ranking from 12th to 14th and the future proofing indicator had dropped in ranking from 3rd to 5th. Transport had not previously been measured for Peterborough but was included this year and contained in the basket of indicators for 'quality of life'.

Questions and observations were raised around the following areas:

- The waste indicators show Peterborough as 21st in ranking. This includes collection of garden waste. How many of the other cities collect garden waste. *Officers advised that most large cities had not collected garden waste. The exact number of cities collecting garden waste within the index was not known. Peterborough had been quite unique within the basket of Cities in that it had collected garden waste and this had therefore affected the ranking as it had pushed up the amount of household waste collected per person in Peterborough. Members were advised that the amount of waste collected per person year on year in Peterborough had dropped showing an improvement but against the other Cities it had not. Councillor Dalton expressed disappointment in some parts of the report and some of the rankings and informed Members that those areas would be focused on over the next twelve months.*
- Has the trial for food waste been completed and will collecting food waste improve our ranking. *Collection of food waste would make the ranking worse due to the increase in the amount of waste per head collected. The trial had been completed and discussions with Enterprise Peterborough would take place to see how it might be taken forward.*
- Members were in favour of the Council being part of the Sustainable Cities Index but were aware that Peterborough was being benchmarked against much larger cities.
- Members were concerned about the length of time it was taking to declare Peterborough as the Environment Capital and wanted to know the timescale for achieving it. There needed to be a timescale in place. *Councillor Dalton advised that this would only be achieved when no one could challenge Peterborough. A number of poor performing indicators had needed to be addressed before this could happen and action plans would need to be put in place to achieve these. Peterborough was however ahead of other cities in that it had an Environment Capital Policy.*
- The Home of Environment Capital was not mentioned in the report; did this slogan still exist? *The report had been about the Sustainable Cities Index not the branding. The Home of Environment Capital branding remained the same.*
- Twelve months ago the Committee asked for a set of objectives that the city could measure itself against to achieve Environment Capital status. The Sustainable Cities Index was chosen. The indicators show two years worth of performance but this had indicated that Peterborough was not doing well in some of the rankings e.g. climate change and transport. What was being done to address this downward trend? *An action plan was being put in place to address these issues.*
- The Committee were informed that the indicator on transport had been based on super output areas which had meant Peterborough had scored badly as Peterborough had a large amount of rural areas compared with the other larger urban cities in the Sustainable Cities Index.
- Members requested that a performance report be produced to report on all the indicators and sent to the Committee on a regular basis. *Officers were advised that they were meeting with the performance management team to discuss the best way to report on the indicators.*

ACTION AGREED

The Committee requested that they received the following information:

- Action plan on Climate Change.
- Forum for the Future detailed report including the transport data.
- Performance report for all indicators to be produced and presented back to the Committee at a future meeting.

8. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The latest version of the Forward Plan, showing details of the key decisions that the Leader of the Council believed the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would be making over the next four months, was received.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and requested that the street lighting policy be brought to the Committee for Scrutiny.

9. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2010/11 and the Scrutiny Officer to include any additional items as requested during the meeting.

10. Date of the Next Meeting

Thursday 3 November 2011

CHAIRMAN
7.00 - 8.36 pm

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM - TOWN HALL
ON 3 NOVEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillors D Day (Chairman), N North, B Rush, F Benton C Ash and N Sandford

Also Present: Councillor M Lee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning

Officers Present: Paul Phillipson, Executive Director for Operations
Richard Pearn, Waste Client Manager
Margaret Welton, Principal Lawyer (Special Projects/Waste 2020)
Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny
Israr Ahmed, Lawyer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peach, Councillor Arculus and Councillor J A Fox. Councillor Benton attended as substitute for Councillor Peach and Councillor Ash attended as substitute for Councillor Fox.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 September 2011

Councillor North advised the Chair that he was concerned that an important point had been missed from the minutes with regard to the Environment Capital Performance Update report and therefore could not approve the minutes. He had asked Councillor Dalton a question regarding when the Environment Capital status would be achieved and when it was achieved what it would look like. There did not appear to be any mention of this in the minutes.

ACTION

Senior Governance Officer to check the notes taken at the meeting held on 8 September 2011 and respond to Councillor North's query.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

5. Energy from Waste – Waste 2020 Update

The report provided the Committee with an update on the Council's procurements relating to Lot 1 (Energy from Waste Facility) and Lot 2 (Materials recycling Facility) and the Council's response to the Peterborough Friends of the Earth (PFoE) report. The Committee were advised that procurements for Lot 1 and Lot 2 had progressed and were in the final rounds of dialogue with bidders. Once the dialogue had closed the next stage for each procurement would be to call for final tenders.

The Waste Client Manager went through each of the assumptions made by the Peterborough Friends of the Earth and referred to the Council's response to each such assumption as set out in Appendix 1 of the report submitted to this Committee. Councillor Sandford commented that it had taken a long time to respond to the Friends of the Earth report and expressed the view that it was lacking in detail.

Questions and observations were raised around the following areas:

- The Waste Client Manager spoke about the debt repayment commencing in 2013 and advised that the procurements, the finances and other factors (such as landfill tax and allowances) were kept under review as regards the optimum time to build the facilities.
- Why did the Council assume that residual waste was going to grow when the Council's strategy was based on significant reductions in waste? Were you therefore admitting that the strategy would not succeed? *Members were informed that the waste would grow as the city grew. The strategy had a challenging target of changing people's behaviour to make the waste per head of population stop growing. The level of waste per head may stop growing but the population would increase. The model had to reflect the aspiration for the city to grow and therefore the population would increase but there was still a commitment to stop the level of waste per person growing.*
- The report states that the Council has a target of recycling at 65% by 2020 and "reducing / no residual" waste growth. The target had originally been 65% plus by 2020. Many other authorities were already achieving that target. Had the target changed? *Members were informed that 65% should have read '65% plus' and that the target had not changed. The aim was still to reach 65% plus and beyond.*
- What technology are you proposing to install for the energy from waste facility. *The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning advised Members that the Council was technology agnostic and it would be through the procurement process and dialogue with the bidders that the bidders would put forward the technological solution that would best suite Peterborough's needs and requirements for an energy from waste facility and to generate heat and power. The Principal Lawyer (Special Projects/Waste 2020) also informed Members that the Council had gone to the market based on the Council's 2007 decision which specified that the requirement was for an energy resource facility that would generate power and heat from waste (with no specific technology identified). Dialogue was currently being undertaken with two bidders to come up with suitable solutions. The bidders were credible UK and International Companies and were keen to provide Peterborough with the best technology on the market to meet its requirements.*
- Members commented that the original decision to build an energy from waste facility was in 2007 and thought that the original proposal was for an incinerator. It was now 2011/2012 but the proposal was not due to go through until 2016. There had been massive technological changes going on all the time. If a contractor were now to propose an MBT plant as the most effective facility for dealing with residual waste would they be refused because the original decision had been for an incinerator even though it may not be the most cost effective way. *The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning reminded Members that he was responsible for making the important decision to award this contract and before he did so, he wanted to be assured in his own mind, that whichever of the bidder's proposal was being recommended, it was the right decision for Peterborough. It is right as the process has progressed that it had been kept under review and that the facility was built when it was financially optimum to do so. The Principal Lawyer also reminded Members that the original working group had considered the Cyclerval type facility (as well as others) when making its recommendations to Council in 2007. However, the original report and decision did not state that the Council was committed to going down the route of any particular form of technology. It was right that the Council's decision had been technology agnostic and had left open the question of the type of technology solution – which was being informed by the current procurement. It had been a long term and complicated*

programme hence the name Waste 2020 but the programme had been kept under regular review, both financially and with regard to technology.

- *Members were concerned that the population was growing, land fill was running out and whilst it was laudable that the council was waiting for the appropriate technology sooner or later a decision would have to be made to go with the technology that works and was available. Would the target for an operational unit to be up and running in four years time be feasible? The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning advised Members that the latest report from officers had advised that they were on target but we keep it under review.*
- *Peterborough Renewable Energy Limited (PREL) has proposed to build a high tech energy from waste facility. Why did Peterborough need two facilities and why can't Peterborough put the waste through the PREL facility. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning informed Members that the PREL facility had not been built and was not, therefore, currently operational or in a position to take any waste from Peterborough. When the Council's procurement process had first started PREL had been invited to attend initial meetings along with other waste companies, to understand what Peterborough wanted to procure. PREL were a commercial operation and chose not to be part of the Council's procurement process.*
- *Members asked about the milestones in place for the Waste 2020 programme to indicate what progress had been made and what was going to happen in the future. This would provide some reassurance that the programme was on track. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning advised that there was a set of milestones in place and that the programme was broadly on track. He also advised Members that further briefings would be held in the New Year for all Councillors to provide another update of what was happening on the Waste 2020 programme.*
- *Will you have to commit to providing the waste to energy facility with a certain tonnage of waste? Members were advised that it had been made clear to the bidders that any exclusivity to the council's waste was not accompanied by a commitment on minimum tonnage. The planning permission for the facility had a catchment restriction within it which meant that the facility could not be filled from imported waste thus ensuring that 75% of the waste would have to be from within the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire authority catchment area.*
- *If you have to guarantee that 75% of the waste has to come from within the Peterborough area surely this would take away the Council's incentive to recycle. Members were informed that this was not the case.*

Members thanked the officers and Councillor Lee for an informative presentation.

ACTION AGREED

1. The Committee noted the report.
2. The Committee requested that:
 - i. A list of milestones for the Waste 2020 programme be provided to Members; and
 - ii. A further report is brought back to the Committee when a final decision has been made on the type of energy from waste facility.

6. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The latest version of the Forward Plan, showing details of the key decisions that the Leader of the Council believed the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would be making over the next four months, was received.

Energy Services Company – KEY/03JUL/11

- Members were concerned that the recent government announcement that solar feed in tariffs would be reduced by half from 12 December 2011 would impact on the council's projects. *The Executive Director of Operations advised Members that the Council had only just received the announcement regarding the tariff changes and the Executive Director for Strategic Resources was assessing the impact it would have on the Council's projects.*

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan.

7. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

Members were concerned that the Trees and Woodlands Strategy had been deferred from previous meetings and was not scheduled into the current work programme. *The Executive Director of Operations informed Members that the Trees and Woodlands Strategy was currently being reviewed along with the contract for Enterprise. The strategy was mostly written but some of the wording relating to Enterprise was still to be agreed.*

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2010/11 and the Scrutiny Officer to include any additional items as requested during the meeting.

8. Date of the Next Meeting

19 January 2012

CHAIRMAN
7.00 - 8.36 pm

ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 6
19 JANUARY 2012	Public Report

Report of the Executive Director of Operations

Contact Officers: Adrian Chapman, Head of Neighbourhoods
Peter Gell, Strategic Regulatory Services Manager

Contact Details: 863887 adrian.chapman@peterborough.gov.uk
453419 peter.gell@peterborough.gov.uk

ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT PERFORMANCE

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide members with an overview of regulatory performance in the field of Environmental Enforcement in order to facilitate debate, enable challenge, and help identify new opportunities to deliver better outcomes to improve and support local communities.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Members of the committee are asked to note the contents of the report, and confirm their support or otherwise for work streams identified within it.
- 2.2 Members are in addition asked to consider whether there are initiatives that have not been identified within the report that Council Officers should also explore, and if so to highlight them.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

- 3.1 Our communities, their sense of pride and aspiration, is directly affected by the condition of our streets and open spaces. Evidence of litter, fly tipping, graffiti etc can give the impression that the community is not loved or that the public sector are not efficient.

However, such evidence of poor environmental condition also has a direct relationship to the volume of crime and anti-social behaviour in an area, previously described to this Committee as the 'broken window theory'.

For this reason the work carried out to tackle environmental crime cuts across the entire Sustainable Community Strategy, and has a very direct link to the Strong and Supportive Communities strand more specifically.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 In March 2011 a paper was brought before this committee outlining the opportunities recent integration of regulatory services into one team within Neighbourhoods presented with regards to delivering better outcomes for communities.

Integration was also seen as signifying a start of a journey in which regulatory services would, through stronger engagement with communities, increasingly align services to local community needs and priorities. Breaking down historical professional boundaries between teams to prevent working in silos was considered key if the council was to maximise the effectiveness of service delivery.

- 4.2 At the time of the previous report to this committee officers engaged in Environmental

Enforcement undertook regulatory activity in the following areas:

- Flytipping
- Accumulations
- Business Waste
- Flyposting
- Littering
- Graffiti
- Dog fouling

Since March 2011 in order to meet service demands placed on the Council in other areas officers were also asked to take the lead with regards to abandoned and untaxed vehicles, section 215 of the Planning Act relating to loss of amenity, as well accompanying the Traveller liaison officer on visits to unauthorised Traveller encampments.

A regulatory functional area sometimes linked to environmental regulatory matters is that of statutory nuisance, the most common of these being noise pollution. This area is picked up by other officers due to a very different statutory framework underpinning it, although they work closely with environmental enforcement staff.

4.3 Due to the very nature of environmental crime, it being very visible to communities when there is a problem, a significant amount of the work of the team is reactive. Appendix 1 shows service requests in this area for the period 1/11/10 to 8/12/11, fly tipping with 1530 incidents being the biggest category.

4.4 Providing sufficient capacity to deal with the volume and variety of environmental crime issues within the city does present a constant challenge to Regulatory Services, and as a result a number of measures have been implemented this year to add resilience. In April 2011 Peterborough City Council entered into a contract with Rutland County Council to deliver their statutory regulatory services. As part of this arrangement nine staff TUPE transferred from Rutland to Peterborough. Having a wider pool of staff has provided more flexibility, and the city has benefited from using new staff to support service delivery in Peterborough.

Earlier this year, three parking enforcement staff received training to enable them to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) to deal with littering offences; the vision is that all in the team will be developed in this way. Though this multi-skilling approach will not make a huge difference to the overall enforcement capacity due the service demands within parking, it does however enable action to be taken where littering is blatant. Maximising the potential of staff to be able to deal with a broad range of regulatory matters remains a priority within the service, to support this a skills matrix has been produced across regulatory services providing the platform from which to drive change.

With regards to noise nuisance the service identified that significant numbers of complaints related to housing association tenants, and as a consequence we have developed new processes and procedures through work initially with Cross Keys that will rebalance the distribution of work to investigate cases so that the housing association does more before any potential Council involvement. When the Council do intervene the transition is now more customer focused. Similar arrangements will be rolled out with the other housing associations across the city. The investment in better noise recording equipment, the implementation of a triage system to handle requests for service, and improvements to web based information and advisory literature has all resulted in improvements in this area.

4.5 Regulatory Services have been proactive in exploring, implementing and supporting measures aimed at improving regulatory outcomes, a number of these are outlined below.

Neighbourhood Window

The Neighbourhood Window (NW) is a repository that has been developed to hold locality based data. Since its launch it has grown from strength to strength as more data sets are added to it from both Council Services and our partners. With regards to Environmental Enforcement requests for service made through Peterborough Direct have been added enabling hotspot

environmental crime areas to be identified. Enterprise data is currently being added to the NW to build an even more comprehensive picture.

Abandoned Vehicles

Due to legal restrictions regarding the obtaining of data from the DVLA, it was necessary post the contract award to Enterprise to set up new arrangements to enable abandoned vehicle and untaxed vehicle cases to continue to be dealt with. The team removed what had become a barrier to enforcement and have taken on a new role regarding evidence gathering and removal authorisation.

Dog and Pest Service Retendered

In retendering the contract to provide this service, provision was written into it to allow for some dog fouling enforcement and education activities. In retendering the contract efficiencies have enabled these to be provided at no additional cost. The contract consolidates several separate contracts into one.

Officer/Member Walkabouts

Walking the streets with ward councillors has enabled them to highlight to officers those matters which their communities would most like to see addressed, following which a number of wards have seen some quick successes as alleyways are quickly cleared of rubbish, fly tipping removed, measures arranged to prevent unauthorised encampments. In addition to these environmental enforcement staff are regularly undertaking their own patrols, a number of which are along with partner agencies. These are helping to ensure that the Council increasingly identifies and can respond to problems before they are reported by the public.

Littering Summit

At the request of the Deputy Leader a summit took place in November on the subject of littering, bringing together interested parties across the city to help facilitate closer working arrangements. Officers from Neighbourhoods played a key part in this summit, during which a number of opportunities were identified which could help reduce environmental crime within the city. It was recognised by attendees that in order to reduce crime levels enforcement alone was not the answer, education and other measures to influence behaviour would have to be utilised as well.

Gating Orders

Enforcement officers have played a significant part in gaining the required evidence to show that alleyway facilitated crime or ASB would be reduced by gating specific alleys. As a consequence three gating orders have been put in place, these being in Stanground, Orton Goldhay, and Dogsthorpe.

'Operation CAN-do' Environmental Solution Clinic

The first of a number of solution clinics took place in November the first being on the topic of environmental crime. The clinic brought together partner agencies that together have an ability to make a significant impact on tackling environmental crime in the 'Operation CAN-do' area. The clinic resulted in the identification of a number of additional measures that could if implemented improve the locality. The measures which range from short to long term initiatives have been put to a resident forum made up of representatives from the community, and agreed priorities identified.

'Operation CAN-do'

Though a Solution Clinic has taken place regarding environmental crime in this area, a number of initiatives were already being implemented to tackle environmental crime; the clinic has however helped to identify new opportunities. A number of current measures are identified below:

Fly tipping has and remains a problem in this area and across other parts of the city. Working with the Fire Service, fly tipping which presents a fire and or public safety hazard will be prioritised to ensure its swift removal. The Council and partners will be flagging fly tipping with notices so that the public are aware that the council is dealing with the matter. Where fly tipping

or accumulations occur on Council land Enterprise through their contract are required to remove it. Officers from the Environmental Enforcement team have been working with Enterprise staff to ensure that we get any evidence that exists at the scene which will support taking enforcement action against the offenders. Officers have accompanied two refuse crews as they go about their early morning rounds. This not only enabled training to be given to the crews on evidence gathering but also helped build a productive team work approach amongst staff.

A further initiative with Enterprise will see a targeted approach at a part of the Lincoln Road which suffers from significant amounts of fast food packaging waste. By linking evidence back to specific premises businesses can through legislative means be required to clear up an area within the vicinity of their premises.

With the number of licensed premises recognised as being a contributory factor to environmental crime in the locality tackling those premises which have a flagrant disregard for the law is important. Through the flexibility that a joined up Regulatory Services offers, work by the Trading Standards Team along with the HMRC and the police have through seizures of non- duty paid goods enabled premise licences to be revoked following licence reviews.

Dedicated littering Enforcement

Councillors may remember that three years ago the Council employed a contractor this being Xfor at the time to undertake littering enforcement in the city, this enabled Council staff to concentrate on the more complex environmental crime offences. This approach resulted in a significant number of FPN's being issued but became uneconomical after a while as a self financing model. Based on a new financial model this arrangement is thought viable again and discussions have been taking place with regards to procuring a contractor to deliver littering enforcement again.

5. KEY ISSUES

5.1 Performance statistics

The customer focused drive from within the Neighbourhoods Division, supported by partner agencies, and aided by Neighbourhood Committees and other community forums has led to greater customer engagement and consequently an increased understanding of customer need. The Neighbourhood Window has been used to support service managers in the alignment of services to customer need.

One of the impacts of increased customer engagement is greater accessibility to Council services; this has the potential in conjunction with increased foot patrols by Council staff and wider reporting by partner agencies to raise the level of reported environmental crimes. Appendix 1 shows the number of reported crimes through Peterborough Direct, and via the Neighbourhoods Flare operating system by officers for the period 1/11/10 to 8/12/11. Having also compared the previous year's figures some areas of environmental crime have increased while others have fallen. Those that have decreased are accumulations, down by 2%, littering 30%, fly posting 42%, while the following are up, fly tipping by 13%, graffiti 40%, and littering from vehicles by 350%.

Appendix 2 show details of formal enforcement action taken for the above period, along with comparator information regarding the previous year. It can be seen that enforcement action increased last year.

There are a number of factors to be aware of when considering the level of enforcement action, in order to understand the relationship with the number and nature of sanctions. By far the majority of environmental crime offenders are faceless, in other words the activity is committed without either witnesses that are prepared to come forward to give evidence, or the crime scene does not contain evidence linking an offender to it. This scenario is more common in fly tipping and accumulation cases as against littering and business waste.

Legislation, codes of practice, and the Councils own Enforcement Policy require a proportionate approach to enforcement, as a result prosecution in most cases should be the last resort, there being other measures ranging from warnings, FPN, statutory notices, and cautions that must be considered first. Where measures prove ineffective in changing the behaviour of an offender subsequent enforcement sanctions become more severe.

Though costs of enforcement and removal of rubbish can not be the basis of determining the nature of enforcement sanctions to be applied, the Council nevertheless remains mindful of them. Issuing a Caution while at the same time recovering the costs associated with the removal of the rubbish from the offender has proven to date to be more beneficial in financial terms than seeking costs associated with legal proceedings which have not covered costs in the past.

6. IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no specific implications relating to this item.

7. CONSULTATION

7.1 No formal consultation is required; the Cabinet Member for Housing Neighbourhoods and Planning oversees regulatory activity in this area.

8. NEXT STEPS

8.1 Feedback from the committee will help inform future service delivery.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None used.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 Appendix 1 Service Requests
Appendix 2 Enforcement Action

APPENDIX 1 SERVICE REQUESTS

1/11/10 – 8/12/11	Number of calls received
Flytipping	1530
Accumulations of Waste on Private Land	751
Littering	205
Abandoned Vehicles	288
Flyposting	138
Duty of Care (Waste Carriers/Transfer Notes)	136
Section 46/47 (Residential/Commercial Misuse of bins)	135
Littering From Vehicle	66
Dog Fouling Enforcement	23
Noise Pollution requests	870

APPENDIX 2 ENFORCEMENT ACTION

Outcomes

Fly tipping:-

- Warning Letters – **129**
- Cautions with costs – **54**
- FPN (Offence reduced to Littering) – **36**
- Prosecutions – **7**, 3 others due in court, with 7 being processed
- Section 46 Notices Served as a result of investigation – **131**

10% of investigations result in positive outcome compared to 3% in same period the previous year. (figures do not include warning letters, although deemed an outcome they are often used as information letters also.)

Accumulations:-

- First Stage Warning Letter – **632**
- Prevention of Damage from Pests Act served - **206**
- Number Cleared in Default – **16**

31% of cases had a notice served to ensure waste was removed compared to 16.5% previous year.

Littering (inc from Vehicle):-

- Littering FPN – **211**
- Vehicle Littering FPN – **74**
- Prosecutions – **43**

36% increase on previous year for Littering and an 89% increase in vehicle litter investigations undertaken.

Fly posting:-

- 48 Hour removal notice – **142**
- Fly posting FPN – **7**
- Fly posting Prosecution – **5**

7% increase on previous year.

Dog Fouling:-

- Dog Fouling FPN -**3**

Noise Nuisance:-

- Notices served – **57**
- Improvement Notice Letters – **606**
- Resolved Informally - **725**

This page is intentionally left blank

ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 7
19 JANUARY 2012	Public Report

Report of the Executive Director of Operations

**Contact Officer(s) – Peter Gell, Strategic Regulatory Services Manager Tel: 453419
Andy Tatt, Network Management Group Manager Tel: 453469**

AN OVERVIEW OF THE MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO ADDRESS VERGE PARKING

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report outlines the work undertaken to assess and tackle verge parking concerns across the city.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 For the Scrutiny Committee to endorse the approach outlined within the report
- 2.2 For the Scrutiny Committee to identify any additional measure that they feel should be employed or explored to tackle verge parking.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The practice of cars parking on grass verges is commonly known as verge parking. It frequently leads to damaged verges and an unsightly mess, especially during the winter months due to wet weather.
- 3.2 In many streets the front gardens of properties have been turned into parking spaces. A dropped kerb and hard surfaced access should be provided in these circumstances, these require the consent of the Council and planning permission may also be required.
- 3.3 Causing an obstruction by parking across a pavement is a matter that in the majority of cases is only actionable by the Police due to legislative restrictions. The exception to this is where there is also a `Traffic Regulation Order` (TRO) prohibiting parking i.e. double yellow lines. In this case the order covers the road side and the adjacent pavement up to the boundary of the public land, and as a result the Council can take action for breach of the TRO, and/or the Police for an obstruction offence. It should be noted that for the Police to take action, there must be a significant obstruction not a partial overhang over the pavement.
- 3.4 Verge parking is not unique to Peterborough; many cities have areas where verge parking is a problem due to the lack of parking provision. Contributory factors are the age of the housing stock, population density, and the high rate of vehicle ownership.
- 3.5 Many of the houses in Peterborough were built at times when there were no or few vehicles on the roads. Consequently, many houses do not have off street parking yet the householders frequently own one and in many cases more than one vehicle. As an issue the Council has received complaints regarding verge parking for many years, yet despite various interventions, some more successful than others, it remains a problem. It has been the subject of discussion at Neighbourhood Committee meetings, Full Council, and now Scrutiny Committee.

It should be stated at the outset that it will not be possible to eradicate verge parking across the city. Improvements can however be made to address some of the worst areas across the city by looking afresh at the problem.

- 3.6 Despite what is often a common perception, verge parking is rarely a breach of parking restrictions. Enforcement action can be taken in the form of a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) in circumstances like that described above where existing double yellow lines and TRO's are in force but this only covers a small proportion of the city.
- 3.7 The Council was one of the first authorities outside of Westminster to implement a major scheme in 2006 covering Old Dogsthorpe which made significant changes to the area including building in new parking provision and introducing a unique at that time TRO to make parking on verges and footways illegal. This all came at a substantial cost of approximately £650,000. Current budgets preclude rolling out this approach but lessons can be learned from it. As a whole the scheme has improved parking within the area, though has not totally eradicated verge parking which is more problematic in evenings and at weekends. During these times enforcement resources face conflicting pressures and often other areas such as the city centre, and near the football ground on match days are a priority.
- 3.8 A number of measures have been implemented during the last 12 months in order to increase enforcement capacity. Working closely together the Highways and Neighbourhoods Enforcement teams have been able to increase the number of lines and signs that require replacement by targeting specific locations requiring replacement/renewal across parts of the city in order to reduce unenforceable areas, due to faint lines, missing sign plates etc. Enforcement rotas and enforcement zones have been updated, and will continue to be reviewed regularly to ensure they meet service needs. Civil Enforcement Officers have significantly increased their output, and vacancies have been filled. Members will be aware that the Council now has a car fitted with a CCTV camera to support enforcement. The camera car is a valuable asset but can only be used to enforce certain parking contraventions, the provisions in Dogsthorpe not being one of them.
- 3.9 In order to look afresh at verge parking Simon Machen Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering and Adrian Chapman Head of Neighbourhoods requested that Andy Tatt from a highways perspective and Peter Gell from an enforcement perspective reviewed verge parking problems and identified measures to remedy the problem.
- 3.10 In order to get a feel for the size of the problem across the city, an exercise of capturing data regarding verge parking 'hotspots' was initiated. As part of this process data was taken from complaints made via Peterborough Direct, from residents and Members following feedback at various forums, from Highways Inspectors, Neighbourhood Managers and Neighbourhood Enforcement Officers. This data was then collated in order to identify what we are calling 'hotspot' areas, the worst areas within the city. This exercise highlighted that if you look hard enough you can find problems almost everywhere, it did though also highlight those areas which generate most community concern.
- 3.11 At the outset the view taken was that an holistic approach was required to look at the problem and that any interventions had to be tailored to the location where the problem existed, this view was reinforced following a number of site visits. Solutions which sought to design out the problem by creating new parking provision thereby utilising highway improvements supported by enforcement where appropriate are felt most likely to be effective. However when this is not possible due to physical layout or funding restrictions then a suite of measures have been drawn up that can be considered on a site specific basis.

Site specific measures that can be considered and used in the highway include:

- Installation of Grass-crete (porous concrete sections which facilitates grass to grow through) which allows parking on verges without the resultant damage.
- Hardening of verge area by tarmacing.
- Planting of suitable trees to act as a physical obstruction.
- Planting of suitable low growth shrubs to act as a physical obstruction.
- Introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO`s) whereby no waiting at any time (double yellow lines) can be installed which not only cover the road but to the highway boundary which includes adjacent verges and footways.
- Installation of suitable bollards or other street furniture which when positioned sensitively can act as a physical obstruction.

Note: Boulders cannot be used legally on the highway as a means of preventing parking. However, where land is not highway, for instance if in the ownership of the Council through strategic property, or is privately owned (e.g. a housing association), then with consent the use of sufficiently large sized ornamental type boulders can also be another considered option to act as a physical obstruction.

4. KEY ISSUES

4.1 Proposed schemes must be affordable in the current economic climate, it is not therefore possible to provide wholesale infrastructure improvements. It is envisaged that each year areas within the city will be identified for improvements, and that those planned schemes for any one year will reflect the resources available to deliver them.

Funding is key to any scheme proposal. Existing highway funds are limited and will need to be supplemented by Neighbourhood Committee funds if considered to be a neighbourhood priority and with Member Community Leadership funding where ward Councillors wish to support a scheme in their ward. Where advantageous to do so and funds are available, schemes to address verge parking problems will be aligned with planned highway improvements in order to reduce scheme costs.

4.2 It is proposed that we will work more closely with Cross Key Homes and other housing associations/private landlords to assist enforcement through their own respective tenancy agreements. These may help for example where property boundary dwarf walls/fences are removed without authorisation to facilitate access for parking within the curtilage of their property without an authorised vehicle crossing being constructed to highway specifications. This will assist with encouragement to have a properly constructed vehicle crossing installed to alleviate the need to both park and cross the highway verge causing damage.

4.3 It is proposed that localities selected for schemes are hotspot areas in communal locations, these being where more than one resident will benefit from the improvements in order to maximise the impact of improvements.

4.4 Schemes will be discussed with the Councillors for the areas the schemes are proposed in order to consult on proposed interventions. An overview of schemes planned for a Neighbourhood Committee area will be taken to the relevant committees to seek feedback and support from those living and working in the community.

4.5 Where solutions require the introduction of TRO's the Council will be subject to statutory consultation periods, the results of the consultation will determine whether the public within that locality at large want the implementation of the scheme proposed.

- 4.6 New legislation in relation to surface water drainage and specifically flooding has recently been introduced in the form of the `Floods and Water Management Act 2010`. This legislation leads us to further consider the consequences of additional hard surfaces installed and with verges the need to consider use where appropriate of more permeable solutions e.g. Grass-crete products which allows water to percolate through the surface into the sub-soil and reduce surface run off to positive drainage systems during heavy rainfall and flood conditions.
- 4.7 Though proposals to tackle verge parking can and will in some cases impose new enforcement obligations on the Council, effective enforcement can only be maintained if enforcement resources are increased in proportion with the demand for Service, or if other areas of enforcement activity are reduced.

4.8 **OUTLINE OF PROPOSED WORKS BY NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL AREA/ TIMESCALES**

The survey work carried out as indicated in section 3.10 above has identified the worst areas of verge damage which we are calling `hot spot` areas. Proposals for the worst site in each neighbourhood area are set out below: :

South Neighbourhood Management Area

Location: Coneygree Road

Coneygree Road is a distributor road running through the heart of Stanground. The highway verge is regularly being churned up by inconsiderate parking resulting in mud being dragged onto the road when vehicles enter and exit the verge area.

This particular location lends its self to a combination of grass-crete (as used as a trial further down some 15 to 20 years ago) and tree planting together with extending existing TRO`s at junctions to deter parking which would obstruct forward visibility. Enforcement could then be undertaken which would cover not only the road but verge and footway to the highway boundary as identified in 3.2. The provision of on street parking at controlled intervals in a staggered layout is also being considered to move vehicles off the verge onto the road, and to assist with slowing down vehicle speeds on the straighter parts of the road.

Example of Damage Coneygree Road



Example of Grass-crete



Costs:

Grass-crete - approximately £75 per square metre

Tree planting - supply of suitable variety tree and install/maintain = £350 per tree.

TRO – dependant on whether this can be amalgamated with other TRO's in the area to reduce costs.

Timescales:

First phase being implemented in conjunction with highway slab replacement works to be completed by the end of March 2012. Further phases would follow after a major electricity utility main is installed through this area which is planned for 2012. Further verge works dependant on funding and priorities for Neighbourhood Committees in the coming financial years.

Central and East Neighbourhood Management Area

Location: Garton End Road

Garton End Road is a distributor road linking Central with the East of Old Dogsthorpe. The highway verge is frequently churned up by inconsiderate parking and also when entering and exiting their properties due to the location on an S-bend. This site lends itself to a combination of grass-crete, low growth shrubs and tarmacing.

Example of Damage Garton End Road



Costs:

Shrubs cost dependant on total area covered (economies in scale) Supply, plant and maintain in the region of £18 per square metre.

Tarmac, harden off verge area (economies in scale) in the region of £35 per square metre.

Timescales:

First phase of grass-crete installation and tarmaced hard surfaced to be completed by end of March 2012 with low growth shrubs in 2012/13 financial year, funding permitted.

North and West Neighbourhood Management Area

Location: Hartwell Way

Hartwell Way is a distributor road circulating a densely populated area of Westwood which includes schools and a local centre. The highway verge is regularly being churned up by inconsiderate parking resulting in mud being dragged onto the road when vehicles enter and exit the verge areas.

This site lends its self to a mix of grass-crete , trees, shrubs and installation of TRO.

Displacement of parking from the existing verges on this route is a big consideration to any final proposal given the restricted amount of available legal parking within the inner residential core area.

In addition, this area also has issues with isolated cases of increased traffic speeds and within the final scheme consideration to assist control with staggered on road parking where appropriate is also being looked at in this joint scheme proposal. This would require change of the existing TRO and the introduction of new TRO's to ensure enforcement could be carried out. This would include appropriate double yellow lines at the junctions where parking would hamper forward visibility.

Example of Damage Hartwell Way



Costs:

As per previously illustrated for other schemes.

Timescale:

Given the scale of this project and the combination of objectives this would realistically need to be phased over several financial years. Funding would need to be available through the processes identified in 4.1.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Head of Service scrutiny on proposals regarding verge parking is undertaken by Simon Machen and Adrian Chapman. Verge parking has been discussed at a number of Neighbourhood Committee meetings, Full Council, and is being reviewed by the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee.

6. NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Proposals regarding the strategy to address verge parking will be amended as necessary following feedback from the Committee. Officers will develop verge parking improvement schemes further, engage with ward Councillors, and present to Neighbourhood Committees in line with timescales identified in 4.4.

7. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 7.1 None

8. APPENDICES

- 8.1 None

ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 8
19 JANUARY 2012	Public Report

Report of the Solicitor to the Council

Report Author – Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny

Contact Details – 01733 452508 or email paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This is a regular report to the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee outlining the content of the Council's Forward Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Committee identifies any relevant items for inclusion within their work programme.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The latest version of the Forward Plan is attached at Appendix 1. The Plan contains those key decisions, which the Leader of the Council believes that the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Member(s) will be making over the next four months.
- 3.2 The information in the Forward Plan provides the Committee with the opportunity of considering whether it wishes to seek to influence any of these key decisions, or to request further information.
- 3.3 If the Committee wished to examine any of the key decisions, consideration would need to be given as to how this could be accommodated within the work programme.
- 3.4 A new version of the Forward Plan will be issued on 17 January and copies will be tabled at the meeting.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Details of any consultation on individual decisions are contained within the Forward Plan.

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

This page is intentionally left blank

**PETERBOROUGH CITY
COUNCIL'S FORWARD PLAN
1 JANUARY 2012 TO 30 APRIL 2012**

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS - 1 JANUARY 2012 TO 30 APRIL 2012

During the period from 1 January 2012 To 30 April 2012 Peterborough City Council's Executive intends to take 'key decisions' on the issues set out below. Key decisions relate to those executive decisions which are likely to result in the Council spending or saving money in excess of £500,000 and/or have a significant impact on two or more wards in Peterborough.

This Forward Plan should be seen as an outline of the proposed decisions and it will be updated on a monthly basis. The dates detailed within the Plan are subject to change and those items amended or identified for decision more than one month in advance will be carried over to forthcoming plans. Each new plan supersedes the previous plan. Any questions on specific issues included on the Plan should be included on the form which appears at the back of the Plan and submitted to Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer, Chief Executive's Department, Town Hall, Bridge Street, PE1 1HG (fax 01733 452483). Alternatively, you can submit your views via e-mail to alexander.daynes@peterborough.gov.uk or by telephone on 01733 452447.

The Council invites members of the public to attend any of the meetings at which these decisions will be discussed and the papers listed on the Plan can be viewed free of charge although there will be a postage and photocopying charge for any copies made. All decisions will be posted on the Council's website: www.peterborough.gov.uk. If you wish to make comments or representations regarding the 'key decisions' outlined in this Plan, please submit them to the Governance Support Officer using the form attached. For your information, the contact details for the Council's various service departments are incorporated within this plan.

NEW ITEMS THIS MONTH:

City of Peterborough Academy – Free School Academy and free special school - KEY/03JAN/12

Clare Lodge Refurbishment - KEY/04JAN/12

Cowgate Enhancement Scheme - KEY/05JAN/12

Local Broadband Plan - KEY/06JAN/12

Eye C of E Primary School Extension - KEY/02FEB/12

All Saints Junior School - Extension of Age Range - KEY/03FEB/12

School Term Dates 2013-2014 - KEY/03MAR/12

JANUARY

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Delivery of the Council's Capital Receipt Programme through the Sale of Land and Buildings - Vawser Lodge Thorpe Road - KEY/04DEC/10 To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of Vawser Lodge</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth	Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, Ward councillors, relevant internal departments & external stakeholders as appropriate	Andrew Edwards Head of Peterborough Delivery Partnership Tel: 01733 452303 andrew.edwards@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken
<p>Energy Services Company - KEY/03JUL/11 To consider potential future developments of energy related products.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Environment Capital, Cabinet Member for Resources	Environment Capital	Internal and External Stakeholders	John Harrison Executive Director-Strategic Resources Tel: 01733 452398 john.harrison@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Sale of surplus former residential care home - Eye - KEY/01OCT/11 To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member for Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of a former care home now surplus to requirement -The Croft, Eye.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth	Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, & Ward councillors, as appropriate	Simon Webber Capital Receipts Officer Tel: 01733 384545 simon.webber@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Section 75 agreement with Cambridge and Peterborough Foundation Trust - KEY/03OCT/11 To approve the section 75 agreement with CPFT for the provision of mental health services.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care	Health Issues	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.	Terry Rich Executive Director Adult Social Services (interim) Tel: 01733 758444	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Hampton Community School - KEY/07OCT/11 To vary the Ormiston Bushfield Academy (OBA) Design and Build Contract with Kier Eastern to allow for the design and build of Hampton Community School.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Public, ward councillors and internal departments	Brian Howard Programme Manager - Secondary Schools Development Tel: 01733 863976 brian.howard@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken

<p>Review of Play Centres in Peterborough - KEY/09OCT/11 To approve recommendations for changes in play centre delivery.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Officers and a Councillor Reference Group</p>	<p>Karen Moody Head of Early Intervention and Prevention and Strategic Lead for Adult Learning and Skills Tel: 01733 863938 karen.moody@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Peterborough's Transport Partnership Policy for pupils aged 4-16 years - KEY/01NOV/11 To approve the new policy for September 2012.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Internal and public consultation</p>	<p>Isabel Clark Head of Assets and School Place Planning Tel: 01733 863914 isabel.clark@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Children's Centres Commissioning - KEY04/NOV/11 To approve the award of contracts for the management and operation of 12 Children Centres in Peterborough.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Providers, Councillors, Staff,</p>	<p>Pam Setterfield Assistant Head of Children & Families Services (0-13) Tel: 01733 863897 pam.setterfield@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

<p>Section 75 agreement with NHS Peterborough - KEY/02DEC/11 To approve the section 75 agreement with NHSP for the commissioning and provision of learning disability services.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care	Health Issues	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate	Terry Rich Executive Director Adult Social Services (interim) Tel: 01733 758444	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Solar Photo-voltaic (PV) Panels Framework Agreement - KEY/06DEC/11 Award of contract for design supply installation operation & maintenance of solar photovoltaic (pv) panels framework agreement.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth	Relevant internal and external stakeholders.	John Harrison Executive Director-Strategic Resources Tel: 01733 452398 john.harrison@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Traffic Signals LED Project - award of contract - KEY/03SEP/11 Contract to replace all traffic signal head lamps in Peterborough with LED Heads.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning	Environment Capital	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate	Amy Wardell Team Manager - Passenger Transport Projects Tel: 01733 317481 amy.wardell@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Heltwate Special School Extension - KEY/01JAN/12 To authorise the award of the contract for extension works to Heltwate Special School.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Alison Chambers Principal Assets Officer (Schools) alison.chambers@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy - KEY/02JAN/12 To approve the draft budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy for public consultation.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>Sustainable Growth</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Steven Pilsworth Head of Strategic Finance Tel: 01733 384564 Steven.Pilsworth@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>City of Peterborough Academy – Free School Academy and free special school - KEY/03JAN/12 To procure a design and build contractor to carry out remodelling and refurbishment works to the existing school buildings and design and build a new special school building at the former Hereward Community College site, Reeves Way</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Ward Councillors and local residents.</p>	<p>Brian Howard Programme Manager - Secondary Schools Development Tel: 01733 863976 brian.howard@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

<p>Clare Lodge Refurbishment - KEY/04JAN/12 To award a contract for the refurbishment of two courtyard areas and extension of bedroom wings to provide four additional lounge areas.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Children's Services	Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities	Relevant internal and external stakeholders.	Sharon Bishop Assets Officer Tel: 01733 863997 sharon.bishop@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Cowgate Enhancement Scheme - KEY/05JAN/12 To award the contract to undertake engineering works as part of the Cowgate Enhancement Scheme.</p>	January 2012	Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Business Engagement	Sustainable Growth / Strong and Supportive Communities	Relevant internal and external stakeholders	Stuart Mounfield Senior Engineer Tel: 01733 453598 stuart.mounfield@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Local Broadband Plan - KEY/06JAN/12 To approve the Local Broadband Plan for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire to release funding for Superfast Broadband.</p>	January 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth	Relevant internal and external stakeholders.	Heather Darwin Head of Service Improvement Tel: 01733 452495 heather.darwin@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

FEBRUARY

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Single Equality Scheme - KEY/02SEP/11 To approve the Single Equality Scheme.</p>	<p>February 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities.</p>	<p>Public consultation via stakeholders and partnerships.</p>	<p>Paul Phillipson Executive Director Operations Tel: 01733 453455 paul.phillipson@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the governance team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Budget 2012/13 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/2023 - KEY/01FEB/12 To approve the final proposed budget including Council Tax for submission to full Council.</p>	<p>February 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>Sustainable Growth</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Steven Pilsworth Head of Strategic Finance Tel: 01733 384564 Steven.Pilsworth@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
<p>Eye C of E Primary School Extension - KEY/02FEB/12 Award of contract for 3 additional classrooms and an additional staffroom with refurbishment of reception area.</p>	<p>February 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Relevant Internal and External Stakeholders.</p>	<p>Sharon Bishop Assets Officer Tel: 01733 863997 sharon.bishop@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

<p>All Saints Junior School - Extension of Age Range - KEY/03FEB/12 To commission a new all through Voluntary Aided Primary School to enable the extension of the age range of All Saints Junior School.</p>	<p>February 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Relevant internal stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Alison Chambers Principal Assets Officer (Schools) Tel: 01733 863975 alison.chambers@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
---	----------------------	---	---	---	---	--

MARCH

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Local Transport Plan Capital Programme of Works (CPW) 2012/13 - KEY/01MAR/12 To approve the Capital Programme of Works for financial year 2012/13.</p>	<p>March 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning</p>	<p>Sustainable Growth</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Committees, internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>Michael Stevenson Project Engineer Tel: 01733 317473 michael.stevenson@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

<p>Statement of Community Involvement (including Neighbourhood Planning guidance) - draft - KEY/02MAR/12 To approve the draft Statement of Community Involvement (including Neighbourhood Planning guidance) for public consultation.</p>	<p>March 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>Sustainable Growth</p>	<p>Internal and external as appropriate.</p>	<p>Richard Kay Policy and Strategy Manager richard.kay@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
---	-------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	--	---	--

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Communications
Strategic Growth and Development Services
Legal and Democratic Services
Policy and Research
Economic and Community Regeneration
HR Business Relations, Training & Development, Occupational Health & Reward & Policy

STRATEGIC RESOURCES DEPARTMENT Director's Office at Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Finance
Internal Audit
Information Communications Technology (ICT)
Business Transformation
Strategic Improvement
Strategic Property
Waste
Customer Services
Business Support
Shared Transactional Services
Cultural Trust Client

CHILDRENS' SERVICES DEPARTMENT Bayard Place, Broadway, PE1 1FB

Safeguarding, Family & Communities
Education & Resources
Children's Community Health

OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT Bridge House, Town Bridge, PE1 1HB

Planning Transport & Engineering (Development Management, Construction & Compliance, Infrastructure Planning & Delivery, Network Management)
Commercial Operations (Resilience, Strategic Parking and Commercial CCTV, City Centre, Markets & Commercial Trading, Passenger Transport)
Neighbourhoods (Strategic Regulatory Services, Safer Peterborough, Strategic Housing, Cohesion, Social Inclusion)
Operations Business Support (Finance)
Planning Transport & Engineering (Development Management, Construction & Compliance, Infrastructure Planning & Delivery, Network Management)

**ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12**

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
9 June 2011 <i>Draft Report 24 May</i> <i>Final Report 31 May</i>	Norwood Lane Caravan Park – Action plan update To scrutinise the impact of the Action Plan on the Norwood Lane and Paston Travellers Site. Contact Officer: Leonie McCarthy	Report noted.
	Review of 2010/11 and Future Work Programme To review the work undertaken during 2010/11 and to consider the future work programme of the Committee Contact Officer: Paulina Ford	Items identified for the 2011/2012 work programme.
14 July 2011 <i>Draft Report 28 June</i> <i>Final Report 5 July</i>	Overview of Environment Capital Programmes/Projects To receive an update on the Environment Capital Programmes and Projects currently in place. Contact Officer: Teresa Wood	
	Home of Environment Capital Initiative – Progress Report To scrutinise the progress of the Home of Environment Capital Initiative Contact Officer: Teresa Wood / Trevor Gibson	
	Members Waste And Recycling Task And Finish Group To consider the disbandment of the Members Waste and Recycling Task and Finish Group. Contact Officer: Margaret Welton	Recommendation to disband the Members Waste and Recycling Task and Finish Group

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
8 September 2011 <i>Draft Report 23 Aug</i> <i>Final Report 30 Aug</i>	Biodiversity Strategy – Progress Report 2010 - 2011 To scrutinize the progress of the Biodiversity Strategy adopted at Full Council in October 2010 and make any necessary recommendations. Contact Officer: James Fisher, Wildlife Officer	
	Environment Capital Performance Update To receive and scrutinise an update on the environmental progress to date as detailed by Forum for the Future and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: Trevor Gibson	
3 November 2011 <i>Draft Report 18 Oct</i> <i>Final Report 25 Oct</i>	Energy from Waste To scrutinise the progress of the council's Waste 2020 programme and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: Richard Pearn	
19 January 2012 <i>Draft Report 3 Jan</i> <i>Final Report 10 Jan</i>	Environmental Enforcement Performance To provide an update on enforcement performance. Contact Officer: Peter Gell/Adrian Chapman	Agreed at meeting held on 10 March 2011
	2012/13 Local Transport Plan Capital Programme of Works (CPW) To consider the draft Capital Programme of Works prior to its consideration by the Executive and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: Michael Stephenson	Annual report
	Parking on Grass Verges To scrutinise the issue of parking on grass verges and make any recommendations Contact Officer: Peter Gell / Andy Tatt	

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
30 January 2012 (Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees and Commissions)	Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Plan to 2015/16 To scrutinise the Executive's proposals for the Budget 2011/12 and Medium Term Financial Plan. Contact Officer: John Harrison/Steven Pilsworth	
22 March 2012 <i>Draft Report 6 March</i> <i>Final Report 13 March</i>	Energy Supply Company (ESCO) To scrutinise the newly formed Energy Supply Company (ESCO) and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: John Harrison	Deferred from November/ January meetings
	Progress Report on the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme and Carbon Management Action Plan To receive an annual report on our progress under the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme and Carbon Management Action Plan. Contact Officer: Charlotte Palmer	Agreed at meeting held on 10 March 2011
	Climate Change Strategy Refresh To scrutinise and comment on the draft policy as part of the consultation/approvals process and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: Jenna Hiley	
	Trees and Woodlands Strategy To Scrutinise the results form the recent consultation and detail on the next steps of the process and make any recommendations. Contact Officer: Darren Sharpe	Deferred from September meeting

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
	<p>Energy Policy</p> <p>To scrutinise and comment on the first Energy Policy as part of the consultation process and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Alice Mitchell</p>	

TO BE PROGRAMMED

Item	Comments
Street Lighting Policy	Requested at meeting of 8 September
Concessionary Bus Passes for Carers	Requested at Group Reps by Cllr Fox.
<p>Council Policy on Renewable Energy</p> <p>To scrutinise the overview of the draft policy for renewable energy in council buildings/estate and to make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Simon Machen</p>	To come to Committee when policy has been written
<p>How sustainability fits in with the Councils Capital Asset Policy and Green Leasing</p> <p>To scrutinise how sustainability fits in with the Councils Capital Asset Policy and Green Leasing and make any recommendations</p> <p>Contact Officer: – Brian Davies, Principal Estates Surveyor</p>	