

MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING HELD 28 JULY 2014

PRESENT

Cabinet Members: Councillor Cereste (Chairman), Councillor Elsey, Councillor Hiller, Councillor North, Councillor Scott, Councillor Seaton and Councillor Serluca

Cabinet Advisers: Councillor Casey and Councillor Lamb.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Holdich and Councillor Fitzgerald.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 30 JUNE 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2014 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

ITEMS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

4. 20MPH SPEED LIMITS

Cabinet received a report which requested it to consider the conclusions and recommendations made by the task and finish review group with regards to the implementation of 20mph signed speed limits.

At its meeting on 17 April 2013, Council had called upon the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee to investigate the benefits of extending 20mph signed speed limits throughout all residential areas in the Peterborough District and to present proposals to the Cabinet for consideration.

A cross party task and finish group was convened, its remit being to investigate the impact of 20mph speed limits in residential areas and to report its findings to the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee, which it did on 20 January 2014.

After gathering all evidence, the group had considered, discussed and debated the relevant merits of what had been learnt, applying the evidence and learning to the city of Peterborough, and as a result, four recommendations had been reached, these being:

Recommendation 1

Due to current available levels of evidence of the impact of 20mph 'signed only' schemes across the country the group recommends that the council await the publication of further evaluation of schemes introduced in other similar size authorities

prior to a recommendation on the roll-out of an authority-wide scheme. Officers to be charged with a further report in 12 months.

Recommendation 2

Whilst being cognisant of the caveat in Recommendation 1 the group is satisfied that the council should progress with implementing 20mph 'signed only' limits in all its constituent villages, subject to consultation.

The implementation of reduced speed limits within villages should be used as a pilot. Implementation will be evaluated by officers to include speed, casualty reduction and a public perception survey as to improved quality of life (including levels of active travel).

Recommendation 3

Undertake a public consultation to gain views of such a scheme in Peterborough, as information presented made it clear such limits need to be self-enforcing and something the public buy into.

Recommendation 4

To agree that budget is made available to undertake the pilot in the villages. Budget will need to cover implementation of the limits as well as speed monitoring and public consultations.

Councillor North introduced the report and advised of the difference between a 20mph zone and a 20mph speed limit, this being that zones utilised calming measures to reduce the adverse impact of motor vehicles in built up areas and 20mph limits reduced the limit, but without utilising physical measures.

Further key points highlighted by Councillor North included the lack of data which was available to clearly demonstrate the impact of 20mph signed only speed limits on speed and casualty reduction; the inconclusiveness of long term casualty reduction due to 20mph speed limits; the preferred recommendation being recommendation 1; support for Parish Council's if any wished to introduce and pay for the scheme in their own areas; and the costs to revert back to 30mph should 20mph speed limits be unsuccessful.

In summary it was advised that there was not enough evidence available at the current time to support a city wide transition to 20mph speed limits.

Members of the task and finish group were given the opportunity to address Cabinet and the following key points were made by Councillor Peach:

- All issues had been thoroughly addressed by the group and a number of individuals from the Police, medical profession, cycling world etc. had looked into the proposals;
- There were a number of councils opting for 20mph speed limits and the group had recommended a pilot within the rural areas;
- The 20mph zones implemented within Park Ward had proven to be very popular with residents and had cut much of the through traffic on a number of roads;
- It was queried whether a pilot would cost as much as was stated; and
- Consideration could be given in the future to a city wide scheme, the cost of which would equate to the positioning of signs coming into and out of the authority.

The following key points were made by Councillor Shearman:

- In 2013, the Government had issued the first circular from the Department of Transport requesting that Local Authorities consider rolling out, over time, 20mph speed limits in residential areas;
- The benefits of such a roll-out were well recognised, with reduction in deaths and serious injury, and there was also evidence to suggest that these implementations had led to an increase in walking and cycling;
- The implementation would also lead to a reduction in the traffic chaos outside schools, particularly around primary and infant schools;
- There were over 14m people living in areas which had taken on this approach to road safety;
- A Public Health England report was now available entitled 'Reducing the Unintentional Injuries on the Roads Among Children and Young People Under 25 Years of Age'. A recommendation contained within this report related to the introduction of 20mph speed limits within residential areas;
- Evidence showed that the majority of accidents involving children coming to and from school did not happen directly outside of the schools. Therefore, small zone implementation did not appear the best way forward; and
- It was recommended that a pilot be undertaken in the village areas and if successful, to be implemented across the whole of the city.

Following comments from the working group members, Councillor Seaton advised that he was a supporter of 20mph zones in general, however the key benefit of these appeared to be across busy residential areas, such as areas near to primary schools etc. A blanket approach to implementing 20mph speed limits would also be more beneficial and would represent better value. With regards to the implementation of a pilot within all villages, there appeared to be a lack of evidence supporting this, however Councillor Seaton concurred with Councillor North's proposal for support to be offered to any Parish Council which may wish to proceed with a 20mph implementation, to be funded by the Parish Council themselves.

Initially, further evidence was required to support any recommendations and a public consultation needed to take place, which could feasibly be undertaken alongside the budget consultation. There were also concerns highlighted around costs, in particular the implementation of electronic signs and the costs that would be incurred to revert any 20mph signs back to 30mph signs if a pilot was unsuccessful. In summary, Councillor North's suggested approach was supported as a way forward.

The Assistant Director for Communities addressed the cost query and advised that additional expenditure would be incurred for re-establishing 30mph signs, and this cost would be equal to the initial cost to install 20mph signs in the first instance.

It was further advised that there were two important pieces of work which had been commissioned by Government following the cessation of the working group, these both being led by the Department of Transport. The first piece of work was around allowing local authorities more control over the use of signage in 20mph zones and other locations, this would ultimately lead to a reduction in implementation costs. The consultation results on this piece of work were due back within 12 months.

The second piece of work was a major research project examining implemented 20mph schemes across the country. The results of this piece of work would not be known until 2017, but outcomes of initial research should be available in early 2015.

Following comments, Councillor North summarised by stating that the implementation of a scheme at the current time would be demanding on budgets that were already stretched and with regards to the implementation of a blanket 20mph speed limit, he would have reservations about this. A 20mph limit would not be so relevant in some parts of the city and would not be for the best benefit of residents if it was not shown by

other authorities that implementation had caused a substantial reduction in accidents and injuries on the roads.

Following debate, the Chairman proposed that Cabinet be minded to accept Recommendation 1, to await the publication of further evidence, and Recommendation 3, to undertake consultation as part of the overall budget consultation. Furthermore that support be offered to local parishes if they wished to utilise their own budget to do so.

The Chairman further advised that he supported the idea of 20mph speed limits across the city, however further evidence was required prior to spending money on rolling any scheme out across the city.

Councillor Seaton thanked the working group for its report and its presentation and further thanked the group for the hard work undertaken in bringing the recommendations to Cabinet. This was endorsed by the Chairman.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED**:

1. To await authorities to publicise impacts of 20mph speed limits as per Recommendation 1 arising from the working group;
2. To undertake a public consultation, alongside the Budget consultation, to gain views of residents on 20mph speed limits, as per Recommendation 3 arising from the Working Group; and
3. To agree to support any Parish Council wishing to implement 20mph speed limits, utilising its own budget to do so.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The recommendations were based on the findings of the Councillor cross party task and finish group.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

To await detailed evaluation reports from similar sized authorities who had recently implemented 20mph signed only limits on their effectiveness.

STRATEGIC DECISIONS

5. DRAFT DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Cabinet received a report which sought its approval for the proposed changes to the way developer contributions (S106 Agreements) would be negotiated in the future.

The proposed changes responded to statutory and regulatory changes by Government and were also set in the context of the anticipated adoption of the Peterborough Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and provided an overview of the CIL draft charging schedule stating that it had been approved for public consultation by Full Council. It was further highlighted that although CIL would be the main mechanism for funding future infrastructure, S106 planning obligations would still be used to fund any necessary on site related infrastructure i.e. open space provision. The provision of affordable housing was also outside of the CIL process and could therefore only be delivered via the use of S106 agreements.

The draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document had therefore been produced in order to sit alongside the CIL and to set out the relationship between planning conditions, S106 agreements and CIL in order to make it clear what infrastructure would be funded by those different mechanisms. The SPD document did not set new policy, but provided a framework for the implementation of existing policies.

An overview of the main aspects of the CIL was provided and it was advised that should the SPD document be approved, it would be subject to a four week consultation alongside the CIL document. It was assumed that the SPD would be adopted at the same time as the CIL with a new developer contributions system being in place from April 2015.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

Approve the Peterborough Draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the purposes of public consultation to take place in August and September 2014.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Government had introduced changes to the way developer contributions could be collected and spent. From April 2015, the use of existing methodology for collecting and pooling developer contributions (POIS) would become unlawful and so unless a CIL was adopted, the collection and use of developer contributions would be severely limited from that date.

To support CIL and to secure the provision of on-site infrastructure there was a need for a Developer Contributions SPD to clearly set out the difference between CIL and S106 agreements.

Cabinet was recommended to approve the Developer Contribution SPD for public consultation in August and September 2014.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

From April 2015 the Council would not be able to secure developer contributions through the POIS system and therefore the Council was proposing to introduce CIL. However, CIL did not cover affordable housing and would not be used to secure site specific infrastructure, particularly on strategic sites. Therefore there was the need for an additional document which supplemented the CIL process and set out how affordable housing contributions and other on-site infrastructure would be secured.

Without a Developer Contributions SPD in place to set out clearly how this process would work, there could be inconsistencies in the approach used and the Council could miss out on securing developer contributions that were critical to accommodate growth targets. It could also mean that a developer would not be aware upfront of the potential costs associated with onsite infrastructure, which could affect the viability of a scheme and either result in lower contributions to fund important infrastructure, such as affordable housing, or stop development coming forward.

Therefore the option of not preparing a Developer Contributions SPD was rejected.

6. PETITIONS SCHEME

Cabinet received a report following the adoption of the revised Standing Orders by Council and the withdrawal of the Authority's former petition scheme.

The Constitution Review Group, a Member Working Group, had been undergoing a process of updating the Council's Constitution. Following the Group's first tranche of work to assess the standing orders applying to meetings of the Council and its Committees and Sub-Committees, it had looked into the adoption of revised petition provisions, resulting in the recommendations contained within the report to Cabinet.

The Legal Officer introduced the report and advised that the implementation of the Localism Act had abolished the statutory petitions scheme and therefore the Council was entitled to replace this with a local scheme. Work had been undertaken by the Constitution Review Group and a scheme was appended to the Cabinet report.

Following unanimous agreement of the vast majority of the scheme, there had been two specific areas upon which the Constitution Review Group had been unable to settle, those being the levels at which a petition should prompt a debate at Full Council and the level at which a petitioner ought to be allowed to address the Cabinet or Scrutiny Committees on their petition.

The report provided an overview of how other Councils had dealt with the implementation of their petition schemes and trigger values had been explored in relation to population. These stood at, on average, around 1% of the population in relation to triggering debate at Full Council and it was therefore suggested that the level for Peterborough be set at 2000 signatures. With regards to the levels for debate at Cabinet or Scrutiny, it was advised that this did not generally appear within other authorities' schemes, however it was felt that an appropriate level was around 25% of the level which would prompt a Council debate, this therefore being 500 signatures. It had also been agreed by the Constitution Review Group that petitioners be permitted a four minute address to Cabinet or Scrutiny Committee.

Cabinet was advised that should the proposals be approved, the report would be taken to Full Council where there would be a right to debate the scheme.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to adopt and recommend to Council:

1. The draft petition scheme as attached to the report;
2. The levels of valid signatures, required in a petition to trigger the varying procedural responses within the Scheme, these being 2000 signatures to trigger a debate at Council and 500 signatures to trigger a debate at Cabinet and Scrutiny (with petitioners to receive 4 minutes speaking time at Cabinet and Scrutiny); and
3. To authorise the Director of Governance to make such minor, technical and procedural changes as she considers it necessary to ensure the Scheme meets standards of best practice in public administration.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Petitions are recognised by the Council, through its Standing Orders and current practice, as a valid and helpful means of communicating the concerns of those who live or work within the City to the Council. An adopted Scheme will assist the petitioners and the Council alike in determining how best to make, receive and respond to a petition.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The likeliest alternative was to adopt separate provisions in the standing orders or terms of reference to each committee or the cabinet. This will not be as easy to understand or navigate.

Chairman
10.00am - 10.27am