



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AND ENVIRONMENT
CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL
ON 25 OCTOBER 2016**

Present: Councillors Peach (Chairman), C Harper (Vice Chairman),
R Brown, S Allen, D King, M Sims, A Ellis, N Khan MBE,
M Jamil, N Sandford, JA Fox

Also Present: Representing the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities:
Councillors John Fox, J Whitby, H Fuller
Henry Clark and Philip Nuttall – Independent Co-opted Members
Councillor D Sanders, Mayor
Councillor Barkham
Councillor Okonkowski

Officers Present: Simon Machen, Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration
Gemma Wildman, Principal Planning Officer
Edward Dade, Senior Planning Officer
Anne Keogh, Housing and Strategic Planning Manager
Caroline Hannon, Senior Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer
James Collingridge, Amey Partnership Manager
Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Chairman's Announcement

The Chairman welcomed Members of the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities who were in attendance for item 5, Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft and advised that whilst they would be allowed to take part in the discussion they would not be allowed to vote. The Committee were also informed that a request to move item 7 to item 6 had been received from the Officer presenting item 7, Community Infrastructure Levy Governance Proposals & Infrastructure Delivery Schedule Update 2016. In accordance with Part 4, Section 1 – Council Standing Orders, Paragraph 3.1, the Chairman agreed to the request and therefore item 7 would now become item 6 on the agenda.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Cereste and Councillor Allen was in attendance as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

Councillor David Sanders was in attendance and advised that he had no declarable interest in item 5, Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft.

3. Minutes of Meetings held on 8 September 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016 were approved as an accurate record.

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

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

5. Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report which provided the Committee with an overview of the draft version of the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft in advance of public consultation in December 2016. It was brought to the attention of the Committee that this was the draft stage only in order to approve submission to Cabinet and public consultation would follow.

The following members of the public were in attendance and had registered to speak, each person was allowed 3 minutes to speak.

Dale McKean - Resident of Eye outlined his concerns regarding the growth of Eye as follows:

- As a resident of the village he was concerned about the impact on the local infrastructure, including the school and doctors surgery.
- In 2010 over 1270 residents objected to the last local plan consultation and were against further growth in Eye village.
- The plan for 305 houses was changed to 185 houses of which only 100 had been built.
- Eye Surgery was already full and would need support from the planning system to accommodate the level of growth which had also been identified by the NHS.
- The local school was already full and further school places would be required.
- The road through Eye was already used as a rat run and traffic would increase as further development took place. There was already much concern amongst residents about children's safety.
- Concern was expressed that the two options mentioned in policy LP38 on page 82 had not been fully explored to understand the impact on the infrastructure in Eye.

Barry Nicholls – Local Consultant made the following comments:

- Deliverability was falling short with approximately only half of planned properties being built.
- There was concern about the level of council land that seemed to have taken precedent over others that was being considered as a better alternative. Smaller private plots would be quicker to turn around than larger plots and council owned land.
- The areas highlighted within the Flood Risk Assessment were challenged and it was requested that these areas should be reconsidered as part of this plan as potential sites for development.
- A secondary list of additional sites should be formulated in the event that some of the original sites were not passed following consultation.

The Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration was also in attendance with the Principal Planning Officer who responded to comments and questions raised by Members. A summary of responses included:

- There was 10 years left on this plan and the early review was being undertaken to extend it for a further 10 years to 2036.
- Smaller sites would make planning the infrastructure more difficult.
- There was no foundation to the statement regarding private sector having better delivery than the public sector as demonstrated by the Great Haddon development for which planning permission was granted in 2014, however the Section 106 had not yet been signed and no building work has commenced despite the best efforts of the Council to move this forward.

- Schools across Peterborough were approaching capacity and therefore the impact on school place availability would be the same in all areas. The Planning Team worked very closely with the Schools Infrastructure Team to ensure forward planning of investment in those areas likely to be affected to address the need for additional school places.
- Forward planning for the transport infrastructure of the city was important for any new developments.
- Flood risk was a primary constraint on where development could happen. There were significant areas of land to the East of the city where development could not take place due to flood risk.
- There were 1342 new homes built and completed in 2014-15, the highest number in the city since 1989 however the pace of growth was reliant on demand.
- Peterborough had the fourth highest housing stock growth annually of any city in the UK.
- More detailed information on infrastructure investment would become available as the plan progressed and moved on from the draft stage once the actual sites had been identified.
- Other documents available relating to the overall growth of the city should be read alongside the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft to gain a better understanding of the whole picture, including the Local Transport Plan, Schools Organisation Plan, Health & Wellbeing Strategy and Environment Action Plan as although this was a robust and comprehensive plan it only covered land use.
- Members were concerned that the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft concentrated on growth rather than regeneration.
- Clarification was provided as to what a Local Plan was. The Local Plan was a land use planning document that set out where new growth would predominantly take place and the associated infrastructure requirements. It also had a set of associated policies which were about controlling land use and development. Therefore regeneration of existing townships and redevelopment of existing areas fell outside of the remit of the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft. However regeneration of some city centre areas had taken place examples of which were the former hospital site and Fletton Quays. The Community Infrastructure Levy was available for investment in areas where regeneration was required such as Bretton.
- Land banking by developers and land owners was discussed as reasons for non-delivery of houses, however it was explained to Members that there could be several reasons such as supply and demand controlling market prices and taxation.
- Transport across the city needed to be reconsidered including rail and traffic to and from the new sites during construction as well as after and this would be included later.
- Concern was expressed over water supplies in the city being adequate for future development as Peterborough had been highlighted as an area which could be subject to water stress in the future. It was confirmed that this had been taken into account in the Local Plan.
- There had been a change in government national policy as to the definition of Gypsy and Traveller and the term now only referred to someone who travels. Following surveys carried out using the new definition it was identified that there was no need for further new Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- Members referred to the environmental sustainability and energy efficiency of new houses as outlined in the Core Strategy and sought assurance that this would be reflected in any future new developments. Members were assured that the quality of new housing would need to be of a high standard, however government policy had changed since the Core Strategy had been put in place and the Code for Sustainable Homes no longer existed and had been replaced by Building Regulations. The use of renewable energy was difficult to achieve given the changes to the feed in tariff. Funding previously available was no longer in place to cover aspects of work that exceed building regulations and therefore it was difficult to insist that developers build higher standards of sustainable homes. The Carbon Challenge pilot site had been built using such funding however government policy had since changed.
- There was a requirement to have more growth in the city and was therefore important to have a Local Plan in place. If a Local Plan was not in place speculative developers

would be able to build where they liked. Speculative developers tended to target reasonable sized villages with unwanted and unplanned developments, therefore causing a significant impact on the communities infrastructure.

- General consensus was to retain the Brewery Tap in any redevelopment in the North Westgate area.
- Members commented that the city centre would benefit from the addition of a large department store.
- Members expressed concern about the deliverability of the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft and the impact on rural communities.
- Members were informed that a secondary list of sites was not required as the Local Plan was frequently reviewed.

Councillor Sanders was in attendance and made the following comments:

- People were generally unhappy with the state of schools in Peterborough and also the state of the roads. More work needed to be done before further new developments commenced.
- There were still remaining houses to be built from the existing Local Plan.
- The state of the roads in and around Eye were poor and current developments had been poorly designed with little space for parking cars.
- The people of Eye in previous consultations had stated that they did not want further growth in Eye.
- The high street in Eye flooded in the winter and therefore additional housing would cause further problems.
- The school and doctors surgery in Eye were already full and therefore further development in Eye would only impact further on this situation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee endorse the Peterborough Local Plan Further Draft and recommend to Cabinet for approval with the following recommendations:

1. That Cabinet take into consideration the impact of growth on infrastructure including:
 - a. School Places. There is already a lack of school places within the authority and further development will cause further pressure. Cabinet need to ensure that future provision is addressed prior to development taking place.
 - b. Health Care. The health care system is already overstretched and there is a lack of places at doctor's surgeries. Cabinet need to ensure that the impact of a growing population is taken into account for future provision.
 - c. Transport. Concern has been raised with regard to the impact on the local road network and the need for sustainable transport.
2. The Committee asked Cabinet to ensure that any new developments deliver high quality and sustainable housing.
3. In addition to the above recommendations the Committee recommend that Cabinet put a strategy in place to support investment in the renewal of existing district centres and the 'Can-do area'.
4. The Committee also ask that Cabinet works to ensure that existing sites with planning permission are developed.

Councillor Sanders, Councillor Whitby and co-opted Members Henry Clarke and Philip Nuttall left the meeting at 8:20pm.

6. Community Infrastructure Levy Governance Proposals & Infrastructure Delivery Schedule Update 2016

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report which asked the Committee to consider the establishment of governance arrangements for managing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts and to provide an updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.

CIL which was adopted in 2015 was a tax that developers paid in proportion to the amount of floor space that was built. The money was then used to deliver the strategic infrastructure for the growth of the town.

The Principal Planning Officer and the Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration responded to comments and questions raised by Members. A summary of responses included:

- Members were referred to page 190 of the report to show examples of investment in areas such as the 'Can do Area'.
- Where funds were allocated to Parish Councils a cheque was sent to them and they then arranged how to spend the money.
- Additional support would be given to assist those areas without a Parish Council. The role of the Community Capacity Manager would be to act as a gate keeper between the Council and the communities.
- Ward Members would need to work collaboratively with their community to identify the local community investment priorities and pull together a list of projects.
- Members expressed concern with regard to the mechanisms that would be put in place to facilitate the list of community investment priorities.
- Clarification was sought as to the difference between Section 106 and CIL. Section 106 was a legal agreement between the Council and the developer and is principally used to deliver site specific mitigation and onsite infrastructure. CIL was money that is levied at a set rate and is used to deliver more strategic types of infrastructure and did not necessarily relate to a specific development. CIL did not apply to major urban extensions such as Great Haddon.
- Members were reminded that the purpose of CIL was there to provide the infrastructure to deliver growth.
- Members sought clarification as to what a Neighbourhood Plan was. A Neighbourhood Plan was a plan specifically drawn up by a Town or Parish Council or a Neighbourhood Forum.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee endorse the Community Infrastructure Levy Governance Proposals & Infrastructure Delivery Schedule Update 2016 and recommend to Cabinet for approval.

ACTIONS

The Corporate Director for Growth and Regeneration to update Councillor Sandford of the progress with the Croyland Road Crossing.

7. The Draft Peterborough Housing Strategy 2016 to 2021

The Housing and Strategic Planning Manager introduced the report which provided the Committee with an overview of the emerging Housing Strategy 2016-21 and invited comments from the Committee on the proposed content and format.

The Housing and Strategic Planning Manager responded to comments and questions raised by Members. A summary of responses included:

- Members highlighted the need to reduce homelessness in Peterborough and queried whether it had been given sufficient priority within the strategy. Members were informed that issues regarding temporary accommodation and homelessness were being raised as a key priority through the Housing Strategy and it was a national issue not just a Peterborough issue. The Council also had a Homelessness Strategy which sat underneath the Housing Strategy which was a separate document focussing on tackling homelessness.
- Members were informed that approximately 12 months ago there had been a scrutiny task and finish group set up to review the Housing Strategy and a particular focus of the group had been the provision of social housing. One of the recommendations that came out of the review was that the Council start to build affordable housing to help to meet the demand for social housing. Since then the Council had set up a Joint Venture Company with Cross Keys Homes to build a range of housing tenures including affordable housing within the city.
- The Devolution proposals had still to be finalised but within the proposal one of the key strands was a £100M fund for investment in affordable housing. Peterborough would be seeking to access their share of this fund.
- The Council regularly chased developers with planning permission regarding undeveloped sites to try and persuade them to bring forward development however there was a limit to the powers available to make the developer start building as the land was owned by the private sector. Compulsory purchase was an option however the landowner would have to be compensated.
- Members referred to Priority Three which mentioned “Maximising the energy efficiency of existing housing particularly in rural areas”. Members were advised that there were various schemes available and the contact for improved energy efficiency in rural areas was Sharon Malia, Housing Programme Manager who could advise on which schemes were available.
- Approximately 1/3 of all new houses built in the city were affordable houses with the percentage being built on each individual site varying. The type of provision on each site would be according to need with the greatest demand being for two bedroomed properties.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Committee endorse the draft Peterborough Housing Strategy 2016 to 2021 and recommend it to Cabinet for approval.
2. The Committee also recommend that Cabinet note the following concerns of the Committee:
 - a. Homelessness is a growing issue and that the Council should continue to make reducing this a priority.
 - b. There is a lack of affordable housing and the Council should deliver more affordable homes through initiatives such as the new housing company with Cross Keys.
 - c. There are a number of empty and derelict properties with planning permission and the Council should do everything within its power to address this.

Councillor Fuller left the meeting at 8.50pm.

8. Task and Finish Group Report on the Review of the Amey Street Cleansing Contract

Councillor Peach, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group introduced the report. The report provided the Committee with details and the outcome of a review undertaken by the cross party Task and Finish Group into the Amey Street Cleansing contract.

The Chairman thanked the Amey Partnership Manager for his assistance in compiling the report.

Members welcomed the report and commented that it was a good report.

The Amey Partnership Manager responded to comments and questions raised by Members. A summary of responses included:

- Clarification was sought on the meaning of the word “lengthsman”. A lengthsman was an operative who would manually clean the streets in a particular area throughout the day.
- Amey were currently meeting their targets for street cleansing and therefore had not received any fines.
- With regard to recommendation 8 and litter picks, Members requested that the bags of litter be collected quickly once the litter pick had been completed.
- Gluttons were still available for use by Parish Councils but insurance would need to be put in place before they could be used.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee endorsed the report of the Task and Finish Group and agreed to the recommendations from the Task and Finish Group for presentation to Cabinet on 7 November 2016 for approval. The recommendations being:

Recommendation 1

That a three month trial take place using a glutton and a sweeper instead of a sweeper and manual litter pick, this trial will be carried out around the Sarjeant Street area and adjoining streets. These areas have been chosen as they have particularly high levels of litter but also have the inherent issues of parked cars preventing the sweepers from cleaning.

Recommendation 2

To undertake waste composition analysis of litter bins we feel are being used for household or trade waste to try and ascertain where the waste is coming from and prosecute where able. Amey will look to understand where litter bins outside commercial properties / flats are becoming full through black bags or other trade waste. Where these are identified the bags and bins will be emptied to look for any evidence that can be used to prosecute the individuals.

Recommendation 3

Increased enforcement publishing fines to deter further actions of this nature. Through doing this we will target high littering areas across the city for days of action, we would look for the Prevention and Enforcement Service team to support such activities and fine individuals for littering. Before any enforcement activities are carried out we would like residents to be informed through newspaper articles and social media of the potential fines and that we will now be proactively looking to catch individuals. We would like to publicise the names of any residents that are fined to ensure the message that we will not tolerate littering is sent out.

Recommendation 4

Areas of high parking density to have a trial to move the cars on the day the sweeper will attend to see if this can increase levels of cleanliness. We propose to trail this scheme in Oxford Street. All residents will be made aware of what days the street will be swept by a mail drop to all houses and also on street signage. The scheme will work by agreeing a day to suspend the double yellow lines on one side of the road so cars can park on that side and allow the sweeper to cleanse the whole street.

Recommendation 5

To implement a 2 man hit squad which will have a van and equipment to respond to high level littering issues as they arise on a daily basis. These areas will be identified through current knowledge of high litter streets and also calls for service. The team will work Monday - Friday and can be diverted to any area of the city as is required to meet demand.

Recommendation 6

Educate both children and adults around why littering is unacceptable and the costs that this is having on the authority is key. There needs to be clear and concise messages sent out through various mediums to ensure all residents understand that littering is an anti-social behaviour and to instil pride in the area they live in. We want to see officers work with Community Leaders and Community connectors to ensure the message is distributed in the correct way and can be understood by all.

Recommendation 7

It was noted that on a regular basis the road sweepers will cleanse a street and then the refuse collection is carried out causing more litter. We would like to see the sweeper rounds coordinated with the refuse collection to ensure they are carried out following collections. We would also ask that all crews are reminded that if they drop any litter following collection it is cleaned up before they leave the street.

Recommendation 8

Ward councillors to proactively support and promote volunteer groups in their areas to carry out litter picks, this will be teamed with Amey providing litter pickers and bags so that the litter picks can be carried out safely. Amey will liaise directly with the groups to supply the litter pickers and also to arrange removal of the litter collected following the event.

Recommendation 9

It was recognised that some of the streets as you leave the city centre are classified as a 'Low' frequency clean but they still have the volume of foot fall from residents leaving the city centre. As such we would like Amey to identify the worst streets as you leave the city centre and look to have the number of visits to these streets increased with some needing attention at least once per day.

Recommendation 10

Liaise with probation to see if they could assist in complimenting the current Amey service and offer extra litter picking in areas of high demand. This could come under the umbrella of 'Project Clean Peterborough'. Amey to liaise with probation to offer litter picking equipment and help with removing the waste following litter picks.

Recommendation 11

Look to increase the level of street cleansing on areas bordering the city centre this is following our visit and regular issues raised within the area of Millfield and South / North Gladstone.

Recommendation 12

Further ongoing discussions with Amey to look at economies of scale to see if the unit rate could decrease if the amount of work going through were to increase.

9. Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Executive Decisions containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the forthcoming month. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's Work Programme.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

10. Work Programme for 2016/17

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2016/17 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the work programme for 2016/2017.

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 9.11pm

CHAIRMAN