

**MINUTES OF THE GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 7PM ON
WEDNESDAY 4 JULY 2018
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors Harper (Vice-Chairman), K Aitken, R Brown, G Casey, R Ferris, M Farooq, Judy Fox, A Joseph, D King, S Martin, N Sandford
Co-opted Members: Parish Councillor R Lievesley, Parish Councillor R Clarke

Also Present: Councillor Steve Allen – Cabinet Adviser to Leader of the Council
Councillor John Fox – Representing the Group Leader for Werrington First
Simon Fairhall – CEO, Living Sport

Officers Present: Annette Joyce - Interim Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration
Richard Pearn - Head of Waste, Resources and Energy
Philip Hylton - Senior Strategic Planning Officer
Lisa Roberts - Head of Culture and Leisure
Jamie Fenton – Culture and Leisure Development Manager
Paulina Ford - Senior Democratic Services Officer
David Beauchamp - Democratic Services Officer

Councillor Harper welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised the Committee that in the absence of a Chairman he would be taking the position of Chairman for the meeting.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

3. MINUTES OF THE GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5 MARCH 2018.

The minutes of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 5 March 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

5. APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS

The Senior Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which recommended that the Committee appoint Parish Councillor, Keith Lievesley as a non-voting co-opted member to represent the rural communities. A further recommendation included in the report was to appoint a second Parish Councillor Richard Clarke as a non-voting co-opted member also to

represent the rural communities. Both nominations had been put forward from the Parish Council Liaison forum.

The Committee unanimously agreed to appoint both Keith Lievesley and Richard Clarke as co-opted members of the Committee to represent the rural areas.

The nominated persons were in attendance at the meeting and the Chairman invited both Keith Lievesley and Richard Clarke to join the Committee for the remainder of the meeting.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to appoint both Parish Councillor Keith Lievesley and Parish Councillor Richard Clarke as non-voting co-opted members to represent the rural areas for the municipal year 2018/2019. Both appointments to be reviewed annually at the beginning of the next municipal year.

6. PROPOSAL TO SET UP A TASK AND FINISH GROUP TO CONSIDER FLY TIPPING AND WASTE POLICY

The Head of Waste, Resources and Energy introduced the report which proposed that a task and finish group be set up to consider fly tipping and waste policy. The original request for a cross party working group had come from the Leader of the Council at the council meeting held on 21 May 2018.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- There was a general consensus among Members about the severity of fly tipping in the city and the need for a task and finish group.
- It was suggested that the issue of fly tipping needed to be looked at more broadly and creatively and not just focused on enforcement, with a suggestion that waste could be marketed through 'up cycling' initiatives.
- Members commented that fly tipping was one of the major issues facing the city and was one of the most common areas of complaint from residents. The cost to the council to clear the fly tipping was a significant amount of money. It was again suggested that the remit of the task and finish group should be as wide as possible to arrive at creative solutions and investigate what was working at other councils.
- It was also suggested that other councillors should be involved because of the frequency with which the issue was raised. Anecdotal evidence received from residents regarding specific incidents could be used to formulate a creative response to the problem. It was not always the residents of a particular area that were responsible for the fly tipping there.
- It was highlighted that fly tipping was not just an urban problem and also affected rural areas with the volume of waste often being higher in the latter and asked for clarity that this would also be considered.
- Officers mentioned that groups such as farmers and the National Farmers Union (NFU) could be engaged with as they had been involved with other Councils to assist in addressing similar problems. Rural fly tipping was often different in nature to that which goes on in urban areas, for example there was a recent trend of abandoned lorry trailers filled with refuse being left in lay-bys.
- It was suggested that if it was made difficult for people to dispose of their waste then this may contribute to fly-tipping. The £23.50 charge for bulky waste collection was expensive for pensioners and those on a low income. The process of disposing of waste should be made more straightforward.

- Members suggested that progress could be achieved by placing more responsibility on retailers, e.g. by having companies take old mattresses away when a new one was delivered. It was emphasised that members should feed this and other ideas to the task and finish group, even if they were not on the group.
- It was suggested that Parish Councillors from rural areas should be invited on the group. Members noted that members of the Task and Finish Group had the ability to appoint co-opted members at the scoping meeting.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to

1. Agree to establish a Task and Finish group to examine the issue of fly tipping as detailed in the report.
2. Approve the terms of reference for the Task and Finish Group as found in Appendix 1 of the report.
3. Add an additional item nine to the terms of reference; 'To engage with all councillors to obtain as much evidence as is available to address fly tipping'.

7. PETERBOROUGH STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report which provided the Committee with an opportunity to comment on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) prior to it being considered by Cabinet for adoption.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Three neighbourhood plans had been adopted in Peterborough in Castor, Ailsworth and Peakirk. No neighbourhood plans had been adopted in unparished areas. Neighbourhood forums were being set up in Werrington and Fletton.
- Traditionally, neighbourhood plans have been more likely to come from Parished areas. However there was nothing to stop a neighbourhood plan being developed in a more urban area.
- Members highlighted that two-thirds of Peterborough urban areas were not Parished and asked what support a non-Parished group would receive. Members were referred to page 37 of the agenda pack. Once a forum had been set up support would be the same regardless of whether the area was Parished or not. The SCI would be set at a minimum level with the hope that it would go beyond this. Extensive support was already being provided in Werrington and Fletton. However it was highlighted that the forums themselves must do the majority of the work.
- Members mentioned that a great deal of work was required to create a Neighbourhood Plan. It would be difficult to convince people that Neighbourhood Plans were worthwhile and would be difficult to create an all-encompassing plan for a diverse area. The Officer acknowledged that creating a Neighbourhood Plan was a large task and many areas had not been successful but it was highlighted that it was not the council's role to push them forward. Officers offered early discussions with interested groups to see if a neighbourhood plan would be the best approach for a particular area.
- Members asked if a Frequently Asked Questions section could be added to the Peterborough City Council website. This might include providing guidance notes, benefits of having a Neighbourhood Plan and an outline of why people were producing them. Members were advised that there was a considerable amount of information already available and that officers would be happy to signpost Councillors to this or to supplement it if necessary.

- The possibility was raised of a briefing note being circulated providing guidance for the benefit of either Councillors or members of the public.
- Members suggested that the adoption of only three Neighbourhood Plans in Peterborough when thousands had been adopted nationwide could indicate that there was not enough support being provided by the council.
- Areas with no prospect of development may feel that the extra 10% of CIL funding was not worth the cost of developing a Neighbourhood Plan. Areas with development may not be in Parishes.
- Members suggested that the benefits for small parishes was simply not worth the amount of work involved in producing a Neighbourhood Plan. Funding was available so the cost was not necessarily the issue. It was also mentioned that there were cases nationwide of Neighbourhood Plans being ignored against the original intention that they would have a protective element when developments were being considered.
- The possibility was raised of providing information on the 'pros and cons' of producing a neighbourhood plan. Officers stated that more information could be added to the web site rather than providing a briefing note to ensure the information was more accessible to the public. There were links to the Locality page in the SCI although the concerns about the lack of information were noted.
- Members felt overall that the SCI document was good.

RECOMMENDATION

The Growth Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to endorse the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in Appendix A and recommended it to Cabinet for adoption.

AGREED ACTIONS

The Committee requested that the Senior Planning Officer undertake work to improve the website to include frequently asked questions and additional information on how to produce a Neighbourhood plan and where to find support.

8. UPDATED REG 123 LIST AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY SUPPORT POLICIES

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report. The purpose of the report was to seek the endorsement of the Committee on the revised Community Infrastructure Levy Supporting Policies Document, the draft revised Regulation 123 List and the revised Governance Proposals prior to being considered by Cabinet.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Regarding the Reg 123 List, members queried why various types of green infrastructure were included or excluded, for example synthetic turf was mentioned but not woodland trees. Officers responded that the exclusion of woodland trees did not mean that money could not be put towards woodland trees.
- Concern was also raised about the lack of public transport in new developments and it was asked what guarantees there would be with regard to public transport should the policy be adopted. Members were informed that CIL was one potential method of funding the transport needed to support growth but that the changes did not affect this.
- CIL and other Developer Contributions could not be put together on the same project so care had been taken to place the correct items in the correct category to maximise income.
- Other things were also excluded such as roundabouts and junctions needed to make a development proposal acceptable. This was based on common practice and was the most

appropriate way of securing funds to ensure that the required infrastructure was delivered safely and promptly.

- Strategic green infrastructure was included but not allotments or natural green spaces because of how the council obtained funding for green infrastructure. The Environment team who are responsible for delivering parks, greenery etc. currently obtained funding through planning obligations rather than CIL for the majority of these items.
- There needed to be clear differentiation between different types of infrastructure and how they were funded but inclusion on one side or the other did not necessarily affect outcomes.
- In the Reg 123 list there were differences for developments over and under 500 dwellings based on experience of the best way of developing infrastructure funding.
- Members sought clarification as to how they could find out what was happening in their ward. Members were advised that the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule was on the council website which contained a long list of the infrastructure needed to support the growth of the city, however not everything on the list was funded from CIL or Developer Contributions. The Reg 123 list would not help identify what would be spent in a particular ward. A document was published annually explaining how CIL was being spent.
- A useful document that Councillors could refer to was the document on 'Governance Arrangements'. This outlined how CIL would be spent and who was responsible for certain elements. The Community Capacity Manager would be the person to help identify local projects to be tackled.
- There was a time limit on when the neighbourhood portion of CIL money needed to be spent which was 4 to 5 years. The Section 106 and Compliance team would be able to identify the time limit.
- Members commented that having a list of projects ready before funding arrived was important and it was noted that officers had been very supportive in assisting groups when funding had been applied for.

RECOMMENDATION

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to endorse the draft set of Community Infrastructure Levy Supporting Policies documents including a revised Reg 123 List and recommended them to Cabinet for adoption.

9. ACTIVE LIFESTYLES & SPORT STRATEGY

The report was introduced by the Head of Culture and Leisure accompanied by the Culture and Leisure Development Manager, the CEO of Sport England and the Cabinet Adviser to Leader of the Council. The report provided the Committee with an opportunity to scrutinise and comment on the final draft of the Active Lifestyles and Sports Strategy and action plans before it went out to public consultation.

The Growth Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members praised the clarity and precision of the report.
- It was noted that the figures provided on Breast Cancer and Diabetes were national figures and not specific to Peterborough. Members were informed that the figures were obtained from the British Heart Foundation in conjunction with Sport England in 2010 and these were the most precise figures currently available. Peterborough specific data was not available at the time of writing the report.
- Members commented that the report lacked a rural perspective with these concerns having been raised previously when the report was presented to the Committee. The successful large footpath network in the west of the City was given as an example of the importance of rural areas to promoting active lifestyles. It was suggested that the opportunity should be taken to recognise the impact of rural areas on health and wellbeing.

- Members commented that no mention had been made of cricket or bowls clubs and asked why recognition had not been given to walking in rural areas, when it had been recognised that walking was making a contribution in the urban context. Members suggested that footpaths were infrastructure and challenged the exclusion from the report. It was stated that recognition should be given to the fact that some healthy activities in the city take place in rural areas using existing infrastructure with scope for future development.
- Members were informed that footpaths and green infrastructure came under another area of the council and was therefore not included in this strategy.
- Officers emphasised that they did not want to duplicate the work of other council strategies. The Steering Group had requested a focus on physical exercise and how this fitted in with health, however the report had not been written from a health practitioner's view hence why the report was quite light on the health aspect.
- The comments about rural communities were noted and it was suggested that this could be revisited by the Steering Group. It was however emphasised that care needed to be taken to avoid duplicating other council strategies.
- Within the strategy 'Priority 1: Active Living' strong reference was made to walking, cycling and getting active outdoors. It was acknowledged that less mention was made with regard to rural areas but the importance of getting active outdoors were highlighted strongly in the consultation. The Facilities Strategy was limited by the Sport England format, which only recognised certain larger facilities. Efforts were made to pick up those excluded facilities in the strategy going forward but not necessarily the rural areas and this would need to be picked up more strongly.
- It was said that those living in rural areas have a certain advantage of having automatic access to green space, unlike those in urban areas. Members stated that rural areas were used by urban people but there was limited recognition of this in the report.
- More explicit links needed to be made with other strategies including housing, local environment and transport strategies. The need for infrastructure for cycling and walking, was mentioned with more detail required within 'Active Education'. More emphasis needed to be put on how people could be supported and encouraged to access green space within 'Active Recreation' and that just telling people that it was good for them to walk was insufficient.
- It was noted that the costs of engaging in sport had not been mentioned within the strategy. Members were also concerned that the demand was based on the present day and not 5 to 10 years' time, especially considering the plans for a University in the city. Officers were asked if they had taken future projections into account.
- Members were referred to page 65 of the report which contained information on how the strategy linked into other local and national strategies. The Steering Group consisted of a wide representation from the community. The strategy was not a council strategy but a strategy for the city. The strategy was a live document with a detailed action plan for years 1 and 2 with aspirations to take it forward for the next 5 years. Officers were aware of the growth in the city and the Facilities report and evidence provided with the Active Lifestyles Strategy had a brief to take this into account and what would be required in the future for a growing population. The action plan contained immediate actions where existing deficits in provision were identified in order to address them and plan for the future.
- Members again stated that 'matrix thinking' was needed to ensure that actions identified were picked up in other strategies and co-owned to make sure that they really happened. Members were informed that the Culture and Leisure Development Manager had met with all departments and was now the central point of contact and the liaison between the Sports Steering Group and the rest of the council departments. This would ensure that the work being done within the Sports Strategy was not being done alone but alongside and in partnership with other partners and service areas and that the work did not overlap with other strategies already in place.
- The evidence supporting the rejection of a 50m pool being built in the city was attached at Appendix C of the report under 'Swimming Pool Provision'. Sport England funded Independent Consultants KKP to undertake an Active Places Strategy Needs Assessment.

From the evidence gathered they concluded that there was no requirement for a 50m pool but that the city was one 25m pool short (with six lanes). Those in Werrington would benefit most from this because of the distance travelled and health benefits for that area. Sport England, a significant funder, would not fund a 50m pool due to a lack of evidence, but would fund one in Werrington as the evidence supported the need for it.

- It was suggested that a 50m pool was necessary for competition and Peterborough's lack of one could discourage top swimmers. Some Members felt that the strategy had an element of complacency.
- Members suggested the report was complacent and commented on the high quality of the sports facilities that had been previously built in Bretton by the development corporation, many of which had now closed. Providing good quality public tennis courts was important in addition to working closely with private tennis clubs. Reference was made to the lack of first class cricket, which used to exist in the area. It was suggested that more needed to be done to inspire people. The selection of sports listed on Page 107 of the agenda pack was queried and it was asked why tennis and cricket were mentioned and no other sports. E.g. no mention was made of the Peterborough Lions Rugby Team in Bretton.
- Officers commented that discussions had been underway regarding tennis and it was being explored how to improve access to park tennis courts around the city and build a relationship with clubs so that those starting to play park tennis could be encouraged to get more involved. The Lions Rugby club had not shown an interest in the consultation but they did have the opportunity to be involved and it was acknowledged that they had been a very successful club.
- Officers commented that Year 1 and 2 action plans were deliverable and that the strategy was intended to be active and not 'sit on the shelf'.
- The Cabinet Advisor to the Leader mentioned that although there was a general desire for a 50m pool, it was more important to provide more water space in multiple venues not in one place and this was being accomplished with the plans for Werrington and existing facilities. The impetus to bring disused facilities back into use like tennis courts, needed to come from the community.
- Clarification was sought as to why £3m was being spent with Vivacity which included the provision of sport. It was clarified that the £3m mentioned was Vivacity's total contract not just the contract for sport which was about £1m. Vivacity were part of the Steering Group. Care had been taken to make sure actions within the Vivacity contract were represented in the strategy to enable the council to report on what Vivacity were doing with the funding they received from the council.
- Although Vivacity were the culture and leisure provider, the strategy was for the whole city and other partners had felt excluded from the process in the past. Officers had therefore been more proactive in ensuring other partners were represented as they also delivered health, wellbeing, sport and activity in the city of which Vivacity was one element.
- Members congratulated the officers on the strategy and looked forward to seeing it go forward. The new sports centre including a swimming pool in Werrington was welcomed. Currently part of the existing sports centre was shared with the school as well as the library and the separation would be beneficial.
- Members were glad that the provision of sport for disabled people was improving in the city. Officers commented that one of the key recommendations for the Werrington site was the awareness that the existing facility was quite old and located within the school making it difficult to access by the public. The school would need more space under the Schools Development Plans so it was proposed that a new library be attached to the sports centre, removing the current library from the school. The footprint would be the same but greater economies of scale to have a sports centre, community space and library within one space.
- Projects for Years 1 and 2 within the strategy were funded with the exception of the new Werrington Pool and the refurbishment of the Regional Pool as they have yet to go through the Council's budget procedures.

- An opinion was expressed that Peterborough may get a 50m pool with the arrival of the University and that this would be a good time to pursue it and apply for funding and the idea should not be abandoned.
- Concerns were expressed at the lack of reference within the strategy to support for veterans. It was clarified that Vivacity had abolished concession rates a few years ago (e.g. gym membership for armed forces) but this could be revisited within the action plan.
- Members asked if research and consideration had been given to the needs of different culture groups across the city and women-only facilities. Members were informed that women only facilities were provided for sport but care must be taken to comply with equalities legislation and that women-only sessions required that an equal number of male-only sessions would also need to be provided. Vivacity therefore consult with their users to understand what types of activities are required. A minimum number of 25 participants would be required to make an activity financially viable.
- Sport England had adopted a new strategy for 2016 which challenges those working in sport to work hard to engage with underrepresented groups. It was acknowledged however that limited progress had been made on engagement. Contact with the Head of Community Resilience and Integration team was ongoing about how the groups they were engaging with could be supported. Interest has been identified in Basketball for example with England Basketball being engaged to run a coaching course.
- Members expressed concern about the lack of recognition of Peterborough's poor performance against public health indicators in the strategy and the lack of acknowledgment of the large scale loss of facilities in the city.
- The Sports Strategy was a consortium strategy and it was not the council's responsibility to deliver everything to everyone. Working in partnership with others was a way of maximising the benefits. The strategy focused on providing the right facilities for the right places for the right outcomes, not replicating previous facilities. It was noted that close work has been undertaken with colleagues in health but emphasised that this was not a health strategy.
- Members sought clarification as to what the main performance indicators of the strategy were. Members were advised that key indicators would be improving access to school sports facilities and helping primary schools make best use of the £16,000+ government sport premium to achieve a good long term impact.
- The strategy would be brought back to the Committee every year to review the previous year's progress. The main performance indicators will be the action plan.
- Officers were restricted by Sport England's definition of a sport and BMX was unfortunately not recognised as a sport. Officers reminded Members that the strategy would be going out for public consultation in July, August and part of September and encouraged Members to let their constituents know about the consultation so that they could provide feedback.
- It was noted that the Council could not intervene to prevent the closure of private facilities but would encourage private users to maintain their buildings. With regard to the Council's own facilities an infrastructure maintenance programme was in place.
- Encouraging people to use facilities to maintain their viability would be part of the strategy. Under the Skills Development section workshops will be offered to groups to assist them in learning how to become financially sustainable. The focus should be on providing facilities for the largest number of people and to achieve economies of scale.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and

1. Scrutinise the progress made on those aspects of the Active Lifestyles and Sports Strategy relevant to the Committee by providing challenge where necessary and suggesting ideas and initiatives to support the continued delivery of priorities within that portfolio; and
2. Comment on the proposed themes and priorities in the new draft strategy.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee recommend that the Sports Steering Group include within the Active Lifestyles and Sports Strategy more emphasis on the benefits of healthy activities which can be undertaken in rural areas of the city utilising existing infrastructures such as the large footpath network to the west of the city. Additionally more emphasis should be included within the strategy regarding the positive impact of rural areas on health and wellbeing in general.

10. REVIEW OF 2017/18 AND WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2018/2019

The Senior Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which considered the 2017/18 year in review and looked at the work programme for the new municipal year 2018/19 to determine the Committees priorities and agree the proposed way forward for monitoring future recommendations.

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report and

1. Consider items presented to the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee during 2017/2018 and made recommendations on the future monitoring of these items where necessary.
2. Determine its priorities, and approve the draft work programme for 2018/2019 attached at Appendix 1.
3. Note the Recommendations Monitoring Report attached at Appendix 2 and consider if further monitoring of the recommendations made during the 2017/2018 municipal year is required.
4. Note the Terms of Reference for this Committee as set out in Part 3, Section 4, Overview and Scrutiny Functions and in particular paragraph 2.1 item 4 Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee and paragraph 3.8 Flood Risk Management as attached at Appendix 3.

11. 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.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to note the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and requested further information on the following Executive Decision:

- Members requested a briefing note on 'The Provision of Accommodation to Reduce Homelessness' - KEY/23JULY18/01.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

5th September 2018

CHAIRMAN
7.00pm – 8.50pm