

## **ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **AGENDA**

**Meeting to be held in the Civic Centre, Committee Room No. 1, on  
Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2011 at 5.30 p.m.**

#### **Membership**

Cllrs Bonallie, E. Gibson, Heron, Lauchlan, G.Miller, Porthouse, D. Richardson, I. Richardson, Scott, Tye, and A. Wright

ITEM	PAGE
1. <b>Apologies for Absence</b>	
2. <b>Minutes of the last meeting of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2011</b>  (Copy attached)	1
3. <b>Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)</b>  <b>Policy Review Items</b>	
4. <b>Low Carbon Transport in the Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland Policy Review 2011/12 – Low Carbon Public Transport</b>  Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)	10
5. <b>Low Carbon Vehicles – The Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland Policy Review 2011/12: Progress Report</b>  Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)	16

## Scrutiny Items

- |     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 6.  | <b>Update on Developments in Public Transport in Sunderland</b>                       | 22 |
|     | Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)   |    |
| 7.  | <b>Waste Management and Recycling – Update</b>  | 24 |
|     | Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)   |    |
| 8.  | <b>Environment Agency Catchment Flood Management Plans Consultation</b>               | 29 |
|     | Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached)                                  |    |
| 9.  | <b>Work Programme 2011-12</b>   | 36 |
|     | Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)   |    |
| 10. | <b>Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the period 1 November 2011 – 29 February 2012</b> | 39 |
|     | Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached)   |    |

E. WAUGH  
Head of Law and Governance.

Civic Centre,  
SUNDERLAND.

14<sup>th</sup> October, 2011

Date of Next Extraordinary Meeting: Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2011 at 5.30pm  
Date of Next Meeting : Monday 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2011 at 5.30pm

**At a meeting of the ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on MONDAY, 12<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2011 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Miller in the Chair

Councillors Bonallie, E. Gibson, Heron, Lauchlan, D. Richardson, I. Richardson, Tye and A. Wright.

**Also Present:-**

Councillor Tate – Chair of Management Scrutiny Committee.  
Councillor Kelly – Portfolio Holder for Safer City and Culture.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Porthouse.

**Minutes of the Last Meeting of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2011**

On page 3 of the minutes there was a typing error and should read ‘achieving our goal of reducing omissions throughout the whole process’.

On page 4 of the minutes and Mr. Lewins comment on the decision of relevant fees for charging of electric vehicles, the Chairman advised that this would be decided by Cabinet or Council and not this committee.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Declarations of Interest**

Item 4 – Response from Cabinet – 22 June 2011 – Policy Review 2010/11 – Sunderland ‘the Place’

In accordance with Part 5 – [Part 2, Paragraph 11 (b)] of the Council’s Constitution, Councillor Kelly declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item as a member

of the Cabinet and left the meeting having addressed questions from Members of the Committee in respect of their presentation and prior to any deliberation.

Response from Cabinet – 22 June 2011 – Policy Review 2010/11 – Sunderland ‘the Place’

The Executive Director of City Services and the Portfolio Holder for Safer City and Culture submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide feedback from the Cabinet meeting held on 22 June 2011, which considered the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee’s Policy Review into Sunderland ‘the Place’.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Councillor Kelly, Portfolio Holder for Safer City and Culture, presented the report advising that Cabinet had approved the Committee’s recommendations in their entirety and then gave progress updates on the work underway to move forward on those recommendations.

In response to Councillor D. Richardson’s enquiry, Jane Peverley, External Communications Manager, advised that the current ambassador programme was being led by Debra Lewin’s Team, Communications, and that there was a long list of ambassadors but these were people of interest to the City and did not have a particular role. There was a need for fewer people with more important roles around Business and Tourism for example.

Councillor J. Scott enquired as to who the Ambassadors were and how the programme could be broadened if they were looking to reduce the number of candidates.

Councillor Kelly advised that the focus would be on those Ambassadors that could promote at a higher strategic level further afield and raise the profile of the City outside of the region.

Councillor E. Gibson referred to the recent announcement of plans for a new Travelodge Hotel in the City and that she was pleased to see this, which should help with tourism and hopefully other developers would follow.

Councillor J. Scott commented that a number of excellent shows/events had taken place but felt that as an Authority we had let ourselves down when it came to the High Street with a need to change the face of the City as many shops were boarded up/shuttered on evenings and looked rather unattractive.

Councillor Kelly agreed that it would be great to see Fawcett Street, for example, as a livelier, attractive area but there were various issues as the vast majority of properties could be owned by private companies rather than the Authority, and Sunderland had numerous different areas rather than one main shopping area to consider.

Councillor I. Richardson commented that he felt the difference between Newcastle and Sunderland was that Newcastle had more diversity at the moment but this was something we were working on.

Trina Murphy, Service Development Manager, advised that there were a number of projects looking at the designing of programmes for Events to consider footfall into the area.

The Chairman enquired as to how consultation with members would be carried out in relation to the Ambassador's Programme as this was a key element in his opinion.

Ms. Peverley advised that she would investigate further and report back to the Committee.

2. RESOLVED that Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to the report (Appendix A).

### **Low Carbon Vehicles – Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland Policy Review 2011/12: Approach to the Review**

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to seek Members' agreement in relation to the evidence gathering activities for the Scrutiny Committee's policy review for 2011/12 into Low Carbon Vehicles – Delivery of Public Services.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer, presented the report and advised of a site visit scheduled to Smith's Electric Vehicles on 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2011 and that a meeting with Sharon Hodgson, M.P. was also being arranged.

In response to Councillor J. Scott's enquiry, Ms. Lancaster advised that Nexus and Go North East would be attending the next Committee meeting and hopefully Stagecoach also, pending further information, with the purpose of providing an update around low carbon public transport.

3. RESOLVED that Members agreed the proposed plan for the policy review.

### **Performance Report Quarter 4 (April 2010 – March 2011)**

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide the Committee with a performance update against the former national indicators relating to the period April 2010 to March 2011.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mike Lowe, Head of Performance Improvement, presented the report and advised that 27 of the performance indicators were being achieved above target with only 13 indicators below target.

Mr. Lowe highlighted that Recycling performance had improved due to the implementation of the Blue Bin service and the expectation was that the improvements would continue.

Graffiti and flytipping targets had also been met and transport/bus figures had also improved.

Mr. Lowe advised that in relation to Road Safety the number of people killed or injured had fallen and also that the extreme weather conditions had influenced a rise in the amount of litter found during the winter period. Performance did however improve in March, when the weather conditions had subsided. The extreme conditions also had led to extra grit and whinstone chippings being used on footpaths which created a negative impression of uncleanliness.

Mr. Lowe also informed that the percentage of the Authority's road network where maintenance should be considered had worsened and that although these figures still compared well with other authorities, the issue still needed to be kept under careful review.

Councillor Tye commented that he felt the issue of children travelling to school by car was worthy of another report coming before this Committee as there was clearly something wrong with our strategy, due to the increase in the statistics.

Councillor Tye also referred to the Road Safety Performance Indicators and questioned the statistics received via third parties, as he was aware of three examples where accidents had occurred, yet were not recorded. Councillor Tye commented that he would like to understand how the data was collated by the third parties.

Mr. Lowe advised that he would co-ordinate a response with third party colleagues.

Les Clark, Head of Street Scene, referred to the statistics of children travelling to school by car and that in terms of tackling the issue, he was happy to announce that a £5 million Local Sustainable Transport Bid had been won, by North East authorities, to look at reducing car journeys to school and the Committee may wish to look at the work programme for this.

Mr. Clark also advised that he wished to carry out a full audit trail of the accident figures supplied by the Police, etc. and requested that members inform him of any known accidents that had occurred and were not recorded.

The Chairman agreed with Councillor Tye's comments on children travelling to school and felt that the reason this was occurring was due to a lack of bus services and a report on the issue may be the best way forward.

The Chairman also referred to the accident statistics and commented that some road users did not wish to report accidents as it would affect their insurance premiums, which was a major issue in trying to identify problem areas.

In reference to children's transport to school, Councillor D. Richardson commented that there may be the need to concentrate on persuading the children on the idea of walking to school, rather than targeting the parents.

In response to Councillor E. Gibson's enquiry on if there had been an increase in prosecutions when there was an increase in littering, Mr. Clark advised that the volume of fixed penalty notices had risen and that he would circulate the information to the Committee.

Councillor E. Gibson commented that during the extreme weather conditions, Members had requested grit be used, but the type used had left a terrible mess behind. Councillor Gibson also commented that she was most pleased to see a reduction in the number of deaths in relation to Road Safety statistics.

Councillor A. Wright also agreed with Councillor Tye's comments and raised another issue of declining numbers of School Crossing Patrols, with a shortage of 20 officers across the City and the difficulty of recruiting to the posts.

Councillor A. Wright informed of a large number of accidents that had occurred in the St. Chad's area which had not been recorded, accidents which had caused a tremendous amount of inconvenience to road users and felt there was a huge difference in what some perceived as accidents or not.

Councillor J. Scott referred to the Performance Indicator target for number of children 16 and under killed or injured in road traffic collisions, and commented this should be amended to zero.

Councillor Tye commented that he believed this Committee had received a commitment that the whinstone chippings would not be used again, yet they were used the subsequent year and queried that the costs to clean up after their use could outweigh the benefits of using them in the first place.

Mr. Clark advised that he could not recall such a commitment being made and that the chippings were used to help maintain the stock. Rock salt did not melt the snow and the grit helped provide traction ; they were always happy to look at alternatives but what with the extreme weather conditions encountered previously, the best course of action had been taken at the time.

The Chairman commented that he could not recall a commitment having been made but requested that Mr. Clark investigate further.

In response to Councillor I. Richardson's enquiry, Mr. Clark commented that depending on the quality of salt used, it could stop working during such low temperatures.

Councillor Tye agreed that the use of chippings had been the right decision at that time but his personal view was that it did not work and it surely was better to mix with the current salt stock and use on the roads, not the footpaths.

Mr. Clark advised that they were about to review the winter maintenance programme and would include the issue in their investigations.

The Chairman commented that he was very pleased with the improvements in the Recycling Performance Indicators which showed the Council's Recycling Plan to be working well but felt that the projected target of 8% for unacceptable levels of litter was far too high and that this needed to be reduced.

The Chairman also referred to the worsening percentage of the authority's road network where maintenance should be considered and stressed that we needed to keep a careful eye on the issue as it would be a major problem in the future if not addressed now.

Councillor I. Richardson enquired as to the successful insurance claims due to Highways issues.

The Chairman believed that a report had been provided which stated that the amount of successful claims was low but requested a further report be brought back to the Committee.

Mr. Clark advised of a website run by a cycling group which had Sunderland in the top 10 authorities for responding to road network issues quickly.

4. RESOLVED that the Committee considered the continued good progress made by the Council and the Sunderland Partnership and those areas requiring further development to ensure that performance is actively managed.

### **Policy Review – Monitoring of Recommendations**

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide the Committee with the progress in relation to the Traffic Issues; 20 mph zones, and Allotment Provision Policy Review recommendations.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Ms. Lancaster presented the report and advised that 14 recommendations had been completed with another 8 due for completion.

The Chairman referred to the Allotment recommendation 5.1 and commented that he was delighted the Council had confirmed they could not sell the allotments and this would mean they could be upgraded and brought back into use.

Councillor J. Scott informed the Committee that through the Coalfield Area Committee, an Allotment Task and Finish Group had been formed and Strategic



Initiative Budget money had been made available to improve the sites, bring them up to date and look to remove people who were neglecting the allotments.

Councillor I. Richardson enquired if the land would be shared to allow multiple occupancy of the allotments.

Mr. Clark advised that work was ongoing in the North Area with Community Allotments used not just by individuals but by Community Groups and schools.

Councillor I. Richardson enquired if this work would then be rolled out into other areas of the City.

Mr. Clark advised that it was at an information gathering basis which could then be rolled out into other areas.

Councillor J. Scott advised that it was already happening in the Coalfield area.

Councillor E. Gibson referred to page 35 of the report and advised that residents were very happy with the work being carried out to try and tackle the traffic problems.

The Chairman commented that £210,000 had been allocated to improve safety and he was looking forward to seeing this happen. The Chairman also commented that it was pleasing to see this funding being made available, especially during the current economic difficulties the Council was facing.

5. RESOLVED that Members noted the progress towards completion of the actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to the report (Appendix A).

## **Public Conveniences**

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) to update Members about the current provision of public toilets in the City.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mr. Clark presented the report and circulated supplementary information in relation to the costs involved for the public conveniences.

Councillor Tye referred to paragraph 3, Indicative New Build Costs and felt that the costs had been over-exaggerated as Community Centres had been renovated for less than the amount quoted.

Councillor J. Scott also felt that the estimates were too high.

Mr. Clark commented that the refurbishment plan for the Cat and Dog facilities would be going ahead through the Sea Change Funding Programme but the Authority's budget for renewals would struggle to bring one set of toilets up to a suitable standard.

Councillor Heron commented that there was a strong smell of urine, usually emanating from the older toilets, despite being cleaned regularly and felt that it may be that the drains needed cleaning to tackle the problem.

Councillor Heron also suggested that the issue of building new toilet facilities should come under planning and could be funded through Section 106 agreements.

Councillor D. Richardson enquired if the Authority paid insurance premiums on the toilet blocks then why were we having to pay for repairs in the Tram Shelter toilets due to structural damage caused during the Airshow.

Mr. Clark advised that he would look into the issue.

The Chairman commented that most toilet provision had disabled access but some did not and enquired if consideration had been given to expand the male/female disabled facilities.

Mr. Clark advised that a great deal of the toilets tended to be old and if they were looking to expand it probably made more sense to do a complete refurbishment. This may not be the case in every scenario as it could be more worthwhile to demolish some toilets and start again in those instances.

The Chairman then asked Keith Lowes, Head of Planning and Environment, if Section 106 agreements could be used to fund new toilet provision.

Mr. Lowes advised that it could not be used as it was picked up by other legislation and supermarkets, for example, had to provide their own public toilet facilities.

Councillor Tye suggested that as we now had sufficient play provision, which would be attracting more people to those areas, creating a demand for toilet facilities, could Section 106 agreement money be sought for this.

Mr Lowes advised that unfortunately they would not be liable in such cases, but if the Community Infrastructure Levys had been in place, funding could have been sought through those.

Councillor J. Scott commented that Herrington Country Park had toilet facilities which had been omitted from the report.

6. RESOLVED that the Committee receive a further report on the outcome survey in relation to participation in a community toilet scheme in Houghton-le-Spring.

### **Work Programme 2011-12**

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) which was attached for Members' information, the current Work Programme for the Committee's work during the 2011-12 Council year.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

7. RESOLVED that Members noted the information contained in the Work Programme and considered the inclusion of proposals for the Committee into the Work Programme.

### **Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the Period 1 September 2011 – 31 December 2011**

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive Forward Plan for the period 1 September 2011 – 31 December 2011 which related to the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mr. Clark informed Members that the report on the Accessible Bus Network Design Project would not be going to the October meeting of the Cabinet as it was on hold pending negotiations with Nexus.

8. RESOLVED that the Committee had considered the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 September 2011 – 31 December 2011.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) G. MILLER,  
Chairman.

**LOW CARBON TRANSPORT IN THE DELIVERY OF PUBLIC  
SERVICES IN SUNDERLAND POLICY REVIEW 2011/12:**

**LOW CARBON PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priority: SP5 - Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CI01 – Delivering Customer Focused Services, CI04 – Improving Partnership Working To Deliver ‘One City’**

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide members of the Scrutiny Committee with an overview of low carbon public transport in Sunderland.
- 1.2 The presentations delivered by Nexus and Go NorthEast, will inform the Scrutiny Committee’s policy review for 2011/12 into Low Carbon Vehicles in the Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 At its meeting on 13 June 2011 the Scrutiny Committee agreed to focus on Low Carbon Transport in the Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland as the Policy Review for 2011/12 and agreed the aim of the review and terms of reference at its meeting on 26 July 2011.
- 2.2 At a subsequent meeting on 13 September 2011 members of the Scrutiny Committee agreed the proposed approach to the policy review. The plan included seeking evidence from Nexus and bus companies operating in the city in regard to current and future use of low carbon public transport in the city.
- 2.3 One of the five goals of the Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2021 (LTP3) transport strategy is;  
  
*‘To reduce carbon emissions produced by local transport movements, and to strengthen our networks against the effects of climate change and extreme weather events’*
- 2.4 The carbon plan for the UK shows how the Government will deliver the vision of a low carbon economy, which includes addressing climate

change and building a green economy. It notes that one of the most critical issues for addressing climate change is the way people travel.

- 2.5 In considering the way people travel, the issues of providing better public transport, reducing emissions from petrol and diesel engines and movement towards alternative technologies with electric vehicles will need to be addressed.
- 2.6 As outlined in the Scene Setting report received by the Committee on 25 July 2011, transport is a major contributor to the UK's energy demand and greenhouse gas emissions (as well as other polluting emissions). Addressing climate change is therefore a key national and regional priority. There are two separate aims:
  - Reducing greenhouse gas emissions which contribute to climate change; and
  - Mitigating against the effect of climate change.
- 2.7 The LTP3 strategy sets out how transport in Tyne and Wear should contribute to the UK's goal of a 34% reduction in carbon emissions by 2022. These reductions are taken from a 1990 baseline.
- 2.8 By 2050 the region must reduce road transport CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from a projected level of 5,591,032 tonnes down to 1,107,857 tonnes – less than a quarter of present-day levels. Emissions are predicted to rise over the period 2005-2050, if things remain as they are. In order to meet regional contributions to national targets and avoid dangerous climate change, the region must reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 7.7m tonnes by 2050.
- 2.9 Bus emissions are assumed to remain broadly constant over the period to 2030. This is consistent with other analysis and reflects gains in vehicle efficiency which will be offset by additional bus mileage.

### **3. CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 Information on the current and future use of low carbon public transport in the city, including background, opportunities and barriers to usage will be presented to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration.
- 3.2 A written submission of evidence from Go NorthEast can be found at (Appendix A).
- 3.3 The presentation will contribute principally to the following terms of reference for the Policy Review;
  - (c) To investigate the progress made to date and future plans in the council and across partners in regard to the introduction of low carbon vehicles to deliver public services.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 Members are asked to receive presentations from; Bernard Garner (Director General, Nexus) and Kevin Carr (Operations Director, Go NorthEast).

#### **5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 That Members consider and comment on the information provided.

#### **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Minutes of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee 25 July 2011 and 12 September 2011.

---

**Contact Officer:** Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer, 561 1233  
Helen.lancaster@sunderland.gov.uk



## **ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **Brief notes on Low Carbon Vehicles, CO2 Emissions etc - the delivery of public services in Sunderland**

Go North East (part of the Go Ahead Group) operate a fleet of over 686 vehicles in Tyne and Wear, Durham and parts of Northumberland. These vehicles operate from seven core depots, namely, Winlaton, Percy Main, Gateshead, Deptford, Washington, Chester-le-Street and Stanley. The fleet consists of 152 double deck, 425 single deck, 15 coaches, 90 minibuses and 4 articulated vehicles. 208 of these are based in the Sunderland area with a number of additional vehicles passing through the borough dependent on their service pattern. All vehicles are diesel engine powered using bio-fuel (ULSD), to EN 590, with a 95/5 blend.

Our fleet of vehicles do change frequently with new vehicle investment or upgrades following vehicle transfers within the Group, enhancing our profile.

For example, within the last twelve months we have further increased the quantity of Euro 5 vehicles with notable contracts such as the Quaylink service in Newcastle and Gateshead and the Npower Rainton Bridge/Red Arrows service. We will shortly be operating our first hybrid diesel/electric buses for the City of Sunderland and the University of Sunderland from October this year.

At present our policy is to purchase new vehicles to the latest European standards, diesel powered, with emissions to Euro 5 specification, but this will change to Euro 6 from January 2013. All vehicles purchased from 2000 onwards have had constant regeneration traps fitted (CRT's) as standard, this removes particulate matter and raises the emission standard on the vehicle to the next level in this respect.

Nevertheless, we are constantly looking at changing technologies and alternate vehicle fuels which will provide low carbon and more fuel efficient operation, examples would be gas buses (CNG), fuel cells, hybrids (diesel/electric), electric drives, bio-fuel 70/30 blend, fuel additives and ethanol. Trials are ongoing or about to start on a number of these initiatives within the Group.

Each of the alternatives have pros and cons - in the case of hybrids the cost premium of purchase is prohibitive, even taking into account an improvement in fuel consumption of anywhere between 15 and 20%. The premium dependent on specification is around £100k, and for this reason support for the product is essential and partnerships are a clear way forward.

Electric vehicles have limitations in terms of operational range and therefore infrastructure costs need to be part of any justification. Gas has issues with vehicle fill

time, but hopefully the trials we are conducting will iron out some of the issues and enable us to determine the best way forward from all perspectives.

Over the last three years we have expended over £6million each year on new vehicles, and at £150k per single deck and £190k per double deck, you can see the returns that are needed to justify this investment. Therefore, fleet replacement timescales are lengthy.

Our current fleet profile identifying the various Euro standards is attached as Appendix 1.

Clearly, our long term strategy of fleet investment is an important ongoing process, and this will bring significant reductions in emissions, whether it be NOx, CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, PM and HC, but we have recognised the need to continually look at existing vehicle fuel consumption and site energy which both contribute significantly to our carbon footprint.

Therefore, our emphasis this year and in future years will be to achieve a 20% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> per passenger journey by 2015, through a combination of investment, new technologies, improving fuel usage, monitoring driver performance through vehicle telematics, reducing site energy while growing passenger numbers.

Energy Forums with energy champions are in place at each location, focussing on consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> reduction through local initiatives, and engaging staff to take ownership and develop a team ethos to tackle these issues.

Site energy has been addressed leading to reductions in fuel, gas and electricity consumption. Simple housekeeping measures such as "Switch Off!" campaigns have complemented investment in smart lighting systems and energy management systems.

Telematics equipment is now fitted to our vehicles to monitor engine idling, over-revving, harsh acceleration, harsh braking and overspeeding, and provides warning lights to drivers whilst recording individual performance.

Fuel reduction benefits have been achieved by reducing idling and more frequent tyre pressure checks. We now aim to reduce consumption by 2% in the coming year and are actively exploring measures such as:

1. Tyre technology for improvement in rolling resistance.
2. Wheel/axle alignment.
3. Automatic idle shut off.
4. Acceleration limiter fitment.
5. Vehicle performance matching route topography.
6. The installation of a spill free fuel system.
7. An evaluation of hybrid technologies and new engine cooling systems.
8. Reviewing fuel specifications and their energy content.
9. Reducing vehicle weight through the application of composite materials, a long term process working with manufacturers.

To date a significant reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> has so far been achieved. Since 2007/8 emissions per passenger journey have reduced by 3%. At present we have achieved 0.822g/km of CO<sub>2</sub> per passenger journey, and are targeting a further reduction of 0.144g/km of CO<sub>2</sub> per passenger by 2015.





**Table 1** EU Emission Standards for HD Engines, g/kwh

TIER	DATE	CO	HC	NOx	PM
Euro 1	1992 <85kw	4.5	1.1	8.0	0.612
	1992 >85kw	4.5	1.1	8.0	0.36
Euro 2	1996.10	4.0	1.1	7.0	0.25
	1998.10	4.0	1.1	7.0	0.15
Euro 3	2000.10	2.1	0.66	5.0	0.10
Euro 4	2005.10	1.5	0.46	3.5	0.02
Euro 5	2008.10	1.5	0.46	2.0	0.02
Euro 6	2013.01	1.5	0.13	0.4	0.01

**Table 2** Go North East Fleet Emission Standards (includes CRT upgrade)

TIER	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
Euro 2	92
Euro 3	219
Euro 4	271
Euro 5	104

**Table 3** Sunderland Fleet Emission Standards (includes CRT upgrade)

TIER	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
Euro 2	11
Euro 3	38
Euro 4	101
Euro 5	58

**NB:** These figures are constantly changing with fleet movement, investment and so on.

**LOW CARBON VEHICLES – THE DELIVERY OF PUBLIC  
SERVICES IN SUNDERLAND POLICY REVIEW 2011/12:  
PROGRESS REPORT**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priority: SP5 - Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1 – Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4  
– Improving Partnership Working To Deliver ‘One City’**

**1. Purpose of Report**

1.1 This report informs members of progress on the Scrutiny Committee’s Policy Review for 2011/12 into Low Carbon Vehicles – the Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland.

**2. Background**

2.1 Following the initial scoping of the Policy Review on 25 July 2011, members have commenced evidence gathering in relation to Low Carbon Vehicles – the Delivery of Public Services in Sunderland.

**3. Current Position**

3.1 The aim and terms of reference for the Policy Review can be found at **Appendix 1**.

***Project Plan***

3.2 At the Committee meeting of 12 September 2011 members agreed the approach to be taken in regard to gathering the evidence for the Policy Review. Attached for members information is an updated illustration (**Appendix 2**) which outlines the various activities and evidence gathering that will be undertaken throughout the review process. The plan seeks to finalise the evidence gathering arrangements in the coming months. Throughout the review process members will be provided with an up-to-date plan reflecting confirmed dates and additional information.

***Evidence Gathering Following Committee Meeting of 12 September 2011***

Visit to Smith Electric

Wednesday 12 October

In attendance: Cllrs Miller, Wright, Bonallie, Porthouse, I. Richardson.

3.3 This item of evidence principally contributes to Terms of Reference D, E, F and G. The main points from the visit are as follows:

- Smith Electric employs 350 staff, this has grown from 60 employees three years ago which demonstrates the growth of the company and in particular the acceleration of demand for electric vehicles.

- There are four vehicles in the Smith's range. The two most popular are:

**Edison – Ford Transit**

The vehicle has a range of 60-120 miles and a top speed of 50mph. Any derivative of the Ford Transit chassis can be used to meet the customer's needs. The vans are bought complete, and then modified to become an electric vehicle. The engines are sold back to the supplier.

**Newton – LGV**

The vehicle has a range of 40-130 miles and a top speed of 50mph. This vehicle arrives at Smith's ready to be fitted out with the battery, which accounts for 50% of the build material.

- Vehicles can be tailored to meet the requirements of the customer in terms of range, speed and payload. Vehicle range is dependant on the weight of the payload and how well the vehicle is driven. Training is provided to ensure optimum efficiency of the vehicle.
- Smith Electric carried out an audit of vehicle usage across the 12 north east local authorities. The results found that the average daily mileage of each vehicle type was 67 miles or less. This demonstrates that electric vehicles are appropriate for use within Councils as they tend to cover static routes over small geographical areas which are well within the range of the vehicle.
- Electric vehicles must be returned to a base to be recharged overnight. Access to charging points would not be an issue as they can be powered by a standard electric socket.
- Electric vehicles require half the power of an electric oven to charge and a simple socket can be fitted for approximately £100.
- Although the purchase of electric vehicles has an initial high capital cost, the longer term view demonstrates that, based on the fuel costs of today, the Newton model would become as cost effective as a diesel powered vehicle after 3 years, and the Edison model after 4-5 years. A vehicle used for a 10 year period could bring savings of £200 per month.
- Both leasing and finance options are available for customers wishing to introduce electric vehicles into their fleet.
- From a servicing and maintenance viewpoint, Smith's has 90 mobile service engineers, with some only 20 minutes away from Sunderland to provide a fast service.
- With regards to road safety, it was clarified that electric vehicles are quieter but that noise is emitted from the sound of the tyres so there wouldn't be a risk of increased

pedestrian related accidents in comparison to those operating an internal combustion engine, however noise emitters could be specially fitted to vehicles where necessary.

- Due to lack of information and knowledge currently available, Northumbria Police and Gateshead College have begun to investigate how to deal with and investigate the possible outcomes of a road accident involving electric vehicles.
- Smith Electric has an apprenticeship programme in conjunction with Gateshead College to train local young people in electric vehicle production. Smith Electric also works with University of Sunderland with regards to innovation in engineering.
- There is no industry standard in the carbon footprint for producing electric vehicles however Smith Electric continuously monitors it's carbon footprint. It has found that to be carbon neutral Washington plant must produce and have running 200 vehicles. The plant currently produces in excess of 200 vehicles per year, therefore is carbon neutral.

#### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1 That members of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee note and comment on the information provided.
- 4.2 That members note the dates of the forthcoming task and finish activities and indicate whether they are able to attend.

#### **5. Background Papers**

- Minutes of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee; 25 July 2011 and 12 September 2011.

---

**Contact Officer:** Sarah Abernethy (0191 561 1230)  
[Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk)

## **Appendix 1**

### **LOW CARBON VEHICLES – THE DELIVERY OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN SUNDERLAND**

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Terms of Reference for the policy review are:-

- (a) To examine the role and responsibilities of the local authority with regard to climate change and energy;
- (b) To consider national and European policy in regard to the use of low carbon transport in the delivery of services;
- (c) To investigate the progress made to date and future plans in the council and across partners in regard to the introduction of low carbon vehicles to deliver public services;
- (d) To explore the financial and non-financial future implications of the increased use of low carbon vehicles in the delivery of council services;
- (e) To consider appropriate targets for the introduction of electric vehicles into the council's fleet.
- (f) To consider the extent of the council's role as a leader in the use of low carbon vehicles to deliver public services in the city; and
- (g) To consider to what extent future technologies will enable the council and partners to increase the use of low carbon vehicles.

## Appendix 2: Project Plan

<b>TASK</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTORS</b>	<b>DATE/TIME</b>	<b>METHOD/LOCATION</b>
<b>JULY 2011</b>				
Agree scope of the policy review and receive background information in support of the policy review	A, B, C	Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer Paul Lewin/Ian Bell, City Services	25 July 2011, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1
Gain the views of the city's MPs on the use of low carbon vehicles in the city	D, F	Bridget Phillipson MP Sharon Hodgson MP  Julie Elliott MP	<b>TBC</b> 18 Nov 2011, 11am <b>TBC</b>	Written evidence Discussion Group  Written evidence
<b>SEPTEMBER 2011</b>				
Agree the approach to the review, sources of evidence and timetable	NA	Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer	12 September 2011, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1
<b>OCTOBER 2011</b>				
Seek evidence from Smiths Electric Vehicles regarding the technology available now and in the future for low carbon vehicles	C, D, F, G	Representative from Smith's Electric Vehicles	12 October 2011, 1pm.	Site Visit to Smiths Electric Vehicles
Seek evidence from Nexus and the bus operators within the city regarding current and future plans for low carbon public transport	C	Bernard Garner, NEXUS Robin Knight, Stagecoach Kevin Carr, Go NorthEast	24 October 2011, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1
<b>NOVEMBER 2011</b>				
Seek evidence from the University of Sunderland regarding the work it is undertaking in regard to low carbon vehicles	C, D, F, G	Adrian Morris/Dave Bagley, University of Sunderland	8 November 2011, 9.30am	Site Visit to University of Sunderland
<b>DECEMBER 2011</b>				
Explore the market for low carbon vehicles, looking at current and future technologies	C, D, G	Les Clark, Head of Street Scene Representative from Nissan Representative from Smiths Electric Vehicles	12 December 2012, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1
<b>JANUARY 2012</b>				

Explore the procurement of low carbon vehicles regionally	D, E	Ian Taylor, North East Purchasing Organisation	16 January 2012, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1
Explore a cost benefit analysis of introducing low carbon vehicles into the council fleet	D, E	Les Clark, Head of Streetscene		
<b>MARCH 2012</b>				
Agree the draft final report for the policy review		Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer	TBC	Extraordinary Meeting
<b>APRIL 2012</b>				
Agree the final report for the policy review		Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer	2 April 2012, 5.30PM	Committee Meeting, CR1

# **ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

24 OCTOBER 2011

## **UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENTS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN SUNDERLAND**

### **REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priority : SP5 - Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CI01 – Delivering Customer Focused Services, CI04 – Improving Partnership Working To Deliver ‘One City’**

#### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide Members with a progress report regarding public transport in Sunderland, with particular reference to secured bus services.

#### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Local Transport Plan for Tyne and Wear falls within the remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee, of which the priority and investment of public transport is a key policy. As such the Committee has invited Nexus to attend on a regular basis over a number of years to give updates to Members on the various developments in regard to public transport.
- 2.2 At its meeting of 16 November 2009, the Scrutiny Committee received a report on the Bus Strategy formally adopted by the Integrated Transport Authority and Nexus in March 2009 after consultation with key stakeholders, including the five Councils in Tyne and Wear. At that meeting the Committee considered the consultation on the Accessible Bus Network Design Project, which recognised the necessity to improve bus services generally with particular reference to routes, services and journey times.
- 2.3 Subsequently, on 20 September 2010, the Committee was provided with an update from Nexus on the results of the consultations for the Accessible Bus Network Design and future developments in the city.

#### **3. CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 A further progress report on public transport will be presented to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration, with particular regard to secured bus services by Mr Bernard Garner, Nexus Director General.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**



- 4.1 The Committee is asked to receive a progress update from Nexus; to note progress to date; and raise any other issues of concern.

**5. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2021
- Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee Agenda and Reports - 16 November 2009 (Review of the Accessible Bus Network – Consultation)
- Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee Agenda and Reports – 20 September 2010 (progress on the Tyne and Wear Accessible Bus Network Design)

---

**Contact Officer:** Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer: 0191 5611233  
Helen.lancaster@sunderland.gov.uk

## **WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING- UPDATE**

### **REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priority : SP5 - Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CI01 – Delivering Customer Focused Services, CI04 – Improving Partnership Working To Deliver ‘One City’**

#### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 The Committee’s workplan for 2011/12 includes the provision of an update report on wastes management arrangements.
- 1.2 To advise the Committee of the position reached in the procurement of a PFI supported contract for the treatment of residual waste.

#### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The report summarises performance and achievements in 2010/11 and provides a projection of the outturn position for 2011/12.
- 2.2 The amount of municipal waste handled by the Council reduced from 144,894 tonnes in 2009/10 to 142,525 tonnes in 2010/11. This and the improved recycling and composting performance reduced reliance on landfill as a means of disposal with 65.38% of municipal waste being landfilled in 2010/11.
- 2.3 The reduction in the quantities of waste handled in recent years appears to be to slowing down and the % of municipal waste handled in the first quarter of 2011/12 is only slightly down on the same period last year. With small increases in recycling collected during 2011/12 as the full year effects of the blue bin scheme are counted it is estimated that less than 64% of municipal waste will be consigned to landfill.
- 2.4 The reduction in waste handled remains largely attributable to the prevailing economic conditions and measures by food producers and retailers to reduce packaging (the Courtauld Agreement).

### **3. RECYCLING PERFORMANCE**

- 3.1 The 2010/11 figures for household waste recycling composting and reuse was 31.25%. At the first quarter of 2011/12 the figure was 37.3% which is seasonally affected but compares with 31% for the same period in 2010/11. This is due to the blue bin recycling scheme being fully rolled out across the City this year, and the Council sending some of its municipal waste to a local treatment facility to support its commissioning through its waste management contract with Alex Smiles.
- 3.2 The level of garden waste sent for composting remained largely unchanged. In the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2011/12 it was 5,228 compared with 5,312 for the period in 2010/11. Garden waste is currently collected from around 85,000 households.
- 3.3 The improvement in recycling performance since the introduction of the blue bins is set against a background of indications of reduced consumption and consequently fewer recyclable commodities such as newsprint within the waste stream, and reductions in packaging material weights.
- 3.4 The amount of bulky waste recycled in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter remained static at 677 tonnes compared with 685 tonnes for the same period last year. The number of bulky waste collections carried last year was 58,053 compared with 60,233 in 2009/11. Thus the % of bulky waste recycled increased in relation to the number carried out. It is expected that a review of the bulky waste service will take place during Winter 2011/12 to consider options for maintaining the level of service offered to residents, while reducing costs and increasing recycling and reuse of bulky waste.
- 3.5 Residents' response to the blue bins scheme remains positive with sustained numbers making regular use of the bin and the levels of recovered material having increased.
- 3.6 Work has commenced on the assessment of apartment blocks, multi-storey flats and other non-traditional types of properties with a view to incorporating them into the scheme.

### **4. OTHER RECYCLING**

- 4.1 There are 50 operational bring sites provided across the city including those provided at high-rise flats and those with restricted access e.g. schools, places of employment. These cater for a range of commodities in addition to those collected via the blue bin system e.g. books, cartons, textiles and shoes. The improved recovery of materials e.g. paper, glass, cans and plastic bottles; at the kerbside has led to a

reduction in the quantities collected from bring sites. The Council will continue to provide a service for those who choose to use the bring banks as they are inexpensive to operate. During late 2011 we will introduce a re launched bring bank service for paper and mixed commodities, and following a procurement exercise carried out with other North East council's the service will be provided by contractors which provide a modest income.

- 4.2 On-street recycling facilities are provided at six locations across the city.

## **5. COMMUNICATIONS**

- 5.1 Following the extensive communications campaign that was used to launch the blue bin recycling scheme in 2010/11, a scaled down communications plan has been designed and delivered in 2011/12 which concentrates on ensuring the blue bin brand is retained and that residents are asked to help to recover more commodities from within the waste stream.
- 5.2 In April 2011 each of the new recycling vehicles acquired to service the blue bins was fitted with a refreshed display panels, to reinforce the benefits of recycling and highlighting a wider range of materials for example glass jars, papers and plastic bottles. The panels were funded by the Waste Resources Action Programme. During winter 2011/12 a new campaign is planned which will aim to encouraging residents to keep their local environment clean and attractive by using their recycling bins more and putting out less rubbish for collection.
- 5.3 During Winter 2011/12 a new refuse and recycling calendar will be designed building on the improved garden waste calendar launched in March 2011 which gives the specific day and date of collection of each service.

## **6. ANCILLARY CONTRACTS**

- 6.1 The last report set out the ancillary waste contract arrangements in place for recycling, garden and residual waste disposal. These contracts are to cover the period from 1 April 2010 up to the commencement of the PFI contract. It is envisaged that longer term contracts for recyclable and compostable materials will then be awarded by the South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership.

### *Green waste contract*

- 6.2 The new contract with JBT Ltd which commenced on 1 April 2010 provides a local transfer facility and has consequently reduced the distances that collection vehicles have to travel. This has limited the impacts on collection arrangements and realised savings over the

previous arrangements. The contractor is performing the service to a good and reliable standard.

*Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) contract*

- 6.3 The award of this contract was a determining factor in kerbside recycling arrangements. The contract provides for the separation of paper from other recyclable materials delivered to the contractor's facility. The contract which is serviced by Connorco Ltd commenced on 1 April 2010. Transfer and sorting facilities are currently provided in Hendon and Washington and again this provision of local facilities has limited the impacts on collection arrangements. Monitoring of the MRF contractor continues and the service is being delivered in accordance with the specification. Works will start with the STWWMP in the Winter of 2011/12 to review the joint needs of the partnership and if appropriate commence on the planning of procurement of a new MRF contract in 2013/14.

*Waste management contract (interim arrangements for residual waste)*

- 6.4 The contract with A.Smiles Ltd commenced on 24 January 2011. In addition to a waste transfer station at Deptford another is provided at Pattinson, Washington via a sub-contract arrangement. Most of the waste is to be taken to landfill with the facility for the treatment and opportunities for the additional recycling and recovery of 7.5% of the waste delivered to the contractor. The contract allows for the transfer of the Authority's waste to the PFI contract facility once that commences in 2013/14. At that point the interim arrangement will terminate.

**7. PFI CONTRACT (RESIDUAL WASTE)**

- 7.1 The respective Cabinets of the Partnership authorities agreed the preferred bidder as the Sita/CLL consortium at meetings on the 15 September 2010. The solution involves the provision of a twin-line Energy from Waste facility at Haverton Hill, Billingham (designed to export 150,700 MWh/yr to the Grid and achieve over 95% diversion from landfill) with a supporting waste transfer station located within each authority area.
- 7.2 Financial Close was reached and the contract formally awarded in June 2010.
- 7.3 Construction of the new waste to energy plant has commenced as planning permission was already in place.
- 7.4 A public consultation exercise in the Hendon area took place in June and July 2011 in respect of the construction of a new waste transfer station at Jack Crawford House Commercial Road.

- 7.5 Sita submitted a planning application for the above site in July 2011. The outcome of this application is pending but a decision is anticipated during in November 2011.
- 7.6 Subject to the successful grant of planning permission, works on the new waste transfer facility will commence in 2011/12, it should be ready for use in late 2013 with the main energy from waste facility being commissioned in early 2014.
- 7.7 Sita have also applied to Sunderland City Council for planning permission to redevelop the existing waste transfer station at Campground, Springwell as part of the same PFI contract. About 20,000 tonnes per annum of the City's residual household waste will be delivered to this facility primarily from the Washington area from the start of the new contract in 2014. A decision on the planning application is also expected at the end of November 2011.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 The Committee is requested to consider the report and note the measures being taken to improve recycling levels; and the position reached with the PFI supported procurement of a strategic residual waste facility.

## **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 9.1 The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:
- i) Report of the Executive Director of City Services, Director of Financial Resources and Chief Solicitor- South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership- PFI Update; Cabinet 15 September 2010
  - ii) Report of the Executive Director of City Services, Director of Financial Resources and Chief Solicitor- South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership- Appointment of Preferred Bidder for the PFI procurement; Cabinet 15 September 2010
  - iii) Report of the Director of Community and Cultural Services- Wastes Management- Ancillary Procurements; Cabinet 14 January 2009
  - iv) Report of the Director of Community and Cultural Services- Kerbside Recycling; Cabinet 29 April 2009
  - iii) Report of the Director of Community and Cultural Services- South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership- Evaluation Methodology and PFI update; Cabinet 30 July 2008

### **Contact Officer:**

Colin Curtis: 0191 561 3950 (Colin.Curtis@sunderland.gov.uk)

**ENVIRONMENT AGENCY CATCHMENT FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANS  
CONSULTATION**

**Report of the Deputy Chief Executive.**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to bring to Members' attention a consultation from the Environment Agency (EA) on its catchment flood management plans (CFMP) for the region and to seek Members' endorsement of main comments on the proposals and any further comments.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The EA has published a series of draft CFMPs for the North East that it is consulting on between 15<sup>th</sup> August and 6<sup>th</sup> November 2011. CFMPs are high level strategic documents which identify the most sustainable approach to managing flood risk from all sources. These documents are vital elements of the flood risk management planning hierarchy, as described in the EA Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) Strategy for England. CFMPs are river catchment based and cross district boundaries.
- 2.2 The proposals draw on a range of information including local studies such as the Sunderland Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA). The plans will help focus local flood management efforts, such as the preparation by the local authority of a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS).
- 2.3 The EA sees the CFMPs as 'living' documents that may be altered to reflect the outcome of different studies, such as the 'system asset management plans' that are proposed for each CFMP area.
- 2.4 An earlier set of CFMPs was published in 2009-10. Since their publication a number of significant changes have taken place including the commencement of the Flood and Water Management Act (2010), the Flood Risk Regulations (2009) and the FCERM Strategy for England (2011). In addition, considerable efforts have been made to manage flood risk from all sources – Sunderland adopted its SFRA in July 2010 and the PFRA was formally submitted to the EA in June 2011. EA has worked in partnership with Northumbrian Water Limited and all local authorities in the North East to review a number of elements of the CFMPs. It has reviewed all the action plans to fully reflect the requirements for flood risk management.
- 2.5 The EA is responsible for managing flood risk that relates to main rivers, lakes and the sea. Therefore, in Sunderland it has responsibility for the;
- River Wear;
  - River Don and Usworth Burn;

- Northern part of Lumley Park Burn;
  - Coast.
- 2.6 The City Council, as lead local flood authority (LLFA), is responsible for the 'ordinary watercourses' in the city such as Hendon Burn, or the southern part of Lumley Park Burn and its feeder streams, as well as ground and surface water flooding. The range of actions set out in the CFMPs identify whether the lead responsibility is the EA or the LLFA.
- 2.7 The proposed CFMP actions where the City Council is lead do not directly entail any capital items. They are all of a study nature which will require staff resources with, possibly, some additional consultant expertise. It is likely that costs can be defrayed through use of DEFRA funding that has been made available to the local authority to fund the new burdens placed on them by the Flood and Water Management Act (Sunderland has received £120,000 for 2011/12 and has been allocated £158,000 for 2012/13).
- 2.8 Members will recall that the outcome of the SFRA and PFRA studies indicated that while the city has some locations prone to flooding, the overall risk of more than very localised water inundation in the urban areas of Sunderland is low. This has been a prevailing consideration in commenting on the draft CFMPs.

### **3.0 THE ACTION PLANS AND THEIR PROPOSALS**

- 3.1 The CFMP action plans for Sunderland cover:
- The Tidal River Wear
  - Lumley Park Burn
  - Coastal Streams
  - The Don
- 3.2 Each plan is succinct and comprises a short background explanation, a 'vision' for the particular 'policy unit', key messages, a schedule of changes to the actions set out in the earlier CFMP and finally, a schedule of prioritised actions and the organisations leading and supporting the delivery of each action. The accompanying CFMP text and related four plans, which are A3 size in colour, would not reproduce well as part of this report, but may be seen by following this link <http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/committees/cm5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/7292/Committee/1479/Default.aspx>

Copies of the plans will be made available for committee members at the meeting.

- 3.3 Matters where the lead responsibility is the City Council or other actions of particular interest are itemised and commented on below. Before commenting on the particular area actions, the following general comments are made to the overarching structure of the CFMPs. Throughout this report the proposals of the CFMPs and any explanations are indicated in italics.



## GENERAL

- 3.4 **Action Plan Visions:** *In relation to EA's 'vision' for each CFMP, it is noted that these are very similar. Each plan's vision is to better understand the policy unit (EA's term for the catchment plan area) through improved flood mapping and apply this to further detailed appraisals and future proposals for management of flooding. Then the second part of each vision seeks to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding unless where exceptionally necessary they meet the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25 Development and Flood Risk (PPS25).*

**Comment:** It is considered that the visions in their current form add little to the CFMPs. It is suggested that EA should revisit the 'vision' for each CFMP and, instead of it being process-based, write it on a spatial basis. This could identify a long-term outcome for flooding and the general management of the catchment rivers in each policy unit with the main mechanisms for control of water, such as, say, retaining or enhancing local flood plains, or an emphasis on SUDS (sustainable drainage systems), or improving critical drainage, etc. It is also suggested that the second part of each vision concerning development could be deleted, as already both EA and the local authority must abide by the provisions of PPS25.

- 3.5 **Sustainability:** *Several actions throughout the plans state that they will be undertaken using the most sustainable approach, though no explanation is given as to what would define sustainability for the matters in question.*

**Comment:** some further consideration and clarification of the meaning of sustainability for different actions and circumstances should be included in the document.

- 3.6 **Cost –effectiveness:** *Feasibility options are seen as a way of identifying the most cost-effective approach to reducing flood problems e.g. as proposed for the Wear at Fatfield.*

**Comment:** EA is asked to explain its meaning of cost-effectiveness in the context of flood control and threat to life and property. A clear explanation should be included in the documents on how cost-effectiveness is established; will it, for instance, adopt lifetime cost/benefit principles?

- 3.7 **Key Messages:** the Key Messages for each CFMP include a brief indication of the types of flooding that the policy unit is at risk from, for instance river flooding or from surface water. Whilst the areas may be at risk from some flooding from these sources, an indication of the level of risk, location and extent should be included in the messages: as pointed out earlier Sunderland's risk from flooding is generally low and it would be undesirable to imply anything more than this except for the few areas identified through the SFRA and PFRA.

- 3.8 **Additional comment – biodiversity:** The City Council wishes to ensure that flood management measures for the main rivers that EA is responsible for do not have a negative impact on Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species and habitat assets. This needs to be ensured for all four of the CFMP Policy Units that relate to the city.

#### *THE CFMP ACTION PLANS*

- 3.9 **Tidal River Wear:** Covering the area around the River Wear from the western city boundary to the mouth of the river. The policy unit is at risk of coastal, tidal, surface water and river flooding. *CFMP policy is to take further action to reduce the risk of flooding, including;*

- ***Tidal flood plain:*** *Ensure that the tidal flood plain does not see an increase in development.*

**Comment:** The tidal flood plain is not extensive in the city. The City Council has adopted a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment report that includes a similar recommendation and it applies the provisions of PPS25 Development and Flood Risk in taking decisions on planning applications and considerations on the locations for future growth

- ***'System Asset Management Plan';*** *The EA is to give high priority to producing a 'System Asset Management Plan' for the tidal Wear to ensure the most sustainable approach to managing flood defence related assets to ensure flood risk is reduced.*

**Comment:** This is to be welcomed, though note the above comment on sustainability.

- ***Register of structures:*** *Sunderland City Council to establish a register of structures or features likely to have a significant effect on flood risk.*

**Comment:** This is a requirement of the Flood and Water Management Act. The priority for this will be determined by the City Council in preparing its Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.

- 3.10 **Additional comment – biodiversity:** The Wear CFMP should aim to identify habitat protection, enhancement and creation of wildlife opportunities related to flood risk management measures, in particular to identify saltmarsh creation and protection opportunities, control of invasive species and conservation of BAP species such as otter and water vole. The tidal and fluvial main river water quality should be improved and a sensitive clearance programme of litter and other detritus instigated.

- 3.11 **Lumley Park Burn:** Encompasses the urban and rural areas from the Burn's source near Easington Lane to the western boundary of Shiney Row near its confluence with the River Wear. Flood risk in the policy unit is river-related. Further study of the effects of climate change is proposed

by the EA. *The CFMP policy is to continue with existing or alternate action to manage flood risk at the current level;*

- **‘System Asset Management Plan’:** *The EA is to give high priority to producing a ‘System Asset Management Plan’ for the Lumley Park Burn to ensure the most sustainable approach to asset management, continuing the current level of maintenance, though recognising that the standard of protection will reduce over time due to climate change.*

**Comment:** The Sunderland SFRA identifies Lumley Park Burn as one of the areas of the city most prone to flooding and it has both of the city’s main raised defences at Osman Terrace and Dairy Lane. Just maintaining the defences at their current level will mean increased risk of overtopping due to the impacts of climate change. Therefore it is recommended that maintenance of defences should be improved in proportion to the increasing impact of climate change so as to maintain the same risk level of flooding in the defended areas. The likely effects of climate change in the Lumley Park policy unit area should be further studied and actions included in the CFMP to ensure the risk to currently undefended property does not increase.

- **Flood risk mapping for Houghton le Spring:** *EA is to carry out a flood risk mapping study to further define the risk of fluvial flooding at Houghton le Spring as a medium priority.*

**Comment:** This is to be welcomed but in view of the flooding history of the Lumley Park Burn the study should be high priority, preferably linked to the City Council’s production of the Sunderland Flood Risk Management Strategy.

3.12 **Additional comment – habitats:** Lumley Park Burn CFMP should aim to identify habitat protection, enhancement and creation of opportunities related to flood risk management measures, including control of invasive species and conservation of BAP species such as otter, water vole and great crested newt. The river water quality should be improved and a sensitive clearance programme of litter and other detritus instigated. EA should work in partnership with the City Council and others to agree improvements.

3.13 **Coastal Streams:** Numerous small watercourses drain the eastern-most part of the catchment plans’ area to the coast independently of any hydrological connection with the River Wear or each other. Notable coastal streams in Sunderland are Cut Throat Dene, Hendon Burn and Cherry Knowle/Ryhope Dene. Flood risk is fluvial (from water courses) but predicted damages here are very low. *CFMP policy is for ‘no active intervention’.*

- **System Asset Management Plan:** *EA is to give high priority to producing a System Asset Management Plan to determine the most effective approach to managing assets, hence it proposes to cease all flood risk management activity.*

**Comment:** The Sunderland PFRA has identified clusters of properties in the urban area that are at risk from surface water flooding. Mitigation measures need to be considered in preparation by the City Council of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. These measures may involve EA in looking at its assets' management and maintenance. Therefore the proposed policy of 'no active intervention' would seem inappropriate at this point in time and EA should re-consider the policy stance.

- ***Flood risk mapping for Sunderland:*** EA is to give high priority to carrying out a detailed Flood Risk Mapping Study to further define the risk of both fluvial and tidal flooding throughout Sunderland.

**Comment:** This is to be welcomed, though some clarification is needed as this would appear to be a statement about flood risk mapping for all fluvial and tidal flooding in Sunderland.

3.14 **Additional comment – biodiversity:** The Coastal Streams CFMP should aim to identify habitat protection, enhancement and creation of opportunities related to flood risk management measures, including control of invasive species and conservation of BAP species. The water quality of the coastal streams should be improved and a sensitive clearance programme of litter and other detritus instigated. EA should work in partnership with the City Council and others to agree improvements.

3.15 **The Don:** This river is at the edge of the Tyne catchment and the Don policy unit includes the urban areas of Springwell and north Washington. Usworth Burn is a tributary. The main source of flood risk is fluvial, whilst the management of surface water flood risk may require further investment. Whilst the population density is high, the flood risk is low. *The policy is to continue with existing or alternate actions to manage flood risk at the current level;*

- ***Habitat creation:*** Work in partnership to identify habitat creation opportunities through the removal or abandonment of flood risk management assets.

**Comment:** Consideration of any abandonment of flood management assets should only be made after the proposed Systems Assets Management Plan has been prepared. Decisions should only be taken after consultations with the local authority and other stakeholders. The CFMP schedule does not state where the habitat opportunities are located and should clarify this. Where flood risk management measures are planned the Don CFMP should aim to identify and include measures for habitat protection, enhancement and creation of biodiversity opportunities including control of invasive species and conservation of BAP species such as otter, water vole and great crested newt. The river water quality should be improved and a sensitive clearance programme of litter and other detritus

instigated. The City Council should be a partner in identifying improvements.

- **Register of structures:** *Sunderland City Council as high priority (by 2015) to establish and maintain a register of structures or features likely to have a significant effect on flood risk, to identify locations where flood water may overspill.*

**Comment:** This would be part of a city-wide register of structures and features to be prepared by the council as part of its Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, which would determine the priorities.

3.16 **Additional comment – priorities:** It is noted that whilst the flood risk for the policy unit is low, all the actions are given ‘high’ priority. The EA should re-examine the priorities with a view to best managing resources and ensuring true high priorities are tackled first.

#### **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 Committee is requested to:

- i) Endorse the comments as set out in this report and make any other comments considered appropriate;
- ii) Authorise officers to forward a copy of this report together with their detailed comments to the Environment Agency as representing the City Council’s views on the proposals.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS :**

- The relevant CFMPs for Sunderland
- Sunderland Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Sunderland Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment

**Contact Officer: Barry Luccock (0191) 561 1577**

Barry.luccock@sunderland.gov.uk

**ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
WORK PROGRAMME 2011-12**

**24 OCTOBER  
2011**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priorities: SP5 Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4:  
Improving partnership working to deliver 'One City'**

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 The report attaches, for members' information, the work programme for the Committee's work during the 2011-12 Council year.
- 1.2 The work of the Committee in delivering its work programme will support the council in achieving its strategic priorities of Attractive and Inclusive City, support delivery of the related themes of the Local Area Agreement, and, through monitoring the performance of the Council's services, help the Council achieve its Corporate Improvement Objectives CIO1 (delivering customer focussed services) and CIO4 (improving partnership working to deliver 'One City').

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The work programme is a working document which the Committee can develop throughout the year. The work programme allows members and officers to maintain an overview of work planned and undertaken during the Council year.

**3. CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 The work programme reflects discussions that have taken place at the 12 September 2011 Scrutiny Committee meeting. The current work programme is attached as an appendix to this report.

**4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The work programme developed from the meeting will form a flexible mechanism for managing the work of the Committee in 2011-12.

**5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 That Members note the information contained in the work programme and consider the inclusion of proposals for the Committee into the work programme.

---

**Contact Officer:** Sarah Abernethy, Scrutiny and Area Support Officer  
0191 561 1230, [Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk)

**ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2011/2012**

<b>REASON FOR INCLUSION</b>	<b>JUNE 13.06.11</b>	<b>JULY 25.07.11</b>	<b>SEPTEMBER 12.9.11</b>	<b>OCTOBER 24.10.11</b>	<b>NOVEMBER 7.11.11</b>	<b>DECEMBER 12.12.11</b>	<b>JANUARY 16.01.12</b>	<b>FEBRUARY 27.02.12</b>	<b>MARCH 13.03.112</b>	<b>APRIL 02.04.12</b>
<b>Cabinet-Referrals and Responses</b>			Response to the 10/11 Policy Review – Sunderland 'the Place'							
<b>Policy Review</b>	Annual Work Programme and Policy Review (HL)	Scoping Report and Setting the Scene (HL/Les Clark)	Approach to the Review (HL)	Low Carbon Public Transport (Nexus, Go NorthEast, Stagecoach)  Policy Review Progress Report (HL)		Exploring the Low Carbon Vehicle Market (Les Clark)  Policy Review Progress Report (HL)	Procurement of Low Carbon Vehicles (TBC)  Cost Benefit Analysis (HL)	Policy Review Progress Report (HL)	Policy Review: Draft Final Report (HL)	Policy Review: Final Report (HL)
<b>Performance</b>			Performance Q1 (Kelly Davison-Pullan)  Policy Review Recommendations: Performance (HL)			Performance (Mike Lowe)				Performance (Mike Lowe)
<b>Scrutiny</b>	Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code (Keith Lowes)  Forward Plan (SA)	Highways Maintenance (Graham Carr)  Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (Neil Cole)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)	Public Conveniences (Les Clark)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)	Public Transport (Nexus)  Waste Management (Les Clark)  Catchment Flood Management Plans (Neil Cole)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)	Prioritisation Framework for Traffic and Road Safety (1) (Les Clark)	Local Development Framework – Annual Update (Neil Cole)  Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Neil Cole)  Employment Land Review (Neil Cole)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)	Delegated Decisions (TBC)  Prioritisation Framework for Traffic and Road Safety (2) (Les Clark)  LDF Core Strategy (Neil Cole)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)	Fawcett St (Les Clark)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)		Draft Scrutiny Annual Report (HL)  Street Lighting Annual Update (Graham Carr/Aurora)  Work Programme (SA)  Forward Plan (SA)
<b>CCFA/Members Items/Petitions</b>	Request for Inclusion of an Item - Planning Applications (HL)									



**FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS FOR THE PERIOD 1  
NOVEMBER 2011 – 29 FEBRUARY 2012**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**Strategic Priorities: SP5 Attractive and Inclusive City**

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4:  
Improving partnership working to deliver ‘One City’**

**1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive’s Forward Plan for the period 1 November 2011 – 29 February 2012 which relate to the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee.

**2. Background Information**

- 2.1 Holding the Executive to account is one of the main functions of Scrutiny. One of the ways that this can be achieved is by considering the forthcoming decisions of the Executive (as outlined in the Forward Plan) and deciding whether Scrutiny can add value in advance of the decision being made. This does not negate Non-Executive Members ability to call-in a decision after it has been made.
- 2.3 To this end the most recent version of the Executive’s Forward Plan is included on the agenda of each of the Council’s Scrutiny Committees.

**3. Current Position**

- 3.1 Following member’s comments on the suitability of the Forward Plan being presented in its entirety to each committee it should be noted that only issues relating to the specific remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee are presented for information and comment.
- 3.2 For members information the remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee is as follows:-

*Place shaping; Building Control; Unitary Development Plan and the documents comprising the development plan; Local Transport Plan; Coast protection; Cemeteries and Crematorium; Grounds Maintenance; Flood Risk; Highways services and Streetscene; Waste and Recycling; Allotments*

- 3.3 In the event of members having any queries that cannot be dealt with directly in the meeting, a response will be sought from the relevant Directorate.

**4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 To consider the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 November 2011 – 29 February 2012.

**5. Background Papers**

None

---

Contact Officer : Sarah Abernethy 0191 561 1230  
Scrutiny and Area Support Officer  
[Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk)

**Forward Plan -  
Key Decisions for  
the period  
01/Nov/2011 to  
28/Feb/2012**



**E Waugh,  
Head of Law and Governance,  
Commercial and Corporate Services,  
Sunderland City Council.**

**14<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

## Forward Plan: Key Decisions from - 01/Nov/2011 to 28/Feb/2012

No.	Description of Decision	Decision Taker	Anticipated Date of Decision	Principal Consultees	Means of Consultation	When and how to make representations and appropriate Scrutiny Committee	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Tel No
01532	To approve the Sunderland Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD Draft for Consultation	Cabinet	02/Nov/2011	Head of Law and Governance, Director of Financial Services, Sunderland Partnership, Director of City Services	circulation of draft cabinet paper	To contact officer by end of October - Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Sunderland Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD Draft for Consultation	Barry Luccock	5611577
01531	To approve the draft revised Preferred Options Core Strategy.	Cabinet	02/Nov/2011	Head of Law and Governance, Director of Financial Services	Circulation of draft cabinet paper	To contact officer by end of October - Environment and Attractive Scrutiny Committee	Circulation of draft cabinet paper	Neil Cole	5611574
01545	To approve the delivery of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) project pending confirmation of all funding and agree the project management, partnership and procurement arrangements	Cabinet	02/Nov/2011	Deputy Chief Executive	Emails and meetings	Via the Contact Officer by 21 September 2011 - Prosperity and Economic Development Scrutiny Committee and Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Cabinet Report	James Garland	5611158