

## ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN RENEWAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE BOARD

*At a meeting of the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board on Wednesday, 24 June 2015 at the Council Chamber, Runcorn Town Hall*

Present: Councillors Woolfall (Chair), Fry (Vice-Chairman), P. Hignett, V. Hill, C. Loftus, MacManus, Morley, Sinnott, G. Stockton, A. Wall and Zygodillo

Apologies for Absence: None

Absence declared on Council business: None

Officers present: M. Noone, G. Ferguson, G. Cook, D. Cunliffe, E. O'Meara, S. Rimmer and Griffiths

Also in attendance: Councillor R Hignett in accordance with Standing Order No.33. Also 20 members of the public and one member of the press.

### ITEM DEALT WITH UNDER DUTIES EXERCISABLE BY THE BOARD

*Action*

EUR1 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2015, having been circulated were signed as a correct record.

EUR2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

It was confirmed that seven public questions had been received and would be submitted and addressed as part of Minute No 4. It was noted that in accordance with Standing Order 34 (9), written notice of questions must be given by 4.00 pm on the working day prior to the date of the meeting to the Committee Services Manager. As the following two additional questions were received after the deadline it was agreed that a written response would be provided:

#### **MARY SYKES**

I have lived here quite happily for 18 years but since the incinerator has been up and running my life is just a living nightmare with the rotten smells and the constant humming noise every single night unless they are aware of being monitored I report most nights but on Friday 19th June 2015 I broke down in work due to the stress and lack of sleep this can't go on. My family life is suffering I have a husband and

daughter who is 11yrs old .who feel like they have to walk on egg shells around me. I am very weepy and could very easily fall but have a family I am trying to keep together, please please sort this nightmare we are living out. The noise and stink has to go. What is the council going to do?

### **DONNA WOODS**

There is much concern that when the incinerator stack was reduced by 10 meters that this would result in the dispersal from the stack not to be as efficient considering that the original height was the recommended height. Could the committee consider additional monitoring is put in a downwind location to provide additional monitoring of the emissions from the site. I believe Weston School was a recommended place.

#### **EUR3 EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES**

The Board considered the Minutes of the meetings of the Executive Board relevant to the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board.

RESOLVED: That the Minutes be received.

#### **EUR4 REPORT ON AIR QUALITY IN HALTON 2015**

The Board considered a report of the Director of Public Health which presented an overview of air quality in Halton. It also presented a summary of national and local air quality monitoring, progress against National and European Air Quality legislation and provided a response to a petition for Air Monitors received by the Council in March 2015.

It was noted that on the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2015, the Council had received a petition entitled "Request for the Council to Monitor the Air Quality for PM2.5 and other toxins" which contained 5,632 signatures. In response to the petition, the report identified the facts around air quality and air quality monitoring in Halton within the national and international frameworks and identified the following recommendations to address the issues raised in the report and ensure that air quality in Halton remained good and ultimately to improve health and wellbeing in Halton:-

i) Undertake a series of public engagement events to build a greater understanding of the concerns local people had regarding air quality in Halton and identify opportunities to build improved transparent relationships to ensure a clear way forward in all concerns;

ii) Develop an active multi-agency Air Quality Forum (including lay representation) to enable issues and concerns could be raised and discussed in an open, engaged forum and facilitate agreement on actions and outcomes.

iii) Investigate further opportunities to limit emissions and reduce NO<sub>2</sub> in areas of potential high traffic activity around built up areas and achieve compliance with NO<sub>2</sub> Air Quality Objectives.

iv) Develop a full Air Quality Strategy, based on available local and national data and evidence to ensure that Halton was able to sustain recent improvements in Air Quality across the Borough and proactively seek to remove the declaration of Air Quality Management Areas within the Borough.

In accordance with Standing Order No.34 (9), the following public questions were submitted to the Board by email:

#### **QUESTION 1 - ANNE-MARIE ATHERTON**

Halton Borough Council, as quoted in an article in Liverpool Echo, states that the only air quality measure that the Borough fails is the level of Nitrous Oxide/nitrogen dioxide and that this comes from road traffic. I would like to draw your attention to an article produced by the United States Environmental Protection Agency

<http://www.epa.gov/asthma/no2.html>

This article shows a clear link between severe asthmatic attacks and high levels of Nitrous Oxide/nitrogen dioxide.

I would also like to draw your attention to a published scientific paper which prove nitrous oxide/nitrogen dioxide is produced by waste incinerators of which there is one in Runcorn and one (at least) in Widnes. [http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/bgp/5\\_3\\_Waste\\_Incineration.pdf](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/bgp/5_3_Waste_Incineration.pdf)

Therefore I would like to question how does Halton Borough Council air quality investigations distinguish between road traffic nitrogen dioxide and that produced by incinerators?

The medical/treatment cost of the high incidence of asthma and COPD in the borough could be drastically reduced if the air quality was improved - so why does the local council want to do nothing about improving health and quality of life for its inhabitants?

## **RESPONSE**

### Part 1

Nitrogen Dioxide is produced and emitted by combustion processes, and therefore incinerators do produce Nitrogen Dioxide. Air monitoring cannot distinguish between Nitrogen Dioxide from different sources. The results of monitoring undertaken across the Borough, for Nitrogen Dioxide show that levels, including those in and around Weston Point, are well below the national legal levels in all but the designated Air Quality Management Areas within Widnes. The Air Quality Management Areas in Widnes were declared 3 years prior to the development of the Energy from Waste incinerator. While we cannot determine the source of the Nitrogen dioxide using the monitors, we have identified that traffic is the cause of the higher rates in the AQMAs. A series of monitoring has taken place across the Borough, the only areas recording higher levels are the 2 small areas in Widnes which are known to suffer from traffic congestion. Industry within Widnes cannot be the cause of the higher levels in these areas as the higher levels would be recorded across Widnes and not concentrated within these 2 small areas.

I draw your attention to the figure on page 25 of the report which shows the independent air quality monitoring carried out in Weston Point, and highlights that Nitrogen Dioxide levels in Weston Point, with the full running of the Energy from Waste plant are below objective levels in all areas except at the kerbside of the express way. This shows that higher Nitrogen Dioxide levels are a result of the emission from vehicles, and not as a result of emissions from the incinerator.

### Part 2

It is accepted that high levels of air pollution can and does impact upon health, including an association between high levels of Nitrogen Dioxide and potential increased exacerbations of asthma.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency article referred to in the question, highlights the link between high Nitrogen Dioxide levels and severe asthma attacks. We would like to highlight that the Air Quality Standards adopted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency for Nitrogen Dioxide are a yearly average concentration of  $100\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , compared to the UK yearly average of  $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . The United States Environmental Protection Agency states

that “the existing [US] annual primary standard appears to be both adequate and necessary to protect human health against both long- and short-term NO<sub>2</sub> exposures”. In Halton, the highest annual average Nitrogen Dioxide level measured in the Air Quality Management Area is 41.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which, while it breaches the UK Air Quality Objectives, would not exceed the US standard if this was applied and under this basis would not be considered at levels that are harmful to health as described within this article.

Halton data shows that prevalence of asthma, and hospital admissions for asthma (which are indicative of the number of severe asthma attacks) do not correlate with areas that exceed Nitrogen Dioxide objectives. It is not possible to say therefore that higher Nitrogen Dioxide levels are the cause of asthma and asthma admissions in Halton.

As identified in the report, the Council is committed to improving air quality and particularly within the Air Quality Management Areas, and has undertaken, and continues to undertake, a series of measures, as highlighted in the report.

## **QUESTION 2 - COLIN BUTLER**

Considering that the DCC committee refused to endorse INEOS’s proposal for a single point monitor, which was positioned up wind of the Incinerator, does this present Committee consider it to be a good use of funds that will be available from the fund provided by the incinerator to be used for additional monitoring as proposed by the original Section 106 agreement between HBC and INEOS when planning permission was granted. The reason for this not being implemented is due to the fact that a Public Inquiry (which cost INEOS around £1/2m) decided that INEOS under the strict legal definition had met the particular condition as stated in the permit.

The fact that there were 4 assurances given in the planning application which were:-

No steam will reach ground level

There will be no noise complaints

There will be no complaints regarding odour all being proven as not being met.

With the only one not being able to be proven incorrect is that the emissions will not be at the required limits at ground level because INEOS have refused to implement additional

monitoring which the DCC deemed necessary hopefully will further illustrate that this additional monitoring is what the local residents deserve.

## **RESPONSE**

The Section 106 referred to in the question states that the lump sum payments made to the Council as part of the development, are to be used by the Council to fund environmental matters as may be specified from time to time by the Council within the Borough of Halton for the benefit of its residents generally and which may include measures to improve public transport, highway network improvements, travel plan monitoring, waste recycling and wider community improvements such as landscaping and nature conservation measures. The spending of the monies received by the Council as part of the Section 106 agreement is not a matter the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board can decide. The monies from the development must be spent in accordance with the legal agreement which states that the Council will convene a management board, which shall include three elected members, to be charged with the task of identifying environmental matters proposed within the Borough of Halton. The management board will determine how the fund is to be used in accordance with the legal agreement.

The monitors at the Brine Reservoir site are located within the predicted plume direction from the Energy from Waste plant and therefore appropriate for monitoring any emissions from this site. These monitors have not measured above objective levels of pollutants.

### **Supplementary Question:**

The Section 106 agreement for the incinerator planning application has not yet been implemented. Would it be within the remit of this Board to determine how the funds allocated as part of the Section 106 are distributed?

### **Response:**

The Section 106 referred to in the question states that the lump sum payments made to the Council as part of the development, are to be used by the Council to fund environmental matters as may be specified from time to time by the Council within the Borough of Halton for the benefit of its residents generally and which may include measures to improve public transport, highway network improvements, travel plan monitoring, waste recycling and wider community

improvements such as landscaping and nature conservation measures. The spending of the monies received by the Council as part of the Section 106 agreement is not a matter the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board can decide. The monies from the development must be spent in accordance with the legal agreement which states that the Council will convene a management board, which shall include three elected members, to be charged with the task of identifying environmental matters proposed within the Borough of Halton. The management board will determine how the fund is to be used in accordance with the legal agreement.

### **QUESTION 3 - SAMANTHA BENNION**

Considering the number of complaints that have been received about the incinerator along with all of the stress that the plant has caused could the Committee consider that use of the funds the Council receive from the plant are used to provide a monitoring system that is the same as the one in place at Weston Brine and is placed at an appropriate place that will be downwind of the incinerator. This would give the local residents the reassurance that we deserve for having the incinerator dumped on our doorstep whilst at the same time using cash which is not from the general purse and has been earmarked for use of the local community.

### **RESPONSE**

With regards to the Committee determining the spend of the monies received by the Council under a Section 106 agreement, I refer to the response given previously to question 2. The legal agreement for the Section 106 states that a management board will determine the spend based with the terms stated within the agreement and it is not a matter that this committee can agree.

With regards to an additional monitoring site, the prevailing winds in the area are westerly and north westerly and within the direction of a likely plume from the stack, the brine reservoir location was determined to be appropriate on this basis. This location was agreed by an Environment Agency expert and the Planning Inspector subsequently reviewed this location and deemed it appropriate for the discharge of the condition regarding monitoring.

Alternative sites were also considered but were not deemed suitable for a variety of reasons.

Locating a second monitor in the area will not provide

additional information above that which we received from the Brine reservoir site in terms of air quality. As identified within the report, the Council has commissioned an independent Air Quality Consultancy to model air quality across Weston, and results show that pollutants are all within objective levels (other than directly on the express way).

#### **QUESTION 4 - SHEENA MADDOCK**

Many residents have made complaints concerning emissions from the chimney stack and there are major concerns within the community that the monitoring of the site has been dictated by INEOS and we now have the opportunity to use the cash the Council receive from the company to fund additional monitoring. With this in mind would the Council please consider using this money to fund additional monitoring in line with that hoped for by the Planning Committee at the time of the original application made by INEOS?

#### **RESPONSE**

As identified in response to previous questions (question 2). The monies received by the Council form a Section 106 agreement, the terms of which identify how the monies can be spent and the process for this to take place. Considerations will be made based on these terms.

The Section 106 referred to in the question states that the lump sum payments made to the Council as part of the development, are to be used by the Council to fund environmental matters as may be specified from time to time by the Council within the Borough of Halton for the benefit of its residents generally and which may include measures to improve public transport, highway network improvements, travel plan monitoring, waste recycling and wider community improvements such as landscaping and nature conservation measures. The spending of the monies received by the Council as part of the Section 106 agreement is not a matter the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board can decide. The monies from the development must be spent in accordance with the legal agreement which states that the Council will convene a management board, which shall include three elected members, to be charged with the task of identifying environmental matters proposed within the Borough of Halton. The management board will determine how the fund is to be used in accordance with the legal agreement.



The monitors at the Brine Reservoir site are located within the predicted plume direction from the Energy from Waste plant and therefore appropriate for monitoring any emissions from this site. These monitors have not measured above objective levels of pollutants.

#### **QUESTION 5 - DARRIN WHYTE**

The petition was "Air Monitors for Halton", as we know Halton consists of the towns of Runcorn and Widnes and the civil parishes of Hale, Daresbury, Moore, Preston Brook, Halebank and Sandymoor the only AQMA's are in Widnes.

Is it right to rely on diffusion tubes for the basis of a detailed assessment on Air Quality along with using data from pollution stations to forecast future events, which for Runcorn are in Warrington, Speke and Tranmere should we have Air Monitors or diffusion tubes to monitor our polluted air?

#### **RESPONSE**

As stated within the report, Halton has a series of air monitors which monitor air quality directly within the Borough. We currently have 22 active monitors:

- 16 diffusion tubes monitoring NO<sub>2</sub>
  - 12 in Widnes
  - 4 in Runcorn
- 3 real time analysers undertaking continuous monitoring for NO<sub>2</sub>
  - 1 on Milton Road (part of the national AURN network)
  - 1 on Marzhan Way in Widnes
  - 1 at the brine reservoir Runcorn
- 2 real time analysers undertaking continuous monitoring for particulates
  - 1 on Milton Road which measures PM<sub>10</sub>
  - 1 at the brine reservoir which measures both PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
- 1 Monitor for dioxins at the brine reservoir.

The national Automatic Urban and Rural Network, maintained by DEFRA is a national network of monitoring stations which provides national data, local sites include Widnes, Tranmere, Speke and Warrington. The data is provided hourly to DEFRA and is used to assess ambient air quality, identify rapid changes in air quality and assess long term changes in air quality. This data is not received directly by the Council but this data is additional to the monitoring

data undertaken locally.

Monitors can be, and are, relocated regularly to areas where there is a potential to exceed objective levels so that appropriate measures can be taken to prevent elevated levels.

### **QUESTION 6 - JACKIE FLOREK**

Because

1. statistics already show long-term significant health problems,
2. Halton now has a large EfW Incinerator,
3. there are increasing numbers of lorries bringing waste to the Runcorn EfW Incinerator,
4. the stack was significantly reduced in height from the original design (because it is in a flight path) which reduces dispersal efficiency,
5. people living next to it are experiencing conditions which we were assured would not happen,
6. the Brine Reservoir readings 2012-13 showed there were five instances of pollution levels being exceeded,
7. the monitoring in Runcorn is mainly by \*diffusion tubes, ("Local Authorities are advised not to rely upon \*diffusion tube data alone as the basis of a Detailed Assessment..." and "The accuracy of the tubes should be quantified by means of a co-location study with a fully calibrated chemiluminescent analyser."

<http://laqm.defra.gov.uk/laqm-faqs/faq67.html>)

I am asking on behalf of Halton Residents please will the Council either use the money they receive from the EfW Incinerator or seek external funding (or a combination of both) to put in place more and better placed and more appropriate air quality monitoring in Halton which will include monitoring for PM2.5 and all potentially harmful pollutants?

Please note I am not questioning whether the Council does or does not comply with their legal obligation.

### **RESPONSE**

As identified in the response to the previous question (Question 5), the Council has additional appropriate monitors over and above the diffusion tube monitors. One of which is placed at the Brine reservoir site which monitors Nitrogen Dioxide, Particulate at PM10 and PM2.5 and dioxides. This location is appropriate to identify emissions from the Energy from Waste plant as it was determined to sit within the direction of the prevailing wind and within the

likely predicted path of the plume from the incinerator stack.

In addition, as identified within the response to question 3, the monies received under the Section 106 agreement will be spent in accordance with the conditions within the legal agreement and determined by a management group, as laid out within that agreement. Any considerations will be made by this management group once it is up and running.

All monitoring at the Brine Reservoir sites show that air quality is within permitted levels. The levels have been set by Europe and the UK at levels that will protect health, as the air quality monitored within this area is within these levels, it cannot be identified as a cause of ill health.

### **QUESTION 7 - MR MARK CAMPBELL**

There is much concern that when the incinerator stack was reduced by 10 mts that this would result in the dispersal from the stack not to be as efficient considering that the original height was the recommended height. Could the committee consider recommending additional monitoring is put in a downwind location to provide additional monitoring of the emissions from the site. I believe Weston School was recommended place.

### **RESPONSE**

As mentioned in the response to previous questions, the current monitoring site located at the Brine Reservoir represents an appropriate and recommended location for monitoring potential activity from the site, being located along the predicted plume path. Current monitoring indicated that all measured pollutants are within objective levels. The reduction in the height of the stack does not appear to have resulted in any dispersal issues and additional monitoring would not be beneficial.

Alternative locations were considered but discounted during the planning stages and the Brine Reservoir location was considered appropriate.

### **Supplementary Question:**

How can you be certain monitors are in the right position when the plant has not been open that long?

### **RESPONSE**

As part of the planning process metrological data was

collated on all aspects of the plant including an analysis of prevailing winds, the location of the monitors were identified as the most likely were the plant plume path would fall.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the report be noted; and
- 2) the recommendations contained within the report be submitted to Executive Board and it be recommended by this Board that those recommendations be supported.

Director of Public Health

EUR5 PETITION FOR ALTERATION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS, QUEENS AVENUE, WIDNES

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which advised that an 80 signature petition and associated individual letters had been received requesting alteration of the waiting restrictions on Queens Avenue, Widnes.

The immediate area of the Argos/Homebase offices at Queens Avenue/Royal Avenue in Widnes, was subject to intense pressure on available on and off-road parking provision as a result of these offices, the adjacent housing and the shops on Queens Avenue.

At the present time, the parking bays on the shops side of Queens Avenue were limited to 40 minutes stay time, with unrestricted parking on the other side. There were also "At Any Time" restrictions in the area of the junctions with Royal Avenue and Coronation Drive, in order to protect sightlines. The short stay parking provision was intended to provide a high turnover in the use of the bays to give better access to the shops for the majority of customers, with the unrestricted parking available for visitors needing to make a longer visit. It was noted that residents had complained about various parking issues including: The blocking of driveways; all-day parking in the limited stay bays near the shops; and the use of "private" housing association car parks by office workers. These issues culminated in a meeting between residents' representatives, Ward Councillors, Cheshire Police and managers from Argos /Homebase in February 2015.

Whilst it was accepted that it could be in the interests of some businesses and their customers to have a two hour time limit on the parking bays near the shops, this would

severely restrict parking space turnover. It would also limit the number of visitors able to access the businesses directly by being able to drive to the shops and then being able to park immediately near their destination. It was also not clear how a two hour stay would dissuade Argos/Homebase employees from parking there.

Members were advised that Ward Councillors and Cheshire Police had been consulted and supported retention of the present 40 minute stay duration on the bays adjacent to the shops, Cheshire Police pointing out that the present restrictions were introduced to prevent extended parking outside the shops and provide a short term area for those persons visiting said shops.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the requested alteration of the existing 40 minute time limited waiting arrangements adjacent to the shop units in Queens Avenue, Widnes be refused; and
- (2) the lead petitioners and individual writers be so informed.

Strategic Director  
- Policy &  
Resources

EUR6 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORTS FOR QUARTER 4 OF 2014/15

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which detailed the fourth quarter performance management report for 2014/15 on progress against service objectives/milestones and performance targets and provided information relating to key developments and emerging issues that had arisen in relation to:-

- Development and Investment Services;
- Highways and Transportation, Logistics and Development Services;
- Waste and Environmental Improvement and Open Space Services; and
- Housing Strategy.

RESOLVED: That the fourth quarter management report be noted.

EUR7 POLICY AND PERFORMANCE BOARD WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

The Board received a report of the Strategic Director,

Policy and Resources, which sought to develop a work programme of topics for the Board to scrutinise as part of their 2015/16 work programme. It was agreed that the following Working Parties be established for 2015/16:

Trees – Councillors P Hignett, MacManus, G. Stockton, C. Loftus and Sinnott.

Waste Management – Councillors Sinnott, C. Loftus, V. Hill, G. Stockton and Zygadlo.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) Members of the Board indicate target topic areas for potential scrutiny 2015/16;
- (2) Details of topic briefs be agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board, in conjunction with the Lead Officer; and
- (3) Members confirm their support for the continuation of the Waste Management Working Party and establishment of a Trees Working Party with membership as follows:-

Trees – Councillors P Hignett, MacManus, G. Stockton, C. Loftus and Sinnott.

Waste Management – Councillors Sinnott, C. Loftus, V. Hill, G. Stockton and Zygadlo.

#### EUR8 ANNUAL REPORT FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN RENEWAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE BOARD

The Board considered a copy of the Annual Report from the Chair of the Environmental and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board 2014/15. The full Board met five times during the year and the report set out the work carried out and recommendations throughout the Municipal Year April 2014 to March 2015.

The Chair wished to note on record his thanks to Members and Officers for their support during the year.

RESOLVED: That the Annual Report be accepted.

EUR9 OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS,  
VARIOUS LOCATIONS

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which advised on objections that had been received following public consultation on a proposed Traffic Regulation Order to introduce 20 mph speed limits on a number of roads in Halton.

Overall, 17 letters/e-mails were received, 16 of which were objections to aspects of the proposals. With regards to two objections relating to Palace Fields Avenue, these were primarily related to a belief that the lower speed limit would not be complied with and would be of little value, expressing concerns over enforcement. However, the route carried physical traffic calming for its full length which restricted traffic speeds and negated the need for a high degree of Police enforcement. It was therefore recommended that the 20 mph speed limit was implemented at this location.

With regard to the eleven objections relating to Beechwood Avenue, these covered a range of issues which were set out in the report. Several of the objections expressed a belief that the reduced speed limit was unnecessary, given the physical layout and geometry of what was a distributor road and bus route already equipped with a range of facilities to assist vulnerable road users, and two School Crossing Patrols operating adjacent to the local schools. It was therefore recommended that Beechwood Avenue be excluded from the proposed 20 mph zones for the Beechwood area.

Members were advised on the four objections which were received to the introduction of 20 mph speed limits generally and these were summarised in the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the proposal to make a Traffic Regulation Order to implement a 20 mph speed limit on those roads defined in Appendix B with the sole exception of Beechwood Avenue be supported; and
- (2) the report be submitted to the Executive Board for resolution.

Strategic Director  
- Policy &  
Resources

## EUR10 STREET LIGHTING - STRATEGY AND POLICY

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which sought approval for the Street Lighting Strategy and Policy which had been prepared following a previous report to Executive Board on 29 March 2012. The Executive Board, at its meeting on 26 March 2015 approved an Invest to Save bid of £4.7m for a programme of work to replace the current conventional street lighting with energy saving light emitting diode (LED) lighting units. The Executive Board also considered potential measures to achieve street lighting savings. It was noted that the cost of street lighting maintenance was constantly rising, mainly as a result of energy costs which were increasing well above inflation. The cost of energy for all the Council's highway electrical assets (including street lighting, traffic signals, illuminated signs, etc.) was approximately £1,216,000 per annum. It was noted that there was no statutory duty to provide street lighting, however, it was recognised that street lighting had a vital role to play in reducing fear of crime and improving community safety after dark. Due to increased energy costs for street lighting, it was recognised that action must be taken to minimise future growth in energy consumption and was one of the reasons for preparing a Street Lighting Strategy and Policy.

The report highlighted the following proposals which were contained within the Street Lighting Strategy and Policy:-

- There should be no net increase in the highway electrical equipment stock that would increase the demand for and cost of energy other than those detailed in the report;
- There should be a presumption against new lighting schemes or additional highway electrical equipment funded through Area Forums or from the Council's other capital budgets, unless the additional revenue budget was available to fund the on-going lighting/highway electrical equipment and maintenance indefinitely;
- Consideration would need to be given in the future to the removal of lighting from secondary independent footpaths and gated routes to the rear of residential properties;
- Where there were suitable alternative lit routes, then consideration would also be given to no longer



installing lighting on independent footpaths, unless it was a primary route to a school or major employment areas;

- A presumption against any future growth in street lighting provision would be difficult due to the need to provide it on new residential roads and high profile regeneration schemes;
- The developer shall pay the Council a commuted sum to cover the cost of 10 years maintenance, based on the current HBC Term Maintenance Contract or 10% of the new works costs, whichever was the higher, plus the energy charges for the equipment based on the current energy supply contract rates for 10 years.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Street Lighting Strategy and Policy document attached as Appendix 1 be endorsed and submitted for approval to the Executive Board;
- (2) endorsement be given to the proposal to remove street lighting from rear passageways and independent footpaths where these routes were not the primary means of access to properties and when existing equipment is no longer serviceable; and
- (3) endorsement be given to the proposal to require a commuted sum to be paid where non-standard equipment is installed as part of a development (see paragraph 4.7).

Strategic Director  
- Policy &  
Resources

#### EUR11 UPDATE ON GYPSY AND TRAVELLER NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Board considered a report which provided an update on current issues around Traveller needs including: sites, unauthorised encampments, needs and management. The report outlined information on permanent sites within Halton and unauthorised encampments. In addition, Members considered information on the latest national policy for Traveller sites and what was expected from local authorities. The report also provided details on the recent Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment in 2014 and an update on the delivery of new permanent Traveller pitches at the Warrington Road, Runcorn site.

RESOLVED: That the update be noted.

#### EUR12 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 REVIEW

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which provided a summary of the delivery of the four-year implementation programme of Integrated Transport Schemes and Interventions. The report reviewed the delivery of schemes funded through the Integrated Transport Block (ITB), which was used to fund small transport improvements. The ITB was allocated over a range of themes and interventions that were reported and approved by Executive Board for inclusion into the Council's annual Capital Programme. Expenditure across these themes during the four-year period had been in accordance with the overall ITB allocation within each of the themes listed below:

- Integrated Transport;
- Neighbourhood Centres;
- Walking and Cycling Improvements;
- Measure to Assist Buses;
- Local Safety Schemes and other Highway Improvements; and
- Intelligent Transport Systems.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

#### EUR13 NOMINATION OF MEMBERS TO THE CONSULTATION REVIEW PANEL

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which requested nomination of two Members to represent the Board on the Consultation Review Panel.

RESOLVED: That the Chair and Vice Chair of the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board, sit on the Consultation Review Panel as may be required from time to time.

#### EUR14 NOMINATIONS OF MEMBERS TO THE HALTON PUBLIC TRANSPORT ADVISORY PANEL - MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/16

The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, Policy and Resources, which requested Members to agree nominations to sit on the Council's Public Transport Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2015/16.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the nominations for the Halton Public Transport Advisory Panel for 2015/16 be as follows: Councillors Fry, McInerney, Morley and G.Stockton;
- (2) the Chair of the Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board, in consultation with the Executive Board Member for Transportation, nominates a Chair and the Chair to agree such deputies, as may be required from time to time;
- (3) nominations be endorsed; and
- (4) the key issues discussed by the Panel during the Municipal Year 2014/15, as set out in the report, be noted.

Strategic Director  
- Policy &  
Resources

*Meeting ended at 7.40 p.m.*