

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET – 9 APRIL 2013

REGENERATION, ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY PANEL
MEETING HELD ON 27 MARCH 2013

REC149: **CREMATORIUM CONTRACT UPDATE**

The Project Officer presented the Cabinet report which updated Members on progress with the Crematorium project. He reminded those present that Cabinet had last received a report on 8 January 2013 and this report updated Members on progress to date. A copy of the Preliminary Design Principles was handed round to the Panel.

He explained that the previous Cabinet report had authorised officers to start the procurement project to:

- (i) Build a new cremator hall
- (ii) Purchase 3 new cremators each with single stream inline abatement equipment
- (iii) Strip out the old cremators
- (iv) Convert the old cremator hall into much needed office space, meeting rooms and a staff changing room with showering facilities
- (v) Introduce cost effective energy efficient/environmentally friendly options for heating and cooling the building.

The Project Officer explained that since the last report, the following areas had been progressed:

- (i) The original engineer for the Crematorium (Sir Frederic Snow and Partners), had been engaged to advise on the foundations for the new Cremator hall and ancillary buildings.
- (ii) A bat survey was underway which covered the current building and the area of trees that needed to be removed to enable a new car park to be installed prior to the proposed building works.
- (iii) Main utilities routes to building had been identified and the capacity of the gas main was being checked.
- (iv) A new phone and internet route utilising the fast network installed within the Council offices was being installed using a wireless network bridge. This would give both better resilience and a larger bandwidth for internet type activities for the new cremators and other equipment.
- (v) Trundley Design Services had been appointed as architect for the project. This was following a mini tender from the framework agreement.

In relation to the Cremator specification, the Project Officer explained that the current operation of the Crematorium provided two large cremators and one standard cremator. It was reported that since the installation of them in 2007, there had been two occasions when they had not been able to meet a service request. The two instances required cremations of over 50 stone. In the new scheme it was considered appropriate to continue with the arrangements of two large and one standard cremator.

The Project Officer also explained that the maximum number of cremations a year that Mintlyn would be able to cope with was calculated as 3,200. Although the number of cremations fluctuated during certain months this did not have a significant impact on the capacity of the new facility and there was little likelihood that Mintlyn would have any capacity issues in the foreseeable future.

It was also reported that the new cremator hall was expected to last for many years to come, however the cremators would need replacing depending on their use every 10 to 15 years. As such the new hall was being designed to facilitate removal and replacement of the new cremators and ancillary equipment as easily as possible without the need of major building works in the future.

In response to a question from Councillor Pitcher, the Project Officer explained that the original stack would remain in place as a design feature in addition to the new stack. He also explained that the overall budget of £2.4 million was contained within the Council's capital programme and it was estimated that the budget would be split £900,000 for the building works (including fees) and £1,500,000 for the Cremators and equipment.

In response to a comment from Councillor Moriarty, the Assistant Cemeteries & Crematorium Manager explained that a new crematorium had opened in March and had had very little impact on Mintlyn and also a new crematorium was proposed for Cromer, again it was considered that it would have very little impact for Mintlyn.

The Assistant Cemeteries & Crematorium Manager outlined the costs of a cremation which were reasonably low in the table of charges.

RESOLVED: That the Panel supported the recommendations to Cabinet as follows:

That the Executive Director for Leisure and Public Space, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Community be given delegated authority to agree tenders for building works and cremators.

REC150: **PINCH POINT FUNDING APPLICATION**

The Project Officer presented the Cabinet report which explained the actions taken by officers in assisting Norfolk County Council to submit a project relating to the building of a new road between Edward

Benefer Way and Lynnsport in King's Lynn, designed to reduce pressure on the highway network and in addition, providing a new access to the Council's housing land at Marsh Lane and Lynnsport.

The project had been submitted to a government funding stream for traffic authorities called pinch point funding. The fund was worth £170m and covered the whole of England. Its purpose was to remove bottlenecks on the local highway network. Bids needed to be submitted by 21 February 2013 therefore Norfolk County Council contacted the Borough Council to discuss what traffic schemes would be available to consider within the tight timescale. Three different schemes were considered and details of the schemes were set out in the report.

It was explained that due to the timetable that officers needed to comply with to submit a bid (two weeks) Management Team consulted Cabinet Members and briefed them on the proposals so that a bid for the King's Lynn access road into the Lynnsport development could be submitted by the 21st February. This was prior to any formal approval by Councillors on the basis that in the event that Members did not wish to pursue the funding, the application could be withdrawn.

It was also explained that since the proposals had been in the public domain, they had caused some concerns with the Cyclist Lobby, which was unfortunate and contact should have been made with them earlier to explain how the scheme would work.

The Project Officer then explained the route on the plans which had been handed round to the Panel. It was explained that the cycle path would be rerouted with cycle crossings added. It was highlighted that another benefit for cyclists would be a crossing installed at Edward Benefer Way which would be controlled via traffic lights. It was explained that the traffic light provision was already there and it would just be the case of bringing that forward.

The Project Officer also explained how the proposal would reduce the impact on the air quality management areas.

Final decisions on the amount of funding for any specific scheme would be made following an appraisal of the bids received. Funding would be allocated to successful bidders over a period of two financial years.

Councillor Bubb asked whether there would be any through routes from Edward Benefer Way to Lynnsport. The Project Officer explained that a road through to the Gaywood Clock Area had been suggested, however the County Council were not happy with the proposal.

Councillor Scott asked whether there would be no access coming out from the Marsh Lane area into Wootton Road. The Project Officer confirmed that was the case that there would be no direct access onto Marsh Lane, however when the Marsh Lane area was developed then access might be able to be gained. It was anticipated that some traffic

would come away from Gaywood Road onto the new road and Edward Benefer Way. He added that this would be a planning consideration when development came forward.

In response to an issue raised by Councillor Foster in relation to the number of traffic movements, the Project Officer explained that County Highways would look at one development at a time and that developers had to pay for traffic movements which would help the Council to develop areas it wanted to.

Councillor Beales, Portfolio Holder for Regeneration added that the proposals were led by the Highways Authority and explained that even if there was limited development off this road, it still had so many benefits for the wider traffic.

Councillor Long asked whether consideration had been given to moving the road to the other side and leaving the cycle track where it was. The Project Officer explained that the route was on the old railway bed which had a harder surface and more suitable for a road.

Councillor Shorting stated that all the scheme would be doing would be moving one bottle neck to another area. He added that the road would be accessed from Marsh Lane at some point and referred to a similar problem experienced with The Grange estate.

Councillor Mrs Collingham added that it seemed a brilliant idea and she did not think that some of the objections raised related to this proposal.

Councillor Beales further explained that by introducing another 1 km of road would spread the traffic out around the area, however he understood the point being made by the local Councillors. He did however think that the proposal would bring wider benefits overall.

Reference was made to the risk implications of the proposal. The Project Officer outlined the risk implications as detailed at 3.8 of the report. It was explained that Norfolk County Council was the promoting authority and had accepted the risk in principle but if successful would need to agree how the risks would be shared and managed prior to the scheme starting. He added that once the go ahead had been given by the Government, the scheme could commence.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Loveless addressed the Panel. He explained that some of his concerns in relation to the cycle path had been addressed. However, he still had a concern regarding the relocation of the cycle path on the other side of the Anglian Water drain and whether there was enough space for a proper sized cycle path next to the drain. He also asked how much surveying of the project on the ground had already been undertaken.

The Project Officer explained that having walked down that area there was more space on that side than where the cycle path was currently.

He added that the scheme was deliverable and would be as good or better than it was at the moment.

Councillor Loveless added that people living on the Seabank Estate would be delighted to have better access and not be trapped in the estate. He hoped that Lynnsport would make good use of the road.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Collis addressed the Panel. He explained that North Lynn was within his Ward and the proposal would have an impact on Frontway. He asked what would happen at the bottom end of Lynnsport. He added that the access road was long overdue and development had been held up because of accessibility issues. He was satisfied with the comments regarding the relocation of the cycle path, however he hoped that there would be safety barriers alongside the drain as there would be all types of cyclists using the path. He asked for clarification in relation to the sustrans crossings.

In response to some of the comments raised, the Project Officer explained that when the project was put together the County Council did not want to put a link to the main road to Lynnsport, the roads would be linked through the car parks. He explained that the new pelicans pitch would need to be taken into account when that happened. The County Council also insisted that a new car park be installed at the bottom end. In relation to safety barriers, this was still to be considered as discussions still had to be finalised with Anglian Water regarding maintenance of the ditch.

It was explained that the sustrans crossings were a defined crossing and approved by the Cycling Lobby.

Councillor Bubb referred to the bus route at Reid Way which were controlled by bollards. The Project Officer explained that he thought that the bus route in that location had been stopped. Discussions were being held with Norfolk Green and it was hoped that more and better services could be offered in that part of the town.

RESOLVED: That the Panel supported the recommendations to Cabinet as follows:

1. That the land marked on the attached plan, valued at £213,000 together with funding of up to £834,000 in 2014/2015, to bring the funding level up to 30% (as required in the conditions of grant) be approved subject to a grant being awarded.
2. That the Capital Programme is amended to include the £834,000 in 2014/2015 should the grant application be successful.

REC151: **QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL ACCESS**

The Executive Director, Leisure and Public Space presented the report to the Panel which considered proposals to improve access to the

Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The proposal was to undertake improvements in the autumn to alleviate the problems at the same time as the County Council would be undertaking work to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital roundabout in connection with the Sainsbury's and Tesco's schemes.

The Executive Director, Leisure and Public Space explained that the works would create two lanes from the Queen Elizabeth roundabout on the A149 back to the mini roundabout at Winston Churchill Drive and provide a freeflow turn only going north onto the A149.

He then showed a video which demonstrated the congestion which was currently being experienced from the hospital to the roundabout.

It was reported that there was no budget provision for the cost of the scheme within the current capital programme. It was proposed to fund the £198,000 contribution from the Council from the additional income generated through the changes to discounts on second homes within the Borough. It was explained that the charges approved by Council in February 2013 would produce additional funding from the County Council element of second homes income of around £220,000 per annum. The use of the funds to support the works fitted the Council's Business Plan objectives of improving the quality of the environment and also the priorities of the agreed use of County second homes funding through 'supporting partnership activities'. The Hospital had agreed in principle to contribute £100,000 toward the scheme over 4 years.

Councillor M Chenery of Horsbrugh commented that the proposals would not just benefit Borough residents but also North Norfolk residents who also used the hospital.

Councillor Mrs Collingham added that she welcomed the proposal but asked whether consideration had been given to using pay on exit for the car park. The Executive Director, Leisure and Public Space explained that it was part of the business model currently being looked at.

Councillor Pitcher stated that he would also welcome a pay on exit car park but explained that there was also a build-up of traffic into the car park itself. The Executive Director, Leisure and Public Space explained that the proposed scheme was driven by cost, however if it did not stop the congestion the further proposals could be considered in the future.

In response to a comment from Councillor Bubb regarding the proposal for a separate access directly onto the A149, the Executive Director for Leisure and Public Space explained that the proposal had been priced at £1 million and there was no funding available for that.

In accordance with Standing Order 34, Councillor Loveless expressed concern that the County Council were not improving facilities for people

to be able to walk to Ashwicken. He also expressed concern that the County had failed to provide improved safety for pedestrians/cyclists at the roundabout.

RESOLVED: That the Panel support the recommendations to Cabinet as follows:

Cabinet are recommended to amend the Capital Programme to include a £198,000 contribution to the road works specified in the report.