

# Public Document Pack

**Democratic Services Section  
Legal and Civic Services Department  
Belfast City Council  
City Hall  
Belfast  
BT1 5GS**

## **MEETING OF PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE**

Dear Alderman/Councillor,

In addition to those matters previously notified to you, the following item(s) will also be considered at the meeting to be held at 5.15 pm on Tuesday, 4th February, 2020.

Yours faithfully,

SUZANNE WYLIE

Chief Executive

### **AGENDA:**

4. **Restricted Items**

- (a) Proposal to install a Panoramic Wheel in Botanic Gardens (Pages 1 - 40)

5. **Committee/Strategic Issues**

- (c) Alleygating Programme Review (Pages 41 - 46)

6. **Physical Programme and Asset Management**

- (b) City Cemetery Heritage Project - Request for Aerial Mapping (Pages 47 - 50)

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 6  
of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 6  
of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 6  
of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank





<b>Subject:</b>	Alleygating Programme Review
<b>Date:</b>	4 February 2020
<b>Reporting Officer:</b>	Ryan Black, Director of Neighbourhood Services
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Alison Allen, Neighbourhood Services Manager

<b>Restricted Reports</b>	
<b>Is this report restricted?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?</b>	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometime in the future	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Call-in</b>	
<b>Is the decision eligible for Call-in?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues</b>
1.1	A motion regarding the Alleygating Programme, proposed by Councillor Brooks and seconded by Councillor Kelly, was presented to the Council at its meeting on 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2019 calling for a review of the effectiveness of the Alleygating programme to date, and look to build delivery partnerships with other agencies, should internal funding not be available to gate those requests that have been registered with the council.
1.2	This report sets out the background to the previous Alleygating schemes since the pilot project inception in 2005, highlights the number of Alleygates installed in each phase and

	identifies the strengths and weakness of the current process. The report also will outline a proposed terms of reference for the review of Alleygates.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
2.1	<p>The Committee is asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree that the evaluation of the Alleygating Programme to date (Phases 1 -4) is carried out with the intended remit as detailed within report; and</li> <li>2. Recommend that any future phase of Alleygating is referred to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee for consideration as part of the Capital Programme.</li> </ol>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Main Report</b>
	<p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Phase 1</u></b></p> <p>3.1 Councillors may be aware that the initial phase of Alleygating was carried out in 2005-2007 as a pilot with funds from the NIO (now Department of Justice), BRO and Bryson House (now Bryson Charitable Group), PSNI, NIHE, DSD Housing Policy Unit and DRD (now DfI).</p> <p>3.2 The erection of these gates at each end of entries in inner city residential areas had been shown to be extremely effective in England and Wales in improving the quality of life for local people by reducing crime, anti-social behaviour, fear of crime, environmental anti-social behaviour, littering and in promoting social inclusion.</p> <p>3.3 The NIO's Community Safety Unit provided a budget of £220,000 to Belfast City Council (as lead partner of the Belfast Community Safety Partnership) to deliver pilot Alleygating schemes in South Belfast (Lower Windsor) and North Belfast (Little America), based on the identified need of aiming to reduce the levels of anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>3.4 To further supplement the grant aid the Department of Social Development provided a further £230,000 under Phase II of the Neighbourhood Renewal Investment Fund to target areas where antisocial behaviour had been identified as a major problem (Beechmount, Willowfield and Woodvale).</p>

3.5	<p>This funding ensured that a total of 200 gates were erected with a further 20 gates being installed through the Renewing the Routes programme, in Lower Ormeau. An independent evaluation demonstrated the considerable impact the gates had in reducing fear of crime. Respondents reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a positive effect on reducing crime (87%)</li> <li>• There was a positive effect on reducing fear of crime (89%)</li> <li>• There was a positive impact on dumping / cleansing issues (73%)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Phase 2</u></b></p>
3.6	<p>In Feb 2009, £500k of capital funding under the Capital Programme was allocated by Council to commence a further Phase of Alleygates throughout the Belfast area with £125,000 approved for each area of the city. A prioritisation criteria developed by Deloitte was agreed by Health and Environmental Services Committee in 2009 that would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) an assessment of need and</li> <li>(ii) (ii) feasibility (i.e. the feasibility of installing gates in the streets).</li> </ul>
3.7	<p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of streets adjacent to the pilot areas;</li> <li>• ASB and Reducing Fear of Crime</li> <li>• Community support for &amp; capacity to support an Alleygating scheme;</li> <li>• Physical structure of alleyways to ensure that gates will be effective</li> <li>• A ranked list was then approved by committee and a further 174 Alleygates were then installed within the pilot project areas with further areas identified using the prioritised list (Ardoyne, Avoniel, Ballygomartin Road, Glenbank, La Salle, Whiterock).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Phase 3</u></b></p>
3.8	<p>In Feb 2012 £700,000 under the Capital Programme was made available for further Alleygating interventions throughout Belfast. The lists of streets were prioritised against the agreed criteria and 60 streets were identified for gating (148 gates) on equal basis across North, South, East and West. The difference being that the prioritisation process was</p>

	<p>applied to only those locations identified on the Register of Interest and the criteria relied heavily on statistical data.</p>
3.9	<p>Further to Elected Member feedback that the Phase 3 process for identifying locations to be gated did not take in to account local knowledge, the process was revised following Phase 3. A three-step process was therefore proposed that provides an opportunity for elected representatives to use their knowledge of their constituencies to inform decision making, alongside analysis of recorded information and consideration of the register of interest. The Department for Communities Building Successful Communities utilised the services of the Council to enable them to install additional gates in the Divis, Lenadoon and Glencolin areas. Further gates were also installed through the North Belfast Area Working Group intervention. This picked up streets which had not been selected within the ranking process.</p>
	<p><b><u>Phase 4</u></b></p>
3.10	<p>In March 2016, £700k of capital monies were made available to the Area Working Groups (South £140k, North 140k, East £210k and West £210k). Statistical analysis was brought to each Area Working Group to inform Members and the final gate locations were selected by elected members by using their knowledge of their constituencies. This phase also included additional monies from the LIF programme, Urban Villages and private businesses, who wished to be part of the scheme. This current phase is completed and added an additional 362 gates to the existing stock of 712, meaning a total of 1074 Alleygates being managed by City &amp; Neighbourhood Services.</p>
3.11	<p>In the first two phases it was Department for Infrastructure legislation used to create the legal basis upon which to erect the gates. This was because Council did not have legal powers of its own at that stage.</p>
3.12	<p>In 2011, the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act created provision within the Traffic Regulation Order for Councils to enact the gating legislation themselves.</p>
	<p><b><u>Key Issues</u></b></p>
3.13	<p>The decision of Council to initiate a review is timely given no such review has taken place since Phase 1, but also because of the emerging work around holistic and integrated</p>

neighbourhood regeneration. Additionally, Officers have identified a number of additional factors which could be considered in a review. These are:

- Significant drops in the number of people participating in the legal consultation i.e. in the first two phases the levels of response were around 80% - 90%, whereas in Phase 4 some response levels were as low as 20%
- Low consultation levels are making it extremely difficult for Council to demonstrate the necessary legal basis upon which Alleygates can be installed
- An emergence of a small number of consultation responses proactively stating that Alleygates are not wanted or needed (due to low levels of crime/ASB)
- Where Alleygates have not had full support, Council is identifying increasing instances of gates being left open thereby negating the benefit
- Reducing availability of adopted alleyways in the city suitable for Alleygating (as not all alleyways are suitable due to site factors) given the significant number of Alleygates installed to date.

3.14 All of the above should be taken in the context of continuing high levels of public demand for Alleygates. however as each phase has progressed, many of these locations are not suitable for Alleygates, are not alleyways (as only an alleyway by definition of Dfl can be gated) and the legal threshold for installation can be difficult to meet given the low consultation responses.

**Proposed next steps**

3.15 It is recommended, that Council engage a suitably qualified contractor to undertake a review of the Alleygates Programme to date, specifically exploring the following:

- the benefits of the scheme within neighbourhoods and how the overall scheme performs against CPTED principles (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design)
- to review the current selection process and identify potential future options for selection of Alleygate locations taking in to account what has worked well and what could be improved to date
- to examine if there has been any reduction in crime / return for investment in areas where there has been intense Alleygate installation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to examine whether there have been any long-term impacts or reduction in crime within gated areas in general</li> <li>• to identify opportunities to maximise the benefits of Alleygating by working closer with other partners in the context of wider neighbourhood regeneration</li> <li>• to make recommendations about how to maximise the benefits and opportunities from the Alleygate Project, taking into consideration other Council work streams and external strategies</li> <li>• to consider the longer-term impact of the continuous Alleygating investment (Phase 1 to Phase 4) to date in the city</li> </ul>
3.16	<p><u>Financial Implications</u></p> <p>The approximate cost of the evaluation would be £10K–15K with a significant level of in house support from the Alleygating team which would be from within existing budgets.</p>
3.17	<p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications and Rural Needs Assessment</u></p> <p>There are no specific Equality and Good Relations Considerations attached to this report, but they will be built in to any specification and programme of work for a contractor.</p>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Appendices – Documents Attached</b>
	None



<b>Subject:</b>	City Cemetery Heritage Project – Request for Aerial Mapping
<b>Date:</b>	4 February 2020
<b>Reporting Officer:</b>	Nigel Grimshaw, Strategic Director of City & Neighbourhood Services Ryan Black, Director of Neighbourhood Services
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Alison Allen, Neighbourhood Services Manager

<b>Restricted Reports</b>	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Call-in</b>	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues</b>
1.1	The purpose of this report is to update Members on the requirement within the City Cemetery Heritage Project for aerial digital mapping.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
2.1	<p>The Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the absence of an agreed Council Drone Policy, to give special permission to allow a suitably competent company with sufficient public liability insurance, to undertake the necessary aerial digital mapping as part of the City Cemetery Heritage Project.</li> </ul>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Main report</b>
3.1	<b><u>Project Background</u></b>
3.2	In late 2013, BCC began liaising with Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) around potential to apply into their Parks for People Fund. The fund is designed to protect and enhance existing heritage in parks/cemeteries across UK and attract/encourage more people to engage with this heritage

3.3	<p>After visits to several Council sites, City Cemetery was agreed as having vast potential in this regard and in mid-2014, a Council Project Sponsor and internal project team was established to develop the work.</p>
3.4	<p>The overall objective of the project is to 'protect and enhance the existing history and heritage of Belfast City Cemetery and to encourage more people to access, engage with and understand it in order that it is safeguarded for future generations to enjoy, and the initial project identified the following project elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital - new visitor centre</li> <li>• Restoration - of key listed assets</li> <li>• Interpretive - improved signage, storytelling, genealogy etc.</li> <li>• Biodiversity - enhance natural heritage</li> <li>• Promotion/Engagement - encourage greater engagement with site from wide range of stakeholders</li> </ul>
3.5	<p>The Stage 1 application was submitted to HLF in March 2015 (high level project plan) and Stage 1 funding of £160k (match funded with £60k from BCC) was secured in late 2015. The stage 1 funding was used to engage relevant external expertise (design team, conservation architect, interpretive planner, activity planner) and work up detailed project plan (18 month process).</p>
3.6	<p>The Stage 2 application was submitted to HLF in late 2017 with delivery funding of £1.67m secured from HLF in summer 2018 (match funded with £620k from BCC). 2019 was spent finalising designs/costs, securing planning, procuring contractors etc and planning for the move of the Council service yard to another location within the site to accommodate the new project. The move of the service yard is funded by Council up to value of £420K.</p>
3.7	<p>The contractor has been appointed for the three core elements of service yard move, visitor centre build and restoration of listed assets. Additionally, an engagement officer has been recruited. Works are due to commence on site in February 2020 alongside an extensive activity plan delivered by the engagement officer over the next three years (tours programme, schools programme, volunteer initiatives, events etc.).</p>
3.8	<p>In tandem, a range of non-capital elements such as a detailed activity plan, extensive research and robust interpretive plan are also being delivered. The delivery of these will be further enhanced by the recent recruitment of a dedicated engagement officer.</p>
3.9	<p>Another key aspect of the project is the genealogy element, where people will be able to search and interact with the cemeteries burial records. This will involve the enhancement of</p>



	<p>the current records and the development of appropriate hardware and software to ensure that the records can be accessed in a user friendly way, from both within the visitor centre and remotely.</p>
3.10	<p>A key requirement of the digital element of the project is that the cemetery is digitally mapped. This involves photographing the cemetery from the air and geo-tagging each grave and monument. Photographs are then also taken of each grave. This means that graves are not only much easier for cemetery visitors to physically locate, but also that pictures of each and every grave/monument within the site can be accessed from anywhere in the world.</p>
3.11	<p>The digital mapping element of the project is seen as absolutely essential to the project's success and requires a drone flight over the site. In the absence of an agreed Council Drone Policy, special permission for this flight over City Cemetery is therefore being formally requested through Committee.</p>
	<p><u>Financial &amp; Resource Implications</u></p>
3.12	<p>The costs of the aerial digital mapping of the site have been built in to the costs of the overall project.</p>
	<p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications and Rural Needs Assessment</u></p>
3.13	<p>These have been considered throughout the project with necessary screenings undertaken. These will be reviewed as the project progresses.</p>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Appendices – Documents Attached</b>
	None

This page is intentionally left blank