

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 24th May 2016

Time: 10.00a.m. to 12 noon.

Present: Councillors: I Bates, E Cearns, J Clark, L Harford, R Henson, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, A Lay, M McGuire, J Schumann, M Shuter and J Williams.

Apologies: Councillor M Mason.

212. CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

The Committee noted that Council had appointed Councillor Ian Bates as the Chairman and Councillor Ed Cearns as the Vice Chairman for the Municipal Year 2016-17.

213. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Clark declared a personal interest arising from the discussion on Fenland Association of Community Transport (FACT) during item 6 'Concessionary Fares on Community Transport Services' as his company undertook MOT tests on vehicles belonging to the Association.

214. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th April were agreed as a correct record.

In discussion on the action log, the following updates were orally provided:

- a) Minute 140 – Northstowe Phase 2 – Section 106 Heads of Terms- As a further update the Vice-Chairman highlighted that there need to be a further review as a result of the passing of the recent Housing and Planning Act and the proposals for Starter Homes.
- b) Land Acquisition and Licence Agreements to allow construction to commence to Yaxley to Farcet Cycle Path – Councillor McGuire confirmed that regular progress updates were now being provided to the two local members as requested at the last meeting and that the latest sent that day, confirmed further progress.

It was resolved:

To note the other actions progress / completion as set out in the Minutes Action Log report.

215. PETITIONS

There were no petitions to be considered.

216. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK (ITB) PROPOSALS

This report asked the Committee to consider the proposed allocations for Integrated Transport Block (ITB) expenditure for 2016/17 as detailed in the table under paragraph 2.1 of the report and to also support the proposed projects to receive ITB funding for 2016/17 as listed in Appendix 1. Highlighted was a proposal to reduce the allocation for Major Scheme Development from £400k to £200k (as most scheme specific development work could be funded from individual City Deal and Growth Deal projects) and use this to increase the allocation for the Local Highway Improvements (LHI) Initiative by £200k. This had already received the support of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee (H & CI) and the Economy and Environment Committee also indicated their consent to the change with the Vice Chairman clarifying that the full sum would not be available as officer time would need to be allocated as an offset cost.

It was noted that in recent years, Government grant funding for Integrated Transport Block (ITB) had been reduced with no uplift provided for inflation and the reduced ITB allocation of £3.19M per annum had been incorporated in the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Capital Programme since 2015/16. As a result of the reduced funding, the approach for prioritisation of ITB funding had been revised and subsequently approved by this Committee in April 2015. Budget headings in the Capital Report were rationalised into a new category 'Cambridgeshire Sustainable Transport Improvements'. Following comments from Members and officers, officers proposed that this new category was to be incorporated into the 'Delivering Transport Strategy Aims' category.

It was reported that four committed schemes had experienced delay or cost increases, due to issues revealed during detailed design, and thus required funding in 2016/17 to complete the work. They were shown as 'current commitments' in the proposed list of projects in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 set out the 'Long List' of Market Town Transport Strategies (MTTS) schemes. In view of the small annual budgets and cost of schemes, a rolling 3-year funding period was recommended in order that some larger schemes which potentially scored better on benefits were not ruled out from the outset.

There was discussion regarding whether the £200k additional monies in the 'Delivering Transport Strategy Aims' category would be allocated to schemes in the current year, with some Members believing that the spend would only be eligible for schemes to be proposed for the next financial year, for which the closing date was not until November. The officer present clarified that the spend would be in the current year, as any unallocated monies would need to be returned to Government. As there was still the issue of how this would fit with the prioritisation process for LHI, given that the priorities had already been set for the year, there was a request to be provided with written clarification outside of the meeting in respect of the process and timescale that would be used by H and CI Committee to spend the above additional monies and what schemes might be eligible, and whether the current cap would be increased. **Action**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Support the allocation to the ITB budget elements.

- b) Support the proposed projects in Appendix 1 of the officers' report for allocation of ITB funding in 2016/17, and for proposed inclusion in the Transport Delivery Plan

217. CONCESSIONARY FARES ON COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SCHEMES

The Committee received a report on the results of a consultation on proposals contained in the 2016/17 Business Plan decision to remove the discretionary elements of the County Council's Concessionary Fare Scheme.

As background the report explained that the 'English National Concessionary Travel Scheme' (ENCTS) enabled cardholders to travel free on all qualifying local bus services after 09:30 until 23:00 Monday to Friday, and at all times at weekends and on Bank Holidays while legislation enabled authorities to provide additional, discretionary local concessions. In Cambridgeshire, additional concessions were provided to enable cardholders to travel for 50% of the fare on Dial-a-Ride services in the County, and for blind and partially sighted cardholders to travel free before 09:30. Currently, in the cases of Fenland and Huntingdonshire districts, a further 50% concession was added on Dial-a-Ride services funded by the district Councils, resulting in passengers in Fenland and Huntingdonshire receiving free community transport travel.

The report highlighted that the most recent consultation had involved sending out letters and forms to all members of Cambridge Dial-a-Ride (CAMDAR), Ely and Soham Association for Community Transport (ESACT), Fenland Association for Community Transport (FACT), Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (HACT) and The Voluntary Network via the Community Transport providers. A total of 2,600 envelopes were sent out and 1,753 valid responses had been received, equating to a very high 67% response rate. An analysis of the responses was attached as appendix 1 to the report. The key results were that 61% of respondents were either unwilling or very unwilling to pay the additional cost, ranging from 15% for members of The Voluntary Network to 77% of FACT members. Other findings from the consultation were that the main reason for using the services was for essential shopping (75%) with 45% of respondents using the service three or more times per week with 64% believing that the additional charge would have a significant impact on them.

The results of the consultation showed that there was considerable concern amongst users, many of whom were vulnerable, lived in rural areas and were at risk of social isolation. As experience indicated that there might be other ways of providing the essential access that these services currently provided, it suggested that Members could consider deferring the reduction in this budget until 2017/18 to enable further work to take place on options detailed in the report. The Committee was advised that if the implementation of the Business Plan proposal was deferred, the required funding would need to be found from elsewhere with the opportunity to use reserves (operational savings) as set out in the Finance and Performance Report included later on the agenda.

Committee Members comments / questions included:

- One Member suggested that there was a correlation between reducing subsidies to bus service routes and an increase in the usage of Dial-a-Ride services and this

increased cost needed to be taken into account when estimating the savings being made. His concern was that the increased cost of subsidising Dial-a-Ride Services could be greater than the subsidy given on bus routes.

- The Vice-Chairman suggested this latest consultation showed the value of engaging with the public and that such consultations should take place much earlier in the budget process to help in drawing up proposals, rather than consultations being used as a reactive measure to proposals drawn up by officers and Members without prior public consultation to establish the level of public support.
- From a funding point of view a suggestion was made regarding approaching shops / businesses to advertise their logos on buses / other transport vehicles. This was seen as a very positive suggestion that would be investigated further. **Action: PN**
- One Member asked whether it was appropriate that two Members of the Committee were able to speak on the report due to their links with FACT. In response, Councillor McGuire explained that he had been appointed by the County Council (who grant funded the organisation) to be its representative on the FACT Board and believed the Committee would therefore wish to hear any views he had, having been appointed to look after the County Council's interests. He highlighted that the current report was only dealing with concessionary fares. This was confirmed by the officer from Democratic Services. In response to Councillor Lay suggesting that Councillor Clark's garage business serviced FACT vehicles, Councillor Clark corrected this statement, explaining that his garage did not service FACT vehicles but undertook MOT (Ministry of Transport) tests. He did not consider this to be a prejudicial interest preventing him speaking on the current report, but was happy to declare a personal interest.
- The Chairman placed on record his thanks to the staff involved in undertaking the current survey and asked that the appendix be given a wider circulation to Members of the Council. **Action: PN / MS.**

Members supported the proposal to use reserves to defer the removal of concessionary concessions until the 2017/18 financial year, with the Chairman of the Health Committee seeing it as contributing to the Prevention agenda in term of social engagement and helping people keep active and live independently.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the results of a recent consultation on the Business Plan decision to remove the discretionary 50% concession on community transport Dial-a-Ride services;
- b) Recommend the use of reserves to defer the removal of the discretionary concessions until the financial year 2017/18 to allow more time to work with Community Transport operators on the implications of the proposals and potential alternative means of funding and providing community transport services.

218. ENERGY INVESTMENT STRATEGY PRIORITIES

This report sought the Committee's agreement on proposed priorities for an Energy Investment Strategy for the period 2016-2020 following recent Government policy changes on renewable energy. The Committee was reminded that in March 2015 it had agreed to use some of the profits from the Mobilising Local Energy Investment (MLEI) Project, to fund the development of further energy projects, the purposes being to save energy, generate financial returns and retain capacity to grow the scale and ambition of energy work as detailed in paragraph 1.1 of the report. Appendix A of the report identified Cambridgeshire County Council's energy investments alongside potential asset areas, which would require some policy and technical development work in advance of bringing forward projects, and where developed, could grow the scale and ambition of the Authority's energy agenda and revenue generating potential.

It was explained that:

- The Government's recent decisions (concerning Feed In Tariffs, the introduction of climate change levy charges on renewable energy production and cutting of the Zero Carbon Homes Policy), had left solar photovoltaics (PV) and some other energy projects difficult to finance. Future large scale investment required for a low carbon future was further constrained locally by grid capacity and capability constraints and the inability to store surplus renewable energy. However a return to viability could be anticipated as detailed in paragraph 2.2 of the report.
- The UK's Climate Change Act 2008 commits Government to five year carbon reduction budgets and recent global climate change talks in Paris in 2015 builds on this shift from oil and coal to electricity from other sources, with expected electricity price rises.
- Across Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) buildings and schools there was scope to further reduce energy usage and generate savings as detailed in paragraph 2.3.
- Paragraph 2.4 detailed the potential financial and policy benefits to the Authority. Given the grid capacity constraints, it was suggested that it would be prudent during the current investment hiatus to identify and develop future large scale renewable opportunities to be able to apply for Government's 'Contract for Difference' (CFD) and be 'investment ready' for anticipated price and market changes.
- Section 3 of the report detailed the Priorities for an Energy Investment Strategy in 2016-2020.
- The report suggested that there was an estimated minimum £65-70 million of investment opportunities with £15million having so far been invested.
- That to generate energy and to sell it on, would need the creation of energy companies. In addition, to bring forward large scale projects would require a development budget in order to finance the upfront development cost.

Members' comments / questions included:

- One Member, who was a supporter of the work set out in the report, concurred with the need for both the Country and the County to be able to generate more of its own energy and to be as energy efficient as possible as the current fall in oil prices was only a blip and that prices could dramatically increase at any time, bearing in mind the volatility of the Middle East. Another Member on the same theme highlighted that on the 15th May Germany had generated all its energy needs from renewable energy and Portugal was in a similar position.
- One Member expressed his concern regarding the Council's Revenue Budget being used to pay up front for the development of energy projects. He considered them to be risky investments with no guaranteed return and would be at the expense of front line service expenditure at a time of severe cuts to the services residents received. In response it was explained that in respect of financing advance development costs on projects, the risks were very small as the projects put forward would be the subject of a sound business case that would generate returns that would not only pay back any initial investment, but would be expected to provide a surplus to the Revenue Budget in future years. It was also clarified that feasibility work could not be financed from capital.
- A Member queried why the City Deal was not paying for Park and Ride energy schemes in St Ives and Longstanton. It was explained that the St Ives site was not included in the City Deal boundary while in respect of such projects generally, a pilot scheme was required first in order to test their practicality.
- In respect of the Soham Solar Park Project referred to in the report, one Member highlighted that the consultation with the parish council had been inadequate and that future projects needed to ensure that there was good advance consultation with interested / affected parties. While this scheme had, had to be developed to very tight time constraints it was accepted that lessons would be learnt to improve consultation on future large scale projects.
- There was concern from some Members that the current paper made no reference to the financial risks associated with the Country leaving Europe and the financial implications of European funding no longer being available to help fund projects.
- In reply to a question, it was confirmed that the County Council's current policy was not to build any further wind farms on its own estates. Further to this, a Member highlighted that wind energy technology was advancing and that in the future there might not be the need for very large wind turbines and suggested that the Council should not continue with a policy indefinitely that might hamper a future, more efficient and less obtrusive local energy generation method.
- A Member queried the logic of installing renewable energy schemes in maintained primary schools who may later convert to academies. In response it was explained that loans were only provided on the basis of the schemes recovering all costs and that in respect of academies, any loans included

a higher fee to counter the increased risk. The energy projects also provided a benefit to the wider public purse by helping spend less on energy.

- The Vice-Chairman suggested the need for a Council-wide holistic approach to financing energy schemes, rather than being financed from the Economy and Environment Committee budget.

There was further discussion regarding wind technology and the need to engage with partner authorities such as Northamptonshire and Peterborough in terms of their policies. There was also discussion regarding the current topical subject of fracking, with one Member suggesting that this could potentially be a future issue for the County seeking officers' views. In reply it was indicated that due to the geology of the County, there was only potentially one small area that could be suitable.

Action: SF. Members requested that officers undertake further research and that in due course E and E Spokes should receive a discussion paper on the wider renewables agenda to cover issues such as:

- wind technology advances and what other partner authorities views were including details of district councils of their planning policies,
- energy produced from waste,
- A separate one page, factual briefing note identifying the possible locations for fracking in Cambridgeshire.

It was resolved unanimously:

a) To agree the following priorities for the Energy Investment Strategy 2016-2020:

i) Maximize investment into schools and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) buildings using energy performance contracting to save energy and costs.

ii) Engage with The Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) 'Local Energy England' programme and other funders to promote and participate in funding opportunities to support local authorities and communities deliver more local energy generation.

iii) Bring forward large scale energy projects on transport assets, the farm estate and housing development land, with a view to developing business cases, applying for 'Contracts For Difference' funding or other grants and making projects investment ready in anticipation of rising electricity prices.

iv) Bring to Committee, options on the regulatory requirements under which the Authority could act as a generator and supplier of energy and assess the mechanisms for buying and selling energy locally to consumers.

v) The principle that development budgets are set for each of the large energy projects as they come forward and repaid from revenues when a project is successfully delivered.

- b) To bring a discussion paper to a future Spokes meeting on the broader renewables agenda including current advances in wind technology and their potential utilisation.

219. COLLECTIVE SWITCHING – SAVING MONEY ON ENERGY BILLS

A key aim of Cambridgeshire Collective Switch had been to help alleviate financial pressures on Cambridgeshire residents by saving money on energy bills. The ICHOOSR contract running Collective Switching for Cambridgeshire residents was due for renewal with the report outlining options going forward.

It was highlighted that five auctions had been run in Cambridgeshire, saving a total of nearly £300k for residents (based on the average savings rate). Appendix A of the report provided details of Cambridgeshire's results compared to the national collective switching position. The total income in 2015/16 for the Collective Switch was £7,151. After marketing expenses, this left £6,861 in the budget to fund the next auction.

The report set out details of three options:

- **Option 1:** Extend the contract with ICHOOSR for one year, running one auction in October each year, using the profits from previous auctions to pay the costs of marketing and project management (staff costs) of the auctions
- **Option 2:** Stop the contract with ICHOOSR, highlight the ICHOOSR registration link on our website for residents to access but provide no marketing or support to residents.
- **Option 3:** Explore other collective switching schemes such as Robin Hood Energy (set up by Nottingham City Council to tackle increasing fuel poverty) and identify the benefits of their 'switching partner packages'.

The report set out the benefits of each option. After brief discussion the Committee was content to accept Options 1 and 3 as recommended by the officers.

It was resolved;

- a) To agree the extension of the current arrangement with ICHOOSR for a further one year whilst;
- b) Reviewing other collective switching options for Cambridgeshire residents and businesses to identify schemes which fit strategically with the growing energy ambitions of the Authority.

220. ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT RISK REGISTER UPDATE

This report provided the Economy and Environment (E and E) Committee with details of its assigned risks on the ETE Risk Register having been last considered by the Committee in December 2015. Other risks on the ETE Register were considered separately by the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee.

The E&E Risk Register presented at Appendix 1 (a separate A3 colour copy had been provided for the Committee members) showed that there were ten risks, three of which

(CR9 Infrastructure Funding, CR22 'Cambridgeshire Future Transport programme' and CR26 Busway Defects) were included on the Corporate Risk Register, one being at Green status, one at Amber status and one at Red status. Of the remaining seven, all were currently at amber level. No risks have been removed or added from the E&E Risk Register since it was last presented to Committee. Appendix 2 of the report detailed for information and any comments all the changes and updates that had been made to the Register since the previous report. Appendix 3 illustrated E&E's residual risk profile in graphic form.

Members' comments / issues raised included:

- CR9 'Failure to secure funding on infrastructure' on key control 3 reading 'Section 106 Deferrals Policy in place' Councillor Harford requested more detail to be sent to her outside of the meeting. **Action: BM**
- CR22 'The Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme fails to meet its objectives within the available budget' The Risk register entry going forward would need to be amended to reflect that the 'Total Transport' project had now taken over. This was agreed. **Action: BM/ JB**
- CR26 Increasing Manifestation of Busway Defects - One Member asked when there was to be a further progress report on busway defects. In reply it was indicated that this was to go to the General Purposes Committee within the next 2-3 months and would be included confidential information in a separate confidential appendix.
- E&E 10 'Failure to Deliver the Greater Cambridge City Deal Programme. Future Tranches of City deal Funding is not made available' – in response to a question regarding whether the current City Deal arrangements were safe and secure in respect of the forthcoming Devolution Referendum it was confirmed that they were not affected by the result but of course future tranches were dependent on delivery of agreed projects.

It was resolved:

To note the position in respect of the Economy and Environment Risk Register.

221. PROPOSED 2016/17 TARGETS FOR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

This report sought to review and agree the 2016-17 targets provided in the report for the previously agreed Economy and Environment key performance indicators.

The Committee was reminded that it had approved the 'Key performance indicators' for the 2016/17 Strategic Framework on 19th January 2016 and had approved the 'Other lower level key E & E performance indicators on 8th March 2016. Together, these comprised the full set of key E & E performance indicators for 2016/17 to be reported to E & E Committee monthly through the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Joint Finance and Performance Report.

The proposed 2016/17 target for each of the agreed indicators was included in Appendix A and had been developed to align with the County Council objectives and existing longer-term targets. The rationale for each target was included in Appendix A to the report. It was highlighted that an error in the printing of the original hard copy agenda had included an incorrect appendix from an earlier report. The right appendix had been included on the Council website and Members of the Committee had been e-mailed and provided with a hard copy version of the correct version in advance of the meeting. Hard copies were available for the public at the meeting.

Councillor Jenkins (appointed since the performance indicators had been agreed), highlighted that none of the targets measured the strength of the Cambridgeshire economy, which he suggested could include measures such as the number of empty shops in towns and the amount of rent arrears. Others made reference to the footfall in shopping centres and the number of table and chairs licences issued. In response it was explained that the performance indicators had already been agreed for 2016-17 and that the current report was the follow up to agree the targets. The statistics he was seeking would be more appropriately provided by the district councils. Bob Menzies agreed to ask the report author, Graham Amis, the Performance and Information Manager who had been unable to attend the meeting, to investigate post meeting the measures used by Cambridgeshire district councils to track their local economy and to provide the Member with a written response. **Action: GA.**

Having commented, it was resolved:

to approve the 2016/17 targets for Economy and Environment key performance indicators as set out in Appendix A to the officers' report.

222. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MARCH 2016

This report provided the Committee with the opportunity to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position for the period to the end of March 2016. It was highlighted that the final outturn report was scheduled for the July Committee meeting and the current expectation was that there would be little change to the position now reported for the end of March.

The key issues highlighted were:

- at the end of March, Economy Transport and Environment (ETE) as a whole was forecasting a year-end underspend on revenue of £1.380m. In relation to the budgets under the stewardship of the ETE Committee an underspend of £635k was forecast for year-end. Since the previous month there had been a relatively small increased underspend in County Planning, Minerals and Waste and reduced in Park and Ride.
- At the end of March, ETE was forecasting an underspend on Capital of £38.2m with one change highlighted since the last Committee being in relation to re-profiling Connecting Cambridgeshire expenditure of £456K.

In relation to the twelve Economy and Environment Committee performance indicators set for 2015-16, one was currently showing as red and eleven green. The indicator

currently red was the 'the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area'. The current forecast for year-end, was that none of the indicators would be red, six would be amber and six green.

It was highlighted that 'The Scheme of Financial Management' permitted Service Management Teams to propose "carry-forwards" from year-end underspends (operational savings) to be held in reserve for specific earmarked purposes. The proposals required initial Service Committee endorsement and then final approval by General Purposes Committee. The use of carry-forwards was intended to support tactical investments and service trials (alongside the wider and larger transformation fund). Appendix B detailed the ongoing 2015/16 multi-year schemes funded from reserves and the amount of funding now required and identified seven new proposed schemes, of which the following three were within the remit of this Committee:

- Modify Park and Ride (Cambridge) ticket machines to wave and pay £135K
- Strategic Transport Corridor Feasibility Studies £200K
- Smart energy grids – Park and Ride sites £100k.

The Committee was asked to review and endorse the list and refer it to General Purposes Committee for final approval in July.

Members' comments included:

- One Member (Councillor Jenkins) asked how the new bids had been created. In reply it was explained that each Directorate Management Team had prepared a list which had then been presented to their Spokes for initial comments / views. Councillor Jenkins suggested that Surface Water Management Programme should be added as a further new proposal. In response, the Chairman indicated that this would need further discussions between the Member and officers outside of the meeting to look at the detail, including costings. **Action:SH**
- page 16 Woodgreen Animal Shelter being unable to provide £80k to part fund a cycle route from Godmanchester and the need to look to fund alternative schemes as the money provided by the Department of Transport grant was time limited, one Member suggested it should be used to part fund the final section of the Huntingdon Road cycle scheme. In response it was explained that the specific money was not available, but that officers would look to see if there was another mechanism to obtain money for the third phase.
- In reply to a question from one Member regarding whether the scheme to modify Park and Ride (Cambridge) ticket machines was double guessing a future decision of the Committee, it was explained that this was currently an option to earmark the monies, and if not approved, would be required to go back to the Council's Central reserve.

Having reviewed the details and commented, it was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the report.

- b) to endorse the proposed use of service underspends set out in appendix B of the officers' report and refer them to General Purposes Committee for approval.

223. APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS AND PARTNERSHIPS AND LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

The Chairman agreed to exercise his discretion to take this late report which it had not been possible to finalise in time for the original agenda despatch.

The Committee received the report to enable it to undertake the annual review of the appointments the Committee made to relevant Internal Advisory Groups and Panels and to Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups relevant to the work of the Committee. It was invited to consider any changes required to the current appointments, taking into account the officer recommendations, the update notes provided in the documents, but also invited Members to update any details that were out of date on the appendices attached to the report.

The only previous appointment to internal advisory groups and panels for the Committee as set out in Appendix 1 was to the Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Strategy Steering Group. As the Strategy has already been agreed at an earlier meeting, it was recommended that it should be disestablished and no appointments made. In respect of changes to appendix 2, an oral update indicated that the recommendation should be changed to remove the Local Transport Board and the Regional Transport Forum while retaining the appointment to the Local Access Forum.

Issues raised in respect of Appendix 2 included:

- Page 4 'Cambridge Bid Board' - Councillor Shuter the current appointee highlighted that this Board was meeting at least six times a year and the meetings shown should therefore be amended from four to six.
- Page 9 'European Metal Recycling (EMR) Liaison Group (Snailwell) – Councillor Schuman made the point that since he had been appointed it had never met. In response attention was drawn to the text which indicated that while it had not met since 2013, the operating manager still considered it a valuable forum in the event that complaints were received regarding the site, in order that matters of concern could be resolved in a timely manner. The Group's value was also confirmed by the Development Management Officer listed. Officers therefore recommended that it should be retained.
- Page 16 – 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond Destination Management Company (DMO) – Councillor Shuter the appointee clarified that the Board had now been fully established following regular meetings and that going forward, the number of meetings shown per annum should be changed from four to at least five.

In discussion there was some concern that while appointments were made to the listed outside organisations, there was currently no apparent feedback mechanism to inform other Members of the activities being undertaken by the organisations. In reply the Service Director for Strategy and Development indicated that due to the

number of organisations involved, he did not have the officer resources to prepare feedback reports to Members. As an alternative he suggested that as the agendas, reports and minutes of the organisations would be available electronically, he would ask Business Support officers to look to updating the document by adding web links to help interested Members access them directly. **Action: BM/ EM**

Having reviewed the groups and panels set out in the officer appendices,

It was resolved:

- (a) to agree to delete the Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Strategy Steering Group set out as the internal advisory group and panel listed for this Committee in Appendix 1 of the report;
- (b) to agree appointments to those partnership liaison and advisory groups as detailed in Appendix 2 with the exception of the Local Transport Board and the Regional Transport Forum which were to be deleted from the list. (The revised list is included as a separate appendix to these minutes)
- (c) To ask Business Support to look to provide links to the listed organisations websites as a way of helping Members access additional information.

224. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

The Committee was asked to note the current Committee's Training Plan (appendix 1) and as there were currently no training sessions planned beyond May to consider suggestions for potential training sessions that could be provided as set out in Appendix 2 and to consider whether any further additions were required and whether invites to listed sessions should be extended to other Committee Members.

In discussion;

- Various Members indicated that the forthcoming training session on Adult Learning and Skills scheduled for 26th May hosted by Lynsi Hayward-Smith was proving to be a difficult day for some Members who had other clashes. The suggestion was the date should be cancelled and re-arranged to a later, more suitable date taking account of Committee Members' diary commitments. **Action BM / EM / LH-S**
- There was the suggestion that Members required a briefing on the new Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill announced in the Queen's Speech on 18th May and the potential impact this could have on the work of the Council and its district partners, as well as a progress update on the 'Total Transport Project'. In discussion it was suggested that both these would be more appropriate as topics on future Member Seminars and that this could be looked at further by Democratic Services. **Action BM / RS / DC**

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) That in noting the upcoming training session for Adult Learning and Skills on the 26th May, to ask officers to look to rescheduling it due to the number of member clashes from other meetings taking place at the same time.
- b) Agree to the list of potential training sessions in Appendix two of the report being arranged during 2016/17.
- c) Note the need to sign an attendance sheet when attending training sessions, so that Members' attendance was accurately recorded.
- d) To suggest the following topics be added to the forward programme for future Corporate Member Seminars:
 - i) The [Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill](#) and how it would affect the County Council and district council functions.
 - ii) Total Transport Progress Update.

225. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

It was resolved unanimously to note the following changes made to the Forward Plan since publication:

- Section 106 Recommended Allocations report – this was originally to have been presented to the current Committee meeting but had been moved to the 9th June Committee, which although previously a reserve date, was now required as there were two key decision reports. Democratic Services reminded Members that this meeting and most future meetings of the Committee for the Municipal Year 2016/17 would be held on Thursdays, as agreed by SMT and Group Leaders. Several Members expressed concern that the Committee had not been consulted about the change of day before the programme was finalised.
- The following three reports already included on the Forward Agenda Plan were re-designated as key decisions:
 - 14th July Cambourne West Planning Application and Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms
 - 1st September meeting – Cycle city Ambition Huntingdon Road Phase 2 and A10 Harston
 - 10th November meeting - Section 106 Funded Cycling Projects - Report consultation results and seek approval to construction

226. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10A.M.THURSDAY 9th JUNE 2016

Councillors Clark and Jenkins sent advance apologies.

Chairman
9th June 2016