

**MEETING OF HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND
SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday 30th May 2017

Time: 11:00am- 11.45am

Present: Councillors I Bates (substituting for Cllr Gardener), I Batchelor, B Hunt (Vice-Chairman), S King, P Raynes, T Sanderson, J Scutt, M Shuter (Chairman) and A Taylor

In attendance: Councillors Hickford and Joseph

Apologies: Councillor Gardener (Councillor Bates substituting)

1. NOTIFICATION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

It was resolved to note that Council had appointed Councillor Shuter as the Chairman and Councillor Hunt as the Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2017-18.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were presented on behalf of Councillor Gardener (Councillor Bates substituting).

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Action Log was noted.

4. PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

5. HIGHWAYS & COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND TRAINING PLAN

Members reviewed the Committee Agenda Plan and Training Plan.

With regard to the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Application Process, Members noted the comment that officer time administering and delivering schemes had not been attributed to the annual capital budget, but had been subsidised by other areas of the capital programme. Officers advised that currently officer time was not

attributed, but it was proposed to move to a system where this was incorporated. In response to a Member comment that any changes should not discourage smaller Parish Councils from applying, officers confirmed that any proposed changes would be fair and sensitive to the needs of applicants, but reflect more accurately the actual costs of developing schemes, and not impact negatively on mainstream budgets. Another Member observed that some Parish and Town Councils had previously submitted vague schemes that had required considerable officer work, or requested various iterations. The Chairman added that he needed to fully understand the LHI process from the Cambridge city perspective so that city bids were not disadvantaged.

In response to a Member question, officers gave some background to the Network Rail Level crossing application, in relation to Transport & Works Act Orders to close or downgrade over 30 public rights of way, road and private level crossings across Cambridgeshire. Officers agreed to circulate a briefing note providing more information to Committee Members on the background to this item, and progress so far. **Action required.** It was confirmed that the County Council had been working closely with District authorities and Local Members on this issue. A Member commented that whatever difficulties closures presented, ultimately the objective was to increase rail capacity, which was a major issue in the region. Officers explained that the key issue for the Council was about the removal or variation of public rights of way, and the Council needs to ensure that its position was robust.

With regard to Library Service Transformation, a Member urged officers to start from the point of establishing what communities need, rather than accepting the compromises inherent in national policy documents.

It was resolved to:

- a) agree the Committee agenda plan attached at Appendix A to the report;
- b) agree the Training Plan that had been developed as set out as Appendix B to the report;
- c) consider other areas of the Committee's remit where members feel they require additional training.

6. NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUND (NPIF) APPLICATION PROPOSALS

The Committee considered a report on the proposed prioritisation of schemes for the bidding for National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) for the Local Road Network. The NPIF was a government fund for investment in areas that were key to boosting productivity, and the current tranche focused on easing congestion and providing upgrades on local routes to unlock job creation opportunities and to enable new housing developments. It was noted that the report would also be considered by the Economy & Environment Committee on 1st June, and that the recommendations from the two County Council Committees would be made to the Combined Authority, which would rank the proposals alongside those made by Peterborough City Council.

A maximum of two schemes from each authority was allowed. A key constraint was that schemes could realistically be completed by 2019/20, which effectively ruled out bids involving purchasing land, for example.

Members noted that paragraph 3.3 of the report stated that three schemes were equally ranked, but Members were being asked to support the top two proposals. Officers advised that those three schemes had scored well and were deliverable. Councillor King, as one of the Local Members in the Wisbech area, indicated strong support for the two Wisbech schemes, stating that they were essential to unlock future development in Wisbech. He did caution that if the southern access road was delivered, the route would cross the railway line, which would make any future attempts to re-establish a railway station in the centre of Wisbech virtually impossible. He hoped that these issues could be overcome.

There was an amendment to the second recommendation proposed by Councillor Bates, seconded by Councillor King, to combine the two Wisbech equally ranked schemes:

“support the recommendation of the top two proposals to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as listed in paragraph 3.3 of the report, and taking the two equally scored Wisbech schemes as one proposal, for the ranking of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough bids.”

Officers confirmed that the requirement from government was that there should be a local contribution to the scheme, and the Combined Authority would be making that decision, and would be mindful that local a contribution would be required.

A Member queried item 5 of the prioritised list of scheme: A142/A10 Witchford – Ely capacity improvements, observing that this was already a very busy roundabout, and would be even busier when the Ely Southern Bypass was completed. Officers acknowledged this, but pointed out that the difficulty with the scheme in relation to this particular funding opportunity was that it would require the purchase of land, so would not be deliverable by 2019/20. They added that this would probably be discussed as part of the Combined Authority’s A10 dualling study.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) support the prioritisation of proposed schemes for National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) bids;
- b) support the recommendation of the top two proposals to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as listed in paragraph 3.3 of the report, and taking the two equally scored Wisbech schemes as one proposal, for the ranking of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough bids.

7. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – FINAL OUTTURN 2016/17

The Committee received a report setting out financial and performance information for Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE), for the final outturn for 2016-17.

At the year end, the hole of the ETE Service was underspent on revenue expenditure by £354K. Members noted the budget areas where the main variances had occurred, including overspends in Waste Disposal, Local Infrastructure & Streets and Asset Management, and an underspend in Libraries. The report set out the process for agreement of one-off funds in addition to the agree budget to support particular schemes and projects, including enabling pilots and continuing savings plans. The Scheme of Financial Management sets out that Service Committees would be asked to recommend annual re-approval to the General Purposes Committee. The only earmarked reserves in the Committee's domain which required continuing approval was £45K for Highways Record Digitisation. The purpose and work of this project was outlined.

A Member recorded her concerns about the underspend in libraries, pointing out that libraries had suffered a greater than proportionate budget cut, and she was concerned that the Libraries Service appeared to be losing out again, and subsidising other services. It was confirmed that the underspend went back into the revenue budget, and was effectively subsidising other areas.

There was a discussion on the Performance Indicator for Road Safety, where deaths and seriously injured on the county's road was significantly above the target. Officers suggested that this was likely to be due to changes in the way that the Police record casualties, and when further analysis had been undertaken, this would be reported to the Committee. Members suggested that it would also be useful to know the type of road user involved e.g. cyclist, pedestrian or driver.

It was resolved unanimously to:

1. review and comment on the report;
2. recommend to the General Purposes Committee for approval the earmarked reserve listed in section 2.6 which is continuing in 2017-18.

8. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS, AND PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

The Committee considered a report on appointments to outside bodies, internal advisory groups and panels, and partnership liaison and advisory groups.

As more information was needed on some groups, such as the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Road Safety Partnership Strategic Management Board, in terms of the Committee's remit and workload, it was agreed that this should be delegated to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman, following discussion with Lead Members. The schedule would be circulated to Committee Members once agreed, and any outstanding appointments brought back to Committee for discussion.

It was resolved to:

- (i) consider the appointments as detailed in appendix 1 to the report, to the relevant internal advisory group and panels;

- (ii) consider the appointments as detailed in appendix 2 to the report, to the relevant partnership liaison and advisory groups;
- (iii) delegate, on a permanent basis between meetings, the appointment of representatives to any outstanding outside bodies, groups, panels and partnership liaison and advisory groups, within the remit of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE) in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.

Chairman