

ECONOMY AND
ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE

Minutes - Action Log



This is the updated action log as at 22nd August 2016 and captures the actions arising from the most recent Economy and Environment Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

MINUTES OF THE 15 TH JULY 2015 COMMITTEE					
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
140.	NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2 – SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS resolution b) Delegation on making any minor changes	Juliet Richardson	A delegation was agreed giving the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make changes to the Section 106 agreements prior to signing.	The Section 106 Heads of terms were agreed on 29 th July 2015 by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, the body with the authority to make the final decision. An update provided on 18 th July indicated that the S106 was in its final stages of drafting.	ACTION ONGOING

MINUTES OF THE 19TH JANUARY 2016 COMMITTEE

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
186.	CHERRY HINTON HIGH STREET – APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT – POLICY GUIDANCE TREE REPLACEMENT	Richard Lumley	With reference to the City Council urban realm improvements to shop fronts, concern was expressed regarding proposals to plant trees near the highway and asked for details on the relevant Policy governing tree planting on / near highways, as he had concerns regarding potential damage. It was agreed to provide the details outside of the meeting, with the point made that the area shown was on private shop frontage and was therefore not on the public highway.	<p>A full e-mail explanation was sent to Members of the Committee on 25th February 2016. This confirmed that the County Council did not have a specific policy on replacement of trees as there has never been a budget. It was explained that The County Council does not manage trees on private property and private roads with the land owner or occupier being responsible. Officers from the County Council deal with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dead, damaged or diseased trees likely to cause injury or damage; • Trees that impede or obscure safe use of the road; • Trees causing damage or likely to cause damage to property.' 	
			At the March Committee meeting several Members made reference to incidents of trees being cut down in conservation areas where replacements had not been provided and where the parish council had not received prior notice or guidance on	In response to the issues raised at the March Committee, the April Committee meeting was informed that officers in ETE were working to finalise a County Council Policy on the maintenance / replacement of trees. Final approval of the Policy will be included as part of the annual Highways infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP) review. An update	FURTHER ACTION REQUEST ONGOING

			<p>replacement. Members considered that specific policy guidance was required on tree replacement that could be provided to individuals / parish councils, including what species of trees could be planted in their place, (to ensure no damage to highways / footways) and asked the Executive Director to refer the issues raised to Highway and Community Infrastructure Committee for further consideration as the appropriate Committee.</p>	<p>provided on 14th July has reported that the draft Policy document has been the subject of some initial consultation.</p> <p>Officers had consequently met with Councillor Bailey who has particular concerns regarding tree replacement. The intention is that once an agreed position has been reached, it will go a Highways and Community Infrastructure Spokes meeting for comments / views before the Policy was resubmitted to the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee. Currently due to more urgent work pressures in respect of the procurement of the new Highways Contract it was not possible to provide the spokes date / Committee date when it will be considered.</p>	
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
189.	<p>FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER 2015</p> <p>a) land acquisition and licence agreements to allow construction to commence on Yaxley</p>	<p>Bob Menzies / Ian Wilson Strategy and Estates</p>	<p>There was a query asking whether, as land had just been sold in the area, this would require the Council to go through the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process again. It was agreed an update on the current position would be sought from Legal and a written response provided outside of the meeting</p>	<p>At the March Committee meeting it was indicated that the legal issues around the land purchase remained outstanding, despite reminders sent to the land owner's solicitors. At the Committee meeting both local Noman Cross Members expressed their frustrations at the continued delay, with one highlighting the current risks for people walking along the path being seriously injured or worse from passing vehicles. Officers were requested to make the</p>	ACTION ONGOING

	to Farcet cycleway / walkway.		<p>to the Norman Cross local Councillors (Councillors McGuire and Henson).</p> <p>At the April Committee meeting it was agreed that Cllrs Henson and McGuire and the Chairman (Cllr Bates) and Vice-Chairman (Cllr Cearns) should receive fortnightly updates on progress.</p>	<p>Members' concerns at the unacceptable delay known to the solicitors involved, with the aim of progressing the necessary land purchase as a matter of priority. An update position was provided to Councillors McGuire and Councillor Henson in a letter dated 7th April.</p> <p>An update e-mail was sent on 7th May and further updates provided in June and July providing details of the follow up action which had been taken with two of the landowners' solicitors. A further update was provided on 4th August.</p>	
--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

MINUTES OF THE 8TH MARCH 2016 COMMITTEE

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
199.	FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – JANUARY 2016 - ISSUES RAISED ON CAPITAL SLIPPAGE	Chris Malyon	In discussion on the issue of Capital programme slippage, it was suggested that if slippage did result in financial implications, it would be helpful to have them highlighted. Officers recognised the need to improve spend profile forecasts and as a result, it was explained at the March meeting that a team led by Chris Malyon the Chief Finance Officer were looking at ways to improve them	<p>The issues raised were considered as part of a review undertaken by the Capital Programme Board. The new approach was highlighted in the Performance and Resources report for May presented to the July Committee meeting which explained that:</p> <p><i>“....All 2016/17 budgets have been reviewed and the planned profile of spend updated to reflect the latest information (with some expenditures being moved into future years),and a £10.5m “Capital Programme Variation”</i></p>	ACTION COMPLETED

			going forward. The point of keeping Members informed, where slippage would have a financial impact, would be taken on board as part of future update reports.	<i>adjustment has been made to reflect the underlying nature of slippage where some schemes (but it is not known which schemes) will inevitably be delayed (for example due to issues over land purchase, or archaeological finds, or planning issues). This adjustment is made to bring the likely level of expenditure in line with the budget (and more accurately estimate the required borrowing levels).....”.</i>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

MINUTES OF THE 19TH APRIL 2016 COMMITTEE

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
207.	ADULTS LEARNING AND SKILLS REVIEW REPORT	Bob Menzies / Emma Middleton	In discussion it was agreed that it would be useful for those Members interested to visit one of the learning centres as further Member engagement would be welcomed (Lynsi Hayward-Smith to be contacted). The Vice-Chairman suggested that a future Spokes meeting could be held at one of the centres in Fenland, followed by a visit to the surrounding area to help increase Member's local knowledge.	<p>It was previously reported that Catherine Walker and Lynsi Hayward-Smith from ETE were investigating the possibility of the September spokes meeting being held at one of the learning centres. As the March Library only had one meeting room and was booked on all the scheduled spokes dates from September to January, officers are currently looking to re-arrange the Spokes meeting to achieve the request.</p> <p>This was still being looked at but as the Library was fully booked up, January might now be the target date.</p>	ACTION ONGOING

Minutes of the 24th May 2016 Committee

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
217.	CONCESSIONARY FARES ON COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SCHEMES	Paul Nelson	1. 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.	1. Officers have approached a number of local businesses but have so far not been successful in attracting sponsorship but will continue to seek opportunities.	ACTION ONGOING
		Paul Nelson / Mike Soper	2. The Chairman asked that the appendix be given a wider circulation to Members of the Council. Action: PN / MS.	2. An e-mail was sent to all Members of the Council on 1 st August 2016 attaching the results from the Consultation with the users of Community Transport that went to the Economy & Environment Committee in May (see link). https://cmis.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/ccclive/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/35/Committee/5/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx	ACTION COMPLETED

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
218.	ENERGY INVESTMENT STRATEGY PRIORITIES	Sheryl French	<p>Members requested that officers undertake further research and that in due course E and E Spokes should receive a discussion paper on the renewable agenda to cover issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind technology advances and what other partner authorities views were including details of district councils of their planning policies • Energy produced from waste <p>A separate one page factual briefing note identifying the possible locations for fracking in Cambridgeshire</p>	<p>A corporate Energy Strategy has been suggested by SMT under which wind turbines and energy from waste will likely to be addressed. A draft is likely for end of September.</p> <p>The issue of fracking, this will be a factual paper that officers have not started yet due to pressures of work but this will be progressed in September.</p>	ACTION ONGOING

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
220.	<p>ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT RISK REGISTER UPDATE</p> <p>A) CR22 'The Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme fails to meet its objectives within the available budget'</p>	Bob Menzies / Graham Amis	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 undertaken	ACTION COMPLETED
	B) CR9 'Failure to secure funding on infrastructure' on key control 3 reading 'Section 106 Deferrals Policy in place'	Bob Menzies	Councillor Harford requested more detail to be sent to her outside of the meeting regarding the Section 106 Deferrals Policy.	A response was sent on 25 th May which explained that in essence during the economic slowdown officers put in place the deferrals policy to ensure flexibility where developers who were being hit by the slowdown were able to defer their 106 contributions so that the S106 agreed pre-crash did not become a block to development.	ACTION COMPLETED

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
221.	PROPOSED 2016/17 TARGETS FOR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	Graham Amis	<p>Councillor Jenkins highlighted that none of the targets measured the strength of the Cambridgeshire economy, suggesting these could include 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 with the current follow up report presented to agree the targets. It was explained that the statistics he was seeking would be more appropriately provided by the district councils.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Performance and Information Manager would be asked to investigate post meeting the measures used by Cambridgeshire district councils to track their local economy and</p>		

			to provide the Member with a written response.	E-mail with links sent to Councillor Jenkins on 14 th June.	ACTION COMPLETED
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
222.	FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MARCH 2016 Request for an addition to the schemes to be funded within the remit of the Committee	Sarah Heywood	Councillor Jenkins asked how the three new schemes within the remit of this Committee proposed for funding, had been arrived at. 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. At suggested that Surface Water Management Programme should be added as a further new proposal. In response, the Chairman indicated that this would need further discussion between the Member and officers outside of the meeting to look at the detail, including costings.	A response was sent on 6th July to the member explaining that officers have reviewed the funding already identified for the Kings Hedges and Arbury Wards Surface Water Management Plans and, given that the progression of the project required gaining landowner and utilities agreement, it was explained that it may take some time to develop. As a result officers were looking for flexibility over which project the money was spent on across the whole County Council area to ensure best value and maintain the delivery of flood risk benefits. No additional funding was required in the current financial year due to the workload already linked to statutory duties, and the uncertainties round how specific plans could progress.	ACTION COMPLETED

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
223.	APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS AND PARTNERSHIPS AND LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS	Bob Menzies	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	An e-mail was sent to Members from Democratic Services on the 15 th June with the updated document which included the requested links to the agendas and Minutes of the outside organisation.	ACTION COMPLETED

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
224.	<p>ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN</p> <p>A) Adult Learning and Skills scheduled for 26th May</p>	Bob Menzies / Emma Middleton/ Lynsi Hayward-Smith	Various Members indicated that the forthcoming training session on Adult Learning and Skills scheduled for 26 th 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.	This session was re-arranged to take place on Tuesday 26 th July 2016.	ACTION COMPLETED
	B) Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill	Bob Menzies / Rob Sanderson / Dawn Cave	There was a suggestion that Members required a briefing on the new Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill announced in the Queen's Speech on 18 th May and the potential impact this could have on the work of the Council and its district partner, 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 at future Member seminars.	Due to the number of priority topics taking precedence it had not been possible to arrange a slot on either the early Summer or September member seminar. Officers were now looking to see if it was possible to utilise a slot on either the 7 th October or 18 th November member seminars.	ACTION ONGOING

MINUTES OF THE 9th JUNE 2016 COMMITTEE					
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
231.	ALTERNATIVE FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CAMBRIDGE PARK AND RIDE SERVICES	Paul Nelson / Graham Hughes	As an additional Resolution it was agreed to ask officers to undertake work on alternative funding arrangements and prepare a comprehensive list on the issues raised in the debate and to circulate the list for initial comments to the Members of the Committee to ensure all options have been identified.	The list was still being finalised at the date of the last information update request.	AC TION ONGOING.
MINUTES OF THE 14th JULY 2016 COMMITTEE					
236.	REFIT FRAMEWORK PROCUREMENT UPDATE; ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING	Sheryl French	It was agreed that questions raised and requests for more detail including an analysis of the differences between REFIT 2 and 3; information on whether the REFIT 3 framework covered the potential variety of projects would be dealt with through a detailed note being circulated by the officers outside of the meeting.	A detailed e-mail was sent to the Committee on the 19 th July and is included as Appendix A to this Action Log.	ACTION COMPLETED

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
237.	ELY SOUTHERN BYPASS – AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION	Brian Stinton	There was a request to provide further detail of the differences between Bid 1 and Bid 2 outside of the meeting.	<p>As this detail was commercially sensitive, the information will be provided in a confidential e-mail to the Committee.</p> <p>An e-mail was sent to the Committee on 2ND August confirming the name of the successful bidder.</p>	ACTION ONGOING
239.	CAMBRIDGESHIRE FLOOD AND WATER SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT	Colum Fitzsimons / Hillary Ellis	Officers were asked to actively ensure more guidance would be provided to local planning committees on how the new arrangements would work.	An email on what training could be involved was sent to the Committee on 8 th August.	ACTION ONGOING
240.	FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - OUTTURN 2015-16 - SECTION 4 'PERFORMANCE INDICATORS'	Graham Amis	A question was raised regarding whether the statistic for 'the Percentage of Complaints responded to within 10 days' (101 complaints were received in March with 92% responded to within 10 working days which was above the 90% target) represented just an acknowledgment or a full response? The Officer responsible for performance indicators believed that this represented a full response, but would double check and respond in writing outside of the meeting.	A response e-mail was sent to the Committee later that day (14th July) from Democratic Services confirming that all 'passes' shown in the report are completed and closed cases and is when the final response has gone out to the customer. Where complaints are more complex and officers know they will not be able to respond within 10 working days, the guidance is that a holding response should go out within ten days. In these cases once they are closed and the final response has gone, they would show as a 'fail' if the response took longer than 10 working days.	ACTION COMPLETED

Procurement of a Service Provider under the GLA' REFIT 3 Framework

Dear ALL,

EE Committee agreed last Thursday the recommendation to procure a service provider for energy performance contracting under the REFIT 3 Framework. Thank you. However, there were some questions raised which required more detailed explanations.

Q1. Why did the report not cover other procurement options, only the REFIT 3 Framework?

Q2. What are the differences between the REFIT 2 and REFIT 3 Framework?

Q3. What are the costs to undertake a procurement under the REFIT 3 Framework and what are the framework charges?

Q4. Does the REFIT 3 Framework cover the variety of projects?

- A review of procurement options was undertaken two years ago. This assessed four procurement routes including (i) undertake an OJEU procure and set up own Framework (ii) an existing CCC procurement for the Local Education Partnership which allowed for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects (iii) Peterborough's energy efficiency and generation contract with Honeywell's (single provider) and (iv) the Greater London Authority's REFIT 2 Framework. The assessment covered procurement, access costs, flexibility for projects and contract arrangements. Members agreed the REFIT 2 Framework route for a number of reasons including (i) a mini competition between the twelve framework providers could be run providing some sense of local competition for the work (ii) no upfront access fee to use the framework but a levy per project once the project was established as viable and (iii) the support arrangements on offer to help CCC become intelligent clients whilst understanding the REFIT contracting arrangements and the details within the framework OJEU procurement.
- The REFIT Frameworks provide access to energy service providers for the public sector and reflect current policy and market conditions. Each iteration of the framework seeks to use the lessons learnt by the public sector and bring suggestions to make improvements to process, outcomes and policy delivery. The REFIT 2 Framework was the successor to the first REFIT framework set up by the GLA and REFIT 3 is the successor to REFIT 2. The focus for the REFIT 2 Framework was the opportunity for the public sector to attract finance incentives for renewable energy as part of the business model to allow deeper retrofit on projects and to capture finance benefit locally for the authority or for projects. REFIT 3 is bringing forward a wider set of service providers (16 rather than 12) and an emphasis on delivering heat projects as well as electricity projects. This means service providers with combined heat and power and district heating schemes and experience of larger and more complex energy project have been included. This reflects government policy and the reforms to the electricity market currently underway.

- The GLA REFIT Framework charges up to 2% on materials and labour for using its framework if a project goes into contract. For the RefiT 2 Framework we negotiated a flat fee of £800 per project including third party quality assurance on the technical aspects of the business cases for quality and costs of energy measures benchmarked against similar proposals, ensuring value for money. This service has provided schools with the comfort that a third party of experts along with ourselves are checking the business cases to ensure they stack up and the pricing is within the expected range. In addition we paid for client support to develop the mini- competition specification to procure a service provider. This cost £40,000. However, this included the levy for the first 10 projects with the balance being recovered via projects as a contribution towards the procurement costs over time. Overall, this means we pay a low levy charge per project and we recover the initial procurement cost. Our intention is to negotiate costs for the procurement and levy charges and where we can re-charge any costs that are incurred where possible.
- Procuring a service provider for energy performance contracting under REFIT 3 does not mean that all CCC projects are compelled to use this provider if the business model of energy performance contracting (EnPC) is not the best financial model for that project. CCC is free to use whichever other procurement route it wants to choose. However, you can not ask a REFIt service provider to undertake business development on a project, develop a business case, see if you like the business case, then use a different procurement method. Before project starts asset owners will need to be clear if energy performance contracting is the right business model. For EnPC, performance risk is passed onto the private sector so in many cases it is a good model for all types of projects from waste, solar, community heating to energy efficiency, or more usually projects that combine and do both energy efficiency and generation.

I hope this has provided you with a little more background but I am always happy to provide you with more background and details if you need them.

Sheryl French

Project Director, Mobilising Local Energy Investment

Cambridgeshire County Council, #MLEI

sheryl.french@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

T: 01223 728552