

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 10th March 2015

Time: 10.00a.m. to 12.40 p.m.

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman), R Butcher, E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), Cllr J Clark, D Connor (substituting for Cllr Clark), D Divine, D Harty, R Henson, J Hipkin, N Kavanagh, A Lay, T Orgee (substituting for Cllr B Chapman), M Rouse, J Schumann, M Shuter, S van de Ven (substituting for Cllr D Jenkins) A Walsh and J Williams.

Also present: Councillors M Mason and J Whitehead.

Apologies: Councillor B Chapman and D Jenkins.

99. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Cearns and Councillor Bates declared non-prejudicial interests in item 6 'Northstowe Phase 2 Update' as a Member and substitute Member respectively of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee.

Councillor van de Ven declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 7 'Department For Transport Cycle City Ambition Programme 2015-18' as the Chairman of the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign.

Councillor Shuter also declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as an informal member of the Lode to Quay Steering Group.

Councillors Orgee, Schumann and Shuter Declared A Non-Prejudicial Interest in item 4 'Mobilising Local Energy Investment (MLEI) Forward Strategy' as school governors of schools wishing to participate in the MLEI Scheme.

100. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The public and confidential minutes of the meeting held on 3rd February 2015 were agreed as a correct record

As an update to the information provided in the Action Log:

- a) On the outstanding action for Minute 26 Adult Learning and Skills Follow Up work from Overview and Scrutiny, Councillor Schumann moved a recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Cearns to set up a working group to look at Adult Education to consider how to improve equity and a county-wide offer, with a report to be presented to Spokes on detailed terms of reference / proposed goals. On being put to the vote the resolution was agreed. **Action: Councillor Schumann to liaise with Lynsi Hayward-Smith on preparation of a report to Spokes before coming back for Committee approval.**

- b) Minute 83 A428/ A421 Alliance – Councillor Bates confirmed the action with him to provide more information to Councillor Walsh on the group which was looking at the ‘varsity line’ was still outstanding. **Action: Councillor Bates to provide details to Councillor Walsh**

All other actions had been completed as stated and would be removed from the Log.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To note the updates on the Minutes Action Log.
- b) to agree to setting up a working group to consider whether Adult Education is working well and where it is not, to consider how to improve equity and a county-wide offer, with a report on detailed terms of reference etc. to go to Spokes before coming back for final approval to the Committee.

101. PETITIONS

None were received.

102. MOBILISING LOCAL ENERGY INVESTMENT (MLEI) FORWARD STRATEGY

The Committee considered a report in order to agree a forward strategy for investment into energy projects beyond the end of the MLEI grant and agree MLEI finance arrangements for academy secondary schools.

A report to Economy and Environment Committee 8th July 2014 had highlighted the risks to contract delivery if the Council did not secure the Solar Park investment (approximately £10million) alongside the Energy Performance Contracting Project investments of £5million. The report author orally confirmed that as set out in the report the Council had received confirmation on 26th February that it had been successful in securing the above finance, with the procurement strategy for delivery of the Solar Park now being finalised. As a result the MLEI Project investment target providing contracts for the delivery of the Solar Park and the Energy Performance Contracting projects was now expected to be delivered before the end of the MLEI contract in August 2015.

The report set out details of:

- The number of assessments undertaken since the appointment of Bouygues Energies and Services Ltd along with the detail of those where contract investment grade proposals had been made.
- The work undertaken on the development of a Managed Services Arrangement (MSA) for academy schools. It was highlighted that in light of the higher risk now expected, it was proposed that charges would need to be made, to offset the higher risk costs to the Authority. Details were also given regarding the clarifications being sought from the Department for Education around loans, finance.

- The key successes of the MLEI Project.
- Setting out details of the options going forward which was either Option 1: to close down the MLEI Project and MLEI Team at the end of August 2015 on completion of the contract with the EU or Option 2: Use the ongoing returns from the investments as part of the MLEI Energy Performance Contracting to fund an energy investment team to develop further energy projects.

In discussion:

- Members congratulated the officer team involved on the successful bid, which had been the only successful Local Authority bid in the solar category in the current round.
- A request was made for officers to make further contact with those schools who had expressed an interest in being involved but who had not taken their interest any further due to the previous uncertainty around academy schools' borrowing restrictions.
- One Member expressed his concern regarding why the County Council was funding energy savings schemes for academies it had no control over, and was in his opinion more appropriately the responsibility of the Department for Education.

It was resolved to:

- a) To note the successful outcome for the County Council's SolarPark project in the Government's Contracts for Difference Auction process.
- b) Agree to accept higher risks for Managed Service Arrangements for Academy Schools and to introduce a differential in the charges for Academy Schools to reflect this.
- c) Agree to use the ongoing returns from the investments as part of the MLEI Energy Performance Contracting to fund an energy investment team to develop further energy projects - Option 2 in Section 3 of the report.
- d) Support the further development of the scale and ambition of the energy work as set out in the report.

103. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN : ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSIDERATION

The Committee considered a report on the key issues arising from the consultation on the Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) Area Action Plan – Issues and Options report which officers had responded to as set out in Appendix 3 to the report and which was now subject to endorsement by Members.

Details were provided regarding the vision for the AAP and the timetable involved in obtaining all necessary approvals. The consultation had included 4 options for

redevelopment as set out below, with Plans of the four options attached as Appendix 2 to the report:

Option 1: Lower level of redevelopment – Boulevard approach to new rail station, focus on easily available land; Water Recycling Centre (WRC) to stay; new area for business; early but limited development.

Option 2: Medium Level of Redevelopment – As option 1, plus new homes and local centre; more comprehensive redevelopment of areas south of Cowley Road; option for Nuffield Road area to change to offices and or residential.

Option 3: Higher Level of Redevelopment – Reconfiguration of water Recycling Centre onto smaller site (subject to technical, operational and financial deliverability) opening up site for large scale redevelopment; Nuffield Road proposed for residential.

Option 4: Maximum Level of Redevelopment – WRC relocated off-site to allow for comprehensive redevelopment of site.

The position of the Council was to strongly support the vision for CNFE with a commitment to the provision of a new railway station, an extension to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and to the proposal for a cycle and pedestrian bridge over the River Cam. It was highlighted that the options proposed would create a significantly higher level of demand for trips than had been assumed in Local Plan or City Deal work and would need further consideration in bringing forward the regeneration of the CNFE AAP area and in assessing the need for wider transport schemes than already planned.

Officers broadly supported the policies of the AAP although they do not support inclusion of part of the Science Park in the AAP area as this would dilute its brand or the proposals at Cowley Road as detailed in paragraph 2.3 (ii) of the report. Other salient comments from the response were set out under paragraph 2.4 of the report included caution about options 3 and 4 and inviting suggestions for the name of the railway station and AAP area providing suggestions of (1) Cambridge Science Park Station; (2) Chesterton Interchange; (3) Cambridge North; (4) Cambridge Fen.

A representative from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign while generally supporting the proposals, highlighted not only the need for a viable walking / cycling route to the Abbey Chesterton Cycling Bridge to be in place from the start, but that this should be required for all transport infrastructure needs, otherwise the Plans, especially Option 3, would lead to serious, increased congestion from the start.

Arising from the report:

- Various Members expressed the view that the Council should not support unrealistic development and that the significant investment already undertaken by Anglian Water at the current water recycling centre made options 3 and 4 unachievable, as the general belief was that they would not be prepared to move site. It was therefore agreed that it was both a waste of public money and time commitment for both officers and members to continue to include these two options. It was therefore moved and seconded as an additional recommendation facilitated by the Chairman and Vice Chairman that options 3 and 4 should not be supported and on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed. As a result officers should make this clear to Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

- One Member raised concerns that there was no reference to the Stagecoach depot relocation and the importance of finding a replacement site in the City. In his view it was the only site large enough to provide City services at the current level and it was therefore vital for the transport network to find an alternative site in the City. In response, it was indicated that any plans for relocation was a commercial decision to be made by Stagecoach.
- One Member queried why the Committee was debating the name of the proposed new station, when she understood it had previously been announced at a full Council meeting as having been named 'Cambridge Science Park'. In response it was clarified that the name had been assigned during negotiations with Government as being a more recognisable name than the alternative of 'Chesterton Sidings'. The final decision on the name would be for Network Rail, and therefore the Committee was being asked its views, which would be passed on.
- With respect to the naming of the station and area, in debate after rejecting naming it after a famous person from the area as being too subjective, the nominations suggested were between Cambridge North and Cambridge Science Park, after a suggestion from the Chairman to put both forward was rejected. On being put to the vote, the majority on the Committee supported Cambridge North to go forward to Network Rail as the Committee's choice of name.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve unanimously the County Council's consultation response to the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan – Issues and Options as set out in Appendix 3 of the Officer's report subject to it being amended to reflect the resolution agreed at c) below.
- b) To agree to propose to Network Rail that the name for the new railway station and Area Action Plan area name should be Cambridge North.
- c) To agree that Options 3 and 4 are not supported by the County Council and to add this to the County Council's consultation response.
- d) Agree unanimously to delegate to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Environment and Economy Committee the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.

104. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2 UPDATE

Members considered a report updating the Committee on the progress being made to resolve outstanding objections raised as part of the recently submitted County Council consultation response on the Northstowe Phase 2 outline planning application and which sought agreement to lift objections where issues had been resolved.

The Committee was reminded that it had received a report at the previous 3rd February 2015 meeting which had included the County Council's proposed formal consultation response to the Northstowe Phase 2 outline planning application for approval. The County Council's response had included the following key issues and objections:

- (i) The proposed average of 1.5 car parking spaces per household was considered insufficient at this stage with an average of 2 spaces per household perhaps more suitable;
- (ii) The suitability of the proposed highway access strategy could only be confirmed when officers had fully reviewed all of the model outputs submitted by the applicants within their Transport Assessment including potential additional sensitivity tests to further demonstrate the robustness of the analysis;
- (iii) Further verification and cross referencing of transport modelling was required to give comfort that the outputs are reasonable and correlate with other models and approaches;
- (iv) The interim proposals for the unguided bus only road was for around 700m of this route to be shared by buses and general traffic, which would revert to dedicated use once Phase 3 was delivered;
- (v) Further discussion was required regarding the width and design of cycle routes along all roads and the busway, and east-west links particularly to the town centre. Further discussion was also needed with regards to agreeing the proposed off-site transport mitigation measures, which includes cycle network enhancements;
- (vi) Part of the eastern education site being used for residential development;
- (vii) The existing Officers' Mess building proposed to be re-used as a primary school.

It was highlighted that good progress had been undertaken with South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and the Homes and Communities Agency(HCA) on the above points since the 3rd February Committee, and these were set out in the report with the following proposals:

- **Parking provision** - The proposed average of 1.5 car parking spaces per household met current approved policy but an average of 2 spaces per household was considered more suitable and was in line with emerging policy where 2 would be the number being put forward for examination. **The Committee was invited to delegate to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee the authority to remove the outstanding objection if the applicant could satisfactorily demonstrate that providing an average of fewer than 2 parking spaces per dwelling would be sufficient for this particular development.**
- **Highway Access Strategy:** Officers confirmed they had most of the necessary information and were of the view that the issue could be addressed through an appropriately worded condition. **Officers therefore recommended that the holding objection on highway access was removed.**
- **Transport Modelling:** The report update indicated that the outputs were reasonable and correlated with other models and approaches. In addition, a further review of modelling undertaken by the Highways Agency (HA) in

connection with the A14 Huntingdon to Cambridge scheme, had been requested to ensure a consistent understanding of the two sets of proposals. This information now been provided by the applicant to the satisfaction of officers. **Officers therefore recommended that the holding objection on transport modelling was removed and that a condition was applied which requires that a traffic monitoring regime to be implemented before, during, and after the development and that money should be set aside as part of a Section 106 agreement to implement local traffic management measures should monitoring suggest there are adverse Northstowe Phase 2 off-site impacts.**

- **Unguided bus only road through the site:** Members' views were sought on the appropriateness of the proposal for shared use for around 700m of the unguided bus only road by buses and general traffic. For temporary sharing of the busway to work, officers recommended planning conditions requiring that sufficient bus priority was provided on the shared use section and at junctions to ensure that buses are not delayed by general traffic. There should also be no on-street parking, and motorised vehicle access from this section of the shared street to land uses along it, so as not to compromise in any way its return to future bus-only use. **Officers sought a delegation to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee for the authority to remove the outstanding concern subject to the applicant demonstrating satisfactorily that the risks can be mitigated.**
- **Cycling Provision:** The applicant had subsequently made proposals for much improved cycle routes across Phase 2 linking to the town centre. These improvements included wider paths along the busway, primary and secondary streets, and the provision of segregated routes along secondary streets. **As a result of this, additional information being provided, officers' concerns on these issues have been addressed and it was recommended the County Council removed its objection to this issue.**
- **Eastern Education Site:** The Council had previously objected to the proposal that part of the eastern education site may be used for residential development, further reducing the land available (County Council officers had subsequently received revised application plans from the HCA which indicated that this land has been returned to solely education use. **On the basis that the plans represent a formal submission and amendment to the application it is recommended the County Council removes its objection to this issue.**
- **Re-Use of Officer's Mess:** County Council officers had now reached a shared position with the HCA that the main Officer's Mess building would make a suitable building for part of the primary school. Further details were being pursued on a number of outstanding points as set out in the report with the information required in order for the objection to be removed. **Officers sought a delegation to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee the authority to remove the outstanding education objections above subject to receiving satisfactory information and confirmation of the Applicant's intentions.**

- **Level of Affordable Housing:** The S106 agreement and viability negotiations would consider the proportion of affordable housing to be provided on-site. The application currently stated that Phase 2 would make provision for an affordable housing contribution of 20% with the provision to be discussed further during the determination process. At the February Meeting Members had questioned what impact a higher percentage of affordable housing would have on the educational requirements for Phase 2. A review of the demographic forecasts of the impact of increasing the % of affordable housing up to the policy level of 40% indicated that, with a standard housing mix, the total demand could increase by around 50 places across all year groups. In the longer-term, this level of demand could be accommodated within the provision currently proposed for Phases 1 and 2.
- **'4 + 4' Member Group:** To help steer negotiations it was proposed to establish a group of 4 members from both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, to feed in views to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, as the determining body. For the County Council, the membership was proposed to be the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Economy and Environment Committee (as the lead Committee), plus one member each from Adults' Committee and Children and Young People Committee, as both had a strong interest in the new development with the Chairmen of the Highways and Community Infrastructure and Health Committees being kept informed. **Members' endorsement of the Group and of its County Council membership was therefore sought.**

Cambridge Cycling Campaign spoke in support highlighting the need to ensure the new settlement was cycle proofed. They considered that as there was sufficient green space officers should ensure shared cycle / pedestrian paths should be avoided. It was clarified in discussion with the Cycling spokesperson that their Chairman and the Cycling Project Team had been involved in the revised proposals.

Councillor Mason who had requested to speak:

- Urged the Committee to insist on 2 parking places per dwelling as the average, and suggested that if the HCA wished to challenge the figure, they should be asked to present the full justification to the Committee for ultimate decision rather than delegating it to officers and the Chairman and Vice Chairman.
- In relation to the Unguided Bus only road paragraphs 2.14 -2.17 he suggested the proposal was extremely ambiguous and the construction needed to be carefully defined with detailed road drawings as he questioned whether the developer was suggesting a route consisting of concrete trackways. He was also concerned regarding what terms and conditions would be agreed for interim maintenance and management and the position if the authority was unable to enforce traffic control on strategic highways, as a result of them not being adopted for many years. He requested that full details should come back to both this Committee and the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee. In response it was highlighted that the report made clear the road to be constructed was a road for use by buses only, but that for a short period when first built, would be shared with cars and was a road, not a guided busway.

- He also highlighted that the Northstowe development still owed the authority approximately £14m in respect of the guided busway agreement and this deficit along with the £25 million now requested for the A14. In response to this point it was indicated that this Committee had discussed the issue of Section 106 payments in the previous report.
- In relation to cycling provision paragraphs 2.18 and 2.19 he raised a question regarding why the city section of the northern guided busway cycleway / bridleway / maintenance track route which had been designated National Cycle Network Route 51 was not properly signposted at each junction and entry point. In response it was indicated that the signs had been ordered and would be put up as soon as possible.

Arising from the report, questions raised included.

- One Member queried whether converting an officers' mess into a school would provide the highest standard of education facilities compared to a purpose built school and whether an analysis had been undertaken to ascertain the costs of each option. In response it was indicated it was only the façade of the building and avenue of trees that was being kept, with the interior of the building being new build. Costs were currently estimated to be similar, but were being further investigated.
- A Member questioned whether the size of the site was adequate as the report made reference to it being 2 hectares smaller than the normal requirement and further questioned whether any lessons had been learnt from the experiences at Cambourne. In response it had now been established that some of the land-take would be for a special school and therefore the Council was prepared to go with what was the minimum acceptable level with officers satisfied that the site size would work.
- There was also discussion regarding the issue of two parking spaces per dwelling with one Member querying whether this contradicted the Council's aim of trying to encourage people to use alternative forms of transport other than private cars. The majority of members took the view that to offer less would discourage people moving to the area, especially as the present day reality was that many families had children and grandchildren living with them.
- Other members challenged the proposal of the developer only providing 20% affordable housing subject to viability and strongly argued that it should be 40%, subject to viability. In response, it was indicated that County Council officers had met with SCDC officers in the last month who confirmed they wanted to see 40% subject to viability which was the SCDC policy.

It was resolved to:

- a) Agree to lift the County Council's objections to the Northstowe Phase 2 outline planning application on the four issues which have now been resolved to officers' satisfaction. (These are highways access strategy, transport modelling, design of cycle ways and removal of residential use

from education land.)

- b) Delegate to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee the authority to remove the other 3 outstanding objections as detailed in paragraphs 2.7, 2.17, and 2.25 included as bold actions above and if subsequently resolved to officers' satisfaction, given that swift progress was being made.
- c) Endorse a '4 plus 4' Member group comprising of Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Members, to give political steer to Section 106 discussions as detailed in paragraph 2.32. The membership from the County Council to be:
 - The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economy Transport and Environment Committee.
 - One nomination from both the Adults and the Children and Young People Committee.

105. DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CYCLE CITY AMBITION PROGRAMME 2015-18

The Committee received progress on the existing programme seeking approval for a further funding bid and its associated programme. The current Cycle City Ambition Grant (CCAG) programme comprised seven schemes in total, three in the city (shown on Plan 1 of the report), and four schemes in South Cambridgeshire (shown on Plan 2). Paragraph 2.2 of the report provided details of the schemes now completed in South Cambridgeshire which were as follows:

- A10, Link to Foxton Station from Shepreth
- A505 Granta Park to Whittlesford Station
- A1307 Wandlebury Park to Babraham Research Campus
- Swavesey to Buckingway Business Park

Updates were provided on the following two agreed at the July 2014 Committee meeting as follows:

- Construction of a segregated cycle lane on the city-bound side of Huntingdon Road was programmed for completion in August
- Construction of segregated cycle lanes on Hills Road – programmed to be substantially complete by the end of September.

Construction on the Trumpington Road scheme approved by Committee on 18th September 2014 was planned to commence in the early summer.

In relation to previous Government announcements for additional funding for cycling, extending the CCAG programme to April 2018 the January 2015, DfT bidding guidance had confirmed that for Cambridgeshire the maximum bid was £6.029m over 3 years. Local authorities were encouraged to add match funding to ensure that the funding per head was at least £10. The objectives for the next round of funding was to

extend the impact and scope of some of the first phase schemes, to compliment and provide an element of match funding from the City Deal, and to use the funding to complete essential links in the cycle network.

Due to the short window in which to submit a bid the programme as set out in the report the details had been tabled to the City Council Cycling and Walking Member's Steering Group on 12th January and had received a positive response with support for extending the Huntingdon Road scheme. The bid was submitted to DfT on 30th January. An announcement on whether it had been successful was expected before 30th March

The proposed list of schemes and budget allocation was set in Appendix 1 of the report which for Cambridge City comprised the following five schemes:

- Queen Edith's Way/ Cherry Hinton Road/ Robin Hood Junction
- Hills Road Phase 2
- Trumpington Road Phase 2
- Huntingdon Road Phase 2
- Two Way Cycling in One Way Streets

for South Cambridgeshire this comprised the following two schemes:

Quy to Lode
A10 Cambridge to Foxton Station

Plans 1 and 2 of the report provided the location of the schemes and revised versions have been included as appendices to these minutes. The details of the Programme Elements proposals were set out in section 4 of the report. The Committee noted the following suggested reserve schemes which met deliverability requirements should additional funding become available, having an element of local support and being relatively uncontroversial. Those listed were all schemes that were not prioritised for years one to five of City Deal, but had been designed and were nearing a point where they were ready to build.

- Whittlesford village to railway station, £500,000
- Papworth to Cambourne, £600,000
- Link through Babraham Research Campus, £300,000
- A10 Melbourn to Royston, £700,000

In addition, it was orally reported that £250k had been allocated to the Council from the Department of health for the 'Walk Local' Project. In addition a further bid of £1m this time from the Department of Transport was being submitted imminently.

Cllr Frances Platten of Lode Parish Council spoke in support of the Quy to Lode scheme which she indicated also had Marshall's support, explaining the work the Parish Council had undertaken in conjunction with Bottisham and Swaffham Parish Councils. She also thanked Mike Davies and his team for their efforts. In response, the Chairman asked her to convey the Committee's thanks for their fund raising efforts and the negotiations they had already undertaken with landowners.

The Chair of North Newtown Residents Association Traffic Review Group Helen Higgs making reference to a document she had e-mailed to members of the Committee in advance, spoke confirming that while she supported cycling / safewalking, the Association opposed proposals for two way cycling in the North Newtown area. This was on the basis that it was too dangerous, due to the number of cars rat running along the side roads as well as the volume of vehicles involved in taking children to the six schools in the area. In reply to a question, she confirmed she would support no car zones outside schools. She explained that the Association were seeking a separate co-ordinated plan / traffic review for the area. In discussion later in the meeting there was a request to ensure this Residents Association was kept fully involved in future discussions.

The Cambridge Cycling Campaign representative welcomed the report and the additional funding, while being critical of the stop start nature of Government Funding, citing the still unfunded Ely proposals. He confirmed the Campaign's support, emphasising the strategic importance of the routes, particularly in the context of housing growth. In relation to the Newtown proposals and countering the previous speaker's views, the Campaign believed increased cycling would lead to a reduction in cars / rat running. He reiterated an earlier point that the emphasis should be to avoid creating shared use walkways / cycleways.

The Local Member for Abbey spoke, making reference to background information she had e-mailed to Committee members in advance of the meeting including a documents produced by Sustrans on Greater Cambridge Cycle rings and main option proposals to link Lode with Cambridge. In relation to the proposed linking of Cambridge City to Lode via Quoy, she hoped that officers would look at the various options, including the route utilising the dismantled railway line, which would create a more scenic and safer route further away from the busy B1102.

In discussion Members of the Committee's views / comments included:

- Congratulating the officer team for their tremendous efforts in preparing the bid in such a short period of time
- One member expressed the view that in parallel with an effective cycling strategy was the need for an effective strategy to reduce the amount of traffic entering Cambridge and measures to ration road space to avoid residents parking on roads. (reference was made to Oxford Road) Another member in response highlighted the need for jobs investment away from Cambridge so that more people did not have to seek employment there.
- It was suggested that the map provided was showing the cycling route for Huntingdon Road on the wrong side of the road.
- With reference to the other routes highlighted by the Member for Abbey in her presentation, Councillor Shuter who was an informal member of the Lode to Quoy Steering Group clarified that local people had concluded that a cycle route along the B1102 was preferable to other routes and that the route along the former rail line was not one that would be considered suitable for children or lone cyclists or for use after dark because of its isolated setting.
- One Member suggested that officers should in relation to the Cherry Hinton Robin Hood cycle route extended to Fulbourn Road and Yarrow Road as this

was a 40 mph road used by a lot of cyclists who travelled into Cambridge and it made sense to link it to the Peterhouse Technology Park.

- The Local Member for Melbourn reiterated the point that it was frustrating that the funding for the South Cambs cycle schemes came in fits and starts as the problems of congestion on the A10 would not be resolved until there was a continuous route created. She also indicated there an error on one of the maps that she would highlight to the officers outside of the meeting.
- The Vice Chairman made the point that going forward with the schemes officers needed to take account of residents' concerns regarding access to people's properties / boundary issues and to ensure they were fully consulted on proposals.
- The point was also made that as there was only a narrow opportunity to apply for funding which needed to be pursued, specific concerns expressed by some residents for example, the design of the proposed bridge, would need to be considered under a different process.
- One Member made the point that as there was suppressed demand for cycling infrastructure beyond the City Deal and current cycling projects, money needed to be identified and set aside to be able to finance them.
- One Member highlighted that to help alleviate issues on the A10 there was a need for a safe cycle route through Harston and as there were two views on where a route should be created, and this would require full local resident consultation.

The Chairman in summing up reiterated the need for full consultation with residents especially in those areas where it was known that there was opposition to two way cycling / other cycling issues concerns e. g. Panton Street / Hills Road and that this should include formal traffic surveys being undertaken, as well as taking on board the further proposals for additional cycling routes raised during the debate. He also requested that the Chairman and Vice Chairman should be furnished with full details of the walking bid proposals. **Action: Mike Davies**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the progress on the current Cycle City Ambition Programme;
- b) support the bid for additional funding as detailed in section 3 of the report;
- c) approve the 2015-18 programme as submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) as set out in Appendix 1 of the report; and:
- d) approve the 'pipeline projects' bid scheme list as set out in section 5 of the report.

106. ADDITIONAL 2015/16 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

The Committee in November 2014 had approved a set of key Economy and Environment (E & E) performance indicators for 2015/16, covering indicators in the Council's Business Plan and other indicators in the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Finance and Performance report. At the last meeting in February

the Committee had approved targets for those key indicators, but requested that additional measures should be developed to cover the following three specific areas:

- The split between full-time and part-time employment;
- Park and Ride passenger numbers (reflecting the impact of car parking charges);
- What was being done to increase the proportion of adults in Fenland who walk or cycle at least once a month.

Members also requested further information about superfast broadband, including why it was not possible to report performance currently. This information was included under paragraph 2.15 of the report.

The proposed additional measures now recommended were:

Split Between Full-Time And Part-Time Employment

As the ONS figures were derived from a sample survey they fluctuated from one month to the next, but confirmed that there has been an increase in the percentage of jobs that were part-time – from 21.7% for the 2010 calendar year, to 25.5% for the 12 months ending September 2014 with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of jobs that are full-time.

The following changes to performance indicators and targets were proposed:

- **that the employment rate target for 2015/16 be amended to 81.1% to reflect the latest available information;**
- **that an additional indicator of “Employment rate – full-time jobs” be included, with a 2015/16 target to also maintain performance at the current level**

It was explained that if both targets were achieved it would mean no further reduction in the percentage of jobs that were full-time.

Park & Ride Passenger Numbers

As previously reported, since the introduction of the parking charge in 2014, passenger numbers on Park and Ride bus services were approximately 12% lower compared with the identical period in 2013.

The following additional performance indicator was proposed:

Total number of Park and Ride passengers (reported monthly)

with the following target:

By 2019 to increase passenger numbers to the level prior to introduction of the car parking charge. This is consistent with forecasts.

Increasing Cycling and Walking in Fenland

In February The Committee had approved a target to increase the percentage of Fenland residents who walk or cycle at least once a month. The agreed target was to increase from 81.1% to the current 89.8% average for the rest of Cambridgeshire

(excluding Cambridge) over 5 years i.e. an underlying increase of 1.7% per year. Some of the planned activity in Fenland was outlined as:

Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) revenue funding is being used in 2015/16 to:

- **provide three cycling roadshow events in Wisbech in the summer;**
- **Undertake personalised travel planning with Wisbech residents;**
- **Update the Wisbech cycle map as an active travel map.**
- **Introduce the Sustrans Bike It project to work with Wisbech schools.**

It was proposed that a report was brought to Economy and Environment Committee annually to update Members on the outcomes of this activity.

Arising from the report:

- One Member queried why the target to increase passenger numbers to the prior level was a four year target, suggesting 18 months to two years might be more appropriate. In response it was explained that this was the consultants own estimate and therefore it was not considered appropriate to adopt a shorter target. The Vice Chairman indicated that a report on Park and Ride Charges had been requested at to come forward to the Committee's July meeting and this might be the appropriate opportunity to consider whether the performance target should be revised. **Action: Joseph Whelan / Graham Amis**
- One local Wisbech member queried why three cycling roadshow events were being proposed in Wisbech. In his opinion, the town was too dangerous for cyclists without appropriate cycling infrastructure put in place linked to the construction of a major relief route. Another Member on the Committee informed him that Fenland District Council were leading on all aspects of this initiative, with the intention of making recommendations in 12 months' time.
- One Member queried how realistic it was to set employment targets that were not within the control of the County Council. In discussion it was suggested that these could also be revisited in due course to consider whether they were still relevant.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Approve the additional 2015/16 indicators and targets for Economy and Environment as set out in Section 2 of the report.

107. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT

This report provided the Committee with an opportunity to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position as at the end of November 2014.

It was highlighted that at the end of January ETE was forecasting a yearend underspend on revenue of £836,000. The cost centres under the stewardship of the E&E Committee were forecasting a yearend underspend of £187,000.

In relation to the budgets under the stewardship of the Committee three significant

forecast variances were reported in respect of:

- An overspend of £261,000 was forecast on Park and Ride, where usage of the sites had been lower than the anticipated level since the introduction of the parking fee.
- Concessionary fares £100,000 where increased passenger numbers were resulting in higher costs and
- Passenger transport other; an underspend of £418,000, where the decision to roll forward funding for community transport to future years, to support the existing schemes for a longer period, would result in a technical underspend at year end.

The other main updates highlighted included:

- At the end of November, ETE was forecasting a yearend underspend on capital of £32.262 million.
- There were six significant areas of forecast underspend for which this Committee had responsibility namely in relation to the Science Park Station, the Connecting Cambridgeshire project, the Guided Busway, the Huntingdon West of Town link road and cycling schemes, each of which had been discussed previously.
- The new underspend reported was in relation to Chesterton Busway Scheme with the reasons for this set out in paragraph 2.6 of the report.
- Of the eleven performance indicators for the Committee three were currently red, one amber and seven green. One of these, 'County matter planning applications determined within 13 weeks' was expected to be red at yearend.
- The two other indicators that currently had a status of red were in relation to the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area and the percentage of complaints responded to within ten days.

Having reviewed the report:

It was unanimously resolved to note the report.

108. REDUCING REOFFENDING PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS

A previous report was presented to this Committee's 25th November 2014 meeting providing details of the outcomes of an Overview and Scrutiny review. This had made recommendations to the April 2014 Cabinet meeting regarding the Council's potential role in helping reduce re-offending, including investigating ways the Council could help in increasing ex-offenders potential employment opportunities.

The November Report provided an update in relation to some of the original, proposed actions and included a new proposal, seeking to set up a small cross party working group to take forward the recommendations. The subsequent debate highlighted that Cabinet had not fully endorsed all the recommendations, as some were not within the County Council's remit and was why, in some areas, no action had been taken. As a result, the Committee agreed to defer the report with a request that officers should address some of the issues raised in a revised report now presented providing an update on the recommendations and giving consideration to whether finding ex-offenders employment, was more appropriately undertaken by the Probation Service and the local Police and Crime Commissioner. The current report provided this information and details of the Council's involvement and role in reducing re-offending.

In the ensuing discussion the Vice Chairman highlighted that at the time of the original overview and scrutiny review the Police and Crime Commissioner had refused to meet with the working party making it difficult to establish links between councillors and his office. He therefore proposed an additional recommendation to set up a working party to scope out the opportunity to plan an event to encourage businesses to consider the employment of those in the criminal justice system through working with a variety of partners including the Police and Crime Commissioner, and that this working group should be opened up to members of other Committees e.g. Adults, to ensure a joined up and strategic approach.

In debate questions were raised regarding:

- Being provided with details of the reoffending rate of offenders. In response it was indicated that approximately 30% of young offenders re-offended within 12 months of serving a community sentence whilst the rate following their release from custody, was much higher (above 80% being quoted). It was therefore young offenders who were the target group to aim to reach.
- The purpose of the working party. The Vice Chairman explained it would be to facilitate an event to encourage the local business community to adopt a different culture and be prepared to give ex-offenders the chance to become responsible citizens. This would be by highlighting the success of firms such as Timpsons whose workforce included around 10% ex-offenders and who would be encouraged to attend, to explain their methods as an example of a socially responsible employer. The aim therefore being for the Council to actively encourage measures to reduce re-offending rates. Tom Jefford confirmed that the proposal which was a community engagement facilitation role was not an area covered by the Probation service or Community Rehabilitation Company and would therefore add value.
- Another member asked what the budget would be for the working group. As the event itself would be organised by the Police and Crime Commissioner (subject to agreement) , the cost would be officer support time as there was no budget allocation for the proposed activity and if agreed, officers would need to make time, which would need to be at the expense of other activities.

The Council's Business Champion highlighted that businesses did engage with youth offenders but long term offenders tended to not be an area they would wish to pursue as this involved issues of trust.

Having debated the issue the additional recommendation was put to the vote and carried by a majority.

It was therefore resolved to:

- a) Note the role of the Police and Crime Commissioners and the establishment of the BeNCH Partnership.
- b) Note the creation of the Community Rehabilitation Company.

- c) Note the actions taken in response to the recommendations agreed by Cabinet following the member led scrutiny review.
- d) Note the work done across the Council already to support the rehabilitation of offenders and support its continuation.
- e) Agree to set up a working group to scope out the opportunity and to plan an event to encourage businesses to consider the employment of those in the criminal justice system working with a variety of partners and to open up membership to other committees e.g. Adults, to ensure a joined up and strategic approach.

109. SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

The following changes to the Agenda Plan were provided by Democratic Services:

The following non key decision reports to be added to the 21st April meeting.

Proposed Formation of a Cambridgeshire & Huntingdon Joint Strategic Planning & Transport Member Group & Nominations – Dearbhla Lawson

ERDF draft Proposal for a Cambridgeshire Energy Services Company – Sheryl French

The following key decision report to be added on 21st April:

Integrated Transport Block & Other Grant Funding Priorities – Dearbhla Lawson – this is a key decision

Removal of the following reports from 21st April:

General Cycling Budget – Two Year Programme

Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Requirements: Practice Guidance as it is already programmed for Committee on 26th May.

It was resolved to:

note the Agenda Plan as amended with the above oral updates provided at the meeting.

110. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10AM APRIL 2015

While this was classed as a reserve date, it was required due to the items already identified as shown in the Forward Plan as orally updated in the previous minute.

Noted.

Chairman
21st April 2015