

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 11th November 2014

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 1.14 p.m.

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

Apologies: Councillors D Jenkins, J Reynolds, and A Walsh

Also present: Councillors G Wilson

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Councillors declared non-statutory, disclosable interests in accordance with paragraph 10.1 of the Members' Code of Conduct:

- Councillor van de Ven declared a personal interest in item 5 (Minute 55) as a member of both the A10 Corridor Cycling Campaign User Group and the Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Rail User Group.
- Councillor Bates declared a personal interest in items 7 (Minute 59) and 9 (Minute 61) as a local Member.

54. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st October 2014 were agreed as a correct record subject to the deletion of the text in the draft version of the comments on page 7 attributed to Laurice Suess and replaced with the following:

“Laurice Suess speaking in opposition to the report recommendations made the point that she was not asking that the bridge should not be built, but that the Committee delay its building, in order to have a more cost effective, integrated approach on concerns raised on the two sides of the bridge, through further consultation with local residents. She suggested that the consultation process had been flawed and the findings as reported were not accurate and gave examples to support this view. She also questioned how much consideration had been given by officers to other solutions which would have a less detrimental impact on Ditton Meadows and suggested any final decision should be based on sound data”.

The Action Log from the Minutes providing the details of the actions undertaken was noted with the following oral updates provided:

In relation to the Adult Learning and skills there was nothing currently to report and therefore a progress update would be provided in the New Year.

The Chairman indicated that on the action in Minute 44 in respect of seeking a way forward on any potential options to provide transport from Barnwell to Addenbrooke's Hospital in advance of the Wing Development the Vice Chairman and himself had already held an initial meeting with officers and the Chairwoman and Vice Chairman of the Children and Young People Committee and would be the subject of ongoing discussions.

55. PETITIONS

None were received.

56. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL GOVERNANCE – ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE

This report set out proposals to establish an integrated governance framework for the Greater Cambridge City Deal and sought endorsement from the Committee. The same report was also going to the Constitution and Ethics Committee that afternoon with the final decisions to be agreed by full Council in December.

The Committee was asked to endorse the proposed terms of reference of the Executive Board and the Assembly, the proposed delegated authorities and to proposals to appoint the Leader of the Council to represent the Council on the Executive Board and this Committee's Chairman, Councillor Bates to be the substitute representative and that the Council's three representatives on the Assembly should be appointed on political proportionality according to membership in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

In discussion some of the main issues raised by Members included:

- One Member expressed concern that the representation to the Assembly and the Executive Board was not representative of the political make of the wider County and that it was a mistake not to include the wider districts, as their co-operation would be required to make the City Deal a success. In response it was explained that geographically, the deal covers the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire area but that we would be working with other districts on the wider impacts and indeed, there are already planned briefing sessions with some of those councils. The small composition of the Executive Committee and the aim of the governance arrangements was to enable decisions to be undertaken quickly. Officers would take on board the concerns to ensure that the three other three districts would be kept updated as the City Deal developed.
- Concern that there appeared to be no provision for scrutiny. In the discussion it was explained that part of the role of the Assembly would be to provide a critical friend role and offer challenge and critique to the Executive Board. It was also highlighted that if the Executive Board was unable to agree on an issue, there was the facility to refer it on to the Assembly.

- Whether there was any provision for substitutes on the Assembly as this was seen as an issue for some Committee Members. In response it was explained that the terms of reference only allowed for three named Members with no provision for substitutes. This was on the basis that the quorum was considered easily achievable being five out of fifteen members.

It was resolved:

To endorse the following and to communicate the Committee's endorsement to Full Council:

- a) The Terms of Reference for the Executive Board;
- b) The proposed delegated authorities set out in paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 of the officer's report;
- c) The Leader of the Council be appointed to represent the Council on the Executive Board;
- d) The Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee be appointed as the Council's substitute representative on the Executive Board;
- e) The Terms of Reference for the Assembly;
- f) To appoint the Council's three representatives on the Assembly, on the basis of political proportionality according to the Council's membership in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

57. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL OUTLINE SCHEME PRIORITISATION

This report updated the Committee on the current position regarding the infrastructure programme to be delivered through the Greater Cambridge City Deal, the work undertaken to date, and the next steps. It sought the Committee's views on the options, before a final decision was made on the programme to be delivered from 2015-20 by the proposed new Executive Board.

In order to identify potential early deliverables and priorities, high level technical assessments had been undertaken. This had considered the programme and potential work packages in terms of their strategic, economic and financial cases, as well as deliverability, support for the early delivery of growth sites and connectivity between key destinations. The purpose had been to develop a shorter list of schemes from the total proposed programme that would be likely to be deliverable within the first five years to inform the decisions that would be made by the Executive Board in January.

The proposals that performed strongest were shaded as set out in the Table overleaf with the remainder comprising the full indicative City Deal Programme. The estimated costs were early estimates, to be refined as more detailed information became available. It was highlighted that the total package exceeded the £500m that could be available through the City Deal so there was the need for some prioritisation of

schemes over the full Deal period, with other funding sources also required.

City Deal programme and shortlisted schemes

Programme area	Scheme	Est. cost (£m)
A428 corridor (Cambourne)	A428 to M11 segregated bus links	13.0
	A428 corridor Park & Ride	11.5
	Madingley Road bus priority	34.6
	Bourn Airfield/Cambourne busway	28.8
A1307 corridor (Haverhill)	A1307 bus priority	36.0
	Additional Park & Ride capacity – A1307	7.2
Pedestrian and cycle networks – City	Chisholm Trail links (cycle links parallel to the railway line north of Cambridge Station)	3.0
	Chisholm Trail bridge	4.5
	City centre capacity improvements	7.2
	Cross-city cycle improvements	15.5
Pedestrian and cycle networks – inter-urban	Bourn Airfield/Cambourne pedestrian/cycle route programme	8.4
	Saffron Walden and Haverhill pedestrian/cycle route programme	4.8
	Cambridge to Royston cycle link	7.2
	Waterbeach pedestrian/cycle route programme	14.4
Cambridge radials – Milton Road/Histon Road	Histon Road, Cambridge bus priority	4.3
	Milton Road, Cambridge bus priority	23.0
Cambridge radials – Hills Road	Project Cambridge, Hills Road	25.8
Cambridge radials – Newmarket Road	Newmarket Road bus priority phase 1, Elizabeth Way to Abbey Stadium	54.8
	Newmarket Road bus priority phase 2, Abbey Stadium to Airport Way	39.8
	Newmarket Road bus priority phase 3, Airport Way Park & Ride	17.3
A10 corridor south (Royston)	Foxton level crossing and interchange	21.6
	Hauxton Park & Ride	17.3
	Hauxton-Trumpington busway	15.8
Cambridge Orbital	Ring road bus priority – Addenbrooke's to Newmarket Road	18.7
	Newmarket Road to Cambridge Science Park Station busway	64.7
	Western Orbital	23.0
A10 corridor north (Waterbeach)	A10 dualling and junctions	63.4
	A14/A10 Milton Interchange	66.4
	Waterbeach Park & Ride	11.5
	Waterbeach Barracks to North Cambridge busway	46.1
	Waterbeach new station	33.1
Total		752.7

Martin Lucas-Smith from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign spoke in support of the report, highlighting that congestion in Cambridge was often the result of cars undertaking short journeys which could be better undertaken on buses or cycling. He stressed the need for the inner ring road and radial road network to include dedicated cycle lane provision as part of bus lanes, to help avoid delays by separating cyclists from car traffic. He also cited Department of Transport official statistics that showed in relation to cycling infrastructure schemes a cost benefit ratio of around 35:1 equating to every £1 spent on cycling provision achieving the equivalent of £35 in health and fitness benefits. He also supported Chisholm Trail links being part of the first tranche, but would also have preferred to have seen the Chisholm Trail Bridge as part of this initial tranche.

Members' comments included:

- Some questioned the Programme's ambition and its achievability in terms of the additional funding required from developers, with the same Members also expressing concern that as the Government funding was not inflation linked, including taking no account of construction linked inflation which was rising this would depreciate the sum provided. In terms of being over ambitious it was highlighted that without setting out such a detailed long term programme it would not have been possible to secure the City Deal. It was recognised that the funding shortfall would be challenging, but that the additional £500m on top of the City Deal funding was being sought from a number of sources including the Local Enterprise Partnership and Local Transport Plan monies, which were in addition to developer contributions. In addition, work being undertaken on skills and apprenticeship training including construction, which could help partly offset rising constructor costs by increasing the supply of skilled labour.
- An issue was raised regarding continuing with second tranche funding following any change of Government. Officers believed there was a high degree of expectation that the Deal would continue regardless of any change of Government but this funding depended on certain triggers being achieved related to economic benefits.
- The need for action to be taken to deter cars from entering Cambridge as it was at the city junctions from the arterial routes that the congestion occurred and needed to be addressed. It was explained that the City Deal aimed to enhance connectivity on radial routes /orbital routes from outlying employment areas. Improved public transport provision was part of the solution to switch people from using their cars.
- One Member felt that the Foxton level crossing and interchange should be included as part of the first tranche. It was explained in reply that this crossing had not been included in the shaded list as it was anticipated to be funded by Network Rail.
- Referring to the Hauxton-Trumpington busway project one Member enquired on what details were available on the expected modal shift compared to other schemes. It was explained that the detailed technical work had not yet been undertaken but would be considered in relation to the Access Study.

It was resolved:

To note the work carried out to date and currently ongoing, and to comment on the programme of transport schemes that could form the first five years' City Deal programme and future work around the City Deal programme.

58. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) DEVELOPMENT – NEW LTP LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY

This report sought approval to adopt the refreshed LTP: Policies and Strategy and the new LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy as Core Documents of the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan which were required to ensure the Plan remained current.

The following speakers spoke against the continued inclusion of an A14 Link Road from Wyton Airfield development and included the following key points:

- Councillor Paul Boothman from Houghton and Wyton Parish Council suggested that the rationale to support its continued inclusion on the basis that its removal “would jeopardise the successful adoption of the HDC Local Plan” was not a good enough reason, when there were such concerns about the severity of its environmental, social and economic impacts and until relevant information was gathered on key options and their impacts fully understood. From there the options would need to be the subject of full and proper consultation. He argued against giving “a false green light to Huntingdonshire District Council and potential developers” for its inclusion within their Local Plan when the justification was far from complete from the modelling so far undertaken. He made the point strongly that this significant route had not been the subject of public consultation and therefore until appropriate work and proper consultation was undertaken to establish best solutions, reference to a link road should be removed, as well as the inference that the Wyton Airfield development was sustainable.
- Councillor John Peters, Chairman of Hemingford Abbots Council provided a map (included as a separate attachment to these Minutes) showing the proposed Link Road and the affected SSSIs and Wildlife sites. He stated that the LTTS had completely ignored the consultation process as it still contained a proposed Link Road overwhelmingly rejected by 98.7% of electors responding. He noted the original LTTS document categorically stated that none of the route options tested provided significant improvements but these words had now been changed to support this Link Road. He stated that other route options existed that had not been tested. Adding ‘if needed’ to the link road was contrary to the published SEA that stated ‘a link road will be needed’ and would lead to blight and uncertainty. However, there was, he said, certainty that if link road remains identified as an option in the LTTS no later withdrawal would be possible and the destruction of the Ouse Valley will inevitably follow.
- Parish Councillor Bridget Flanagan on behalf of the Great Ouse Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Working Group (made up of representatives of four parish councils) highlighted the importance of the Great Ouse Valley in terms of its river, meadows, lakes, reedbed and the national and international importance for their habitats for rare and endangered species with the Ouse

Valley Portholme Meadow representing 7% of the remaining UK flood-plain meadows. She also indicated that currently the AONB had submitted an application to 'Natural England' for the Ouse Valley and Wash to be designated an 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' to give it the protection it deserved and was awaiting their decision. She highlighted that the majority of the Ouse Valley already had a considerable amount of designation. In the areas between Hemingford and Godmanchester almost all had been designated as a County Wild Life Site, Conservation Area, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and in addition, part of it was a new Wild Life Trust Nature Reserve. She also stated that even if it was being suggested that the link road was not required until the 2020s, the Plan as it stood was still condoning the destruction of the environment and while a solution for linking RAF Wyton might have to be found, a link road must not be through this particular area. She stated that it was inconceivable that this landscape and environment of the Ouse Meadows should be sacrificed.

- Councillor Graham Wilson spoke regarding his concerns on the funding, deliverability and environmental implications of the Plan. He said there were too many references in the text to "indicative costs that were still to be determined" and to the Plan making reference to a severe funding gap implying the schemes needed may not go ahead. He suggested that officers should not be offering options where potential funding had not been identified. He also said the County Council should not support developments where it could not mitigate their adverse social and environmental impacts. He referred to a comment in the paper that "It is possible that this work [further environmental assessment] will lead in future to schemes being removed from the LTP, LTTS or from other strategies should it not be possible to avoid unacceptable impacts or provide suitable mitigation". He suggested that the recommendations should be split so that while the Committee supported the policies and strategies proposed, that recommendation b) should be amended to instruct officers to review those schemes supporting development in Huntingdonshire where funding had not been identified and that the Council should not support the inclusion of schemes in the Plan where environmental damage would be caused nor support development if the adverse impacts cannot be mitigated.

There followed significant debate with many Members of the Committee concerned regarding the continued inclusion of the A14 link road to Wyton Airfield in the face of overwhelming local public opposition and on the basis that not every development being suggested in a District Plan should be supported as part of a County Council Transport Policy. Officers in response commented that further work would be needed to determine the full package of proposals and suggested that it would be possible to amend the Plan and remove specific reference to the Link Road at this time. This was on the basis of including wording to consider looking further at a sustainable transport package in order to enable development at RAF Wyton to be undertaken on a sustainable basis. The key concern of the County Council officers would be if a Planning Inspector allowed the development to go ahead without a sustainable transport solution.

On a different issue the member of the Committee representing Little Paxton and St Neots North raised concerns regarding the adoption of a Transport Strategy for St

Neots. Action: Jeremy Smith to brief the local member, the Chairman and other St Neots Councillors outside of the meeting.

As a result of the opposition received from members of the public, Parish Council members and local members at both the October meeting and the current meeting on the inclusion of the Wyton Airfield to A14 Access road, there was Committee consensus that explicit reference to this link road should be removed from the document and that this should be replaced with wording outlining the need to develop a package of sustainable transport measures to support planned growth. Officers agreed that the focus would be to look at sustainable measures but cautioned that this would not necessarily preclude a new link road in the future, if this was deemed to be required as part of a package of sustainable measures needed to mitigate the impacts of planned growth.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To defer the entire report.
- b) For officers to prepare a revised report involving consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman for presentation to the 25th November Committee meeting.

59. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN DEVELOPMENT – WISBECH MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY – NEW HUNTINGDON AND GODMANCHESTER MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY

This report provided details of both the refreshed Wisbech and Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategies for 2011-20131 for adoption.

As a result of the deferral of the previous report it was suggested that the New Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy (MTTS) also required to be deferred until the next meeting so that appropriate changes could be made to it and a revised version re-submitted.

Members' comments included:

- A Fenland Member making reference to the continuing discussions regarding the need for a crossing for the A47 being a concern, as well as seeking information on progress on the March to Wisbech rail link. The Chairman in response confirmed officers were aware of all the options for an A47 crossing and that progress was being made in relation to the Rail Link with the Chairman and Vice Chairman having signed off the Wisbech to Cambridge Rail Study.
- One Fenland Member providing updates on the position of Fenland District Council in relation to the Wisbech MTTS. The same Member requested an update regarding the provision of bus services referenced in paragraph 4.1.9 on the importance of transport provision being provided to access further education and evening classes. It was indicated in response that the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative was due to be updated next year and whether this

aspiration would be through bus company provision or other sources, had yet to be determined.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To adopt the new Wisbech Market Town Transport Strategy as part of Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031.
- b) As a result of the deferral of the previous report, it was agreed to defer a decision on the new Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031, to the 25th November meeting.

60. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY PARK AND RIDE SITES – INTRODUCTION OF PARKING CHARGES

This report sought approval to introduce parking charges at the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Park and Ride Sites at St Ives and Longstanton in line with the current Business Plan which was relying on their introduction from the beginning of April 2015. It was explained that although the operation of the Busway was cost neutral, concessionary fares for bus services had cost £964,616 during 2013/14 and as this cost was unavoidable. The introduction of parking charges would raise important revenue estimated at around £120k per annum.

Comments / issues raised by Members included:

- The Vice Chairman in supporting the proposals indicated that it would be inequitable not to introduce the charges at these sites, having already introduced them at the Cambridge sites.
- There were requests to ensure that appropriate information was provided in advance to users of the sites including leaving information leaflets under wipers of cars parked and ensuring the signage should be clear. In response, officers confirmed that a full programme of information was to be undertaken, subject to agreement being given at the current meeting.
- One Member with reference to the charges at Cambridge Park and Ride sites felt that they were far too complicated and asked why there was not one standard charge of a £1, rather than a tiered charging system. It was explained that the higher charge for longer periods was to deter people leaving their car at the site for long periods e.g. going on holiday.
- In relation to a query raised it was confirmed that it was not intended to charge bikes parked at the site.
- One Member suggested that there were inconsistencies in charging policy with On-street parking being for approval by another Committee.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To approve the introduction of the parking charges.

- b) To agree to consult on the necessary changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders.
- c) To agree the proposed charging structure as detailed in Appendix 1 of the officer report and also attached to these minutes.

61. RESPONSE TO THE ADEQUACY OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED A14 IMPROVEMENT

This report sought the Committee's views on the proposed response by the Council on the adequacy of community consultation undertaken by the Highways Agency (HA) which was required to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the Development Consent Order process being followed by the Highways Agency for the proposed A14 improvement Scheme. The response concluded that the County Council was in general satisfied that the HA had carried out the consultation in accordance with their Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) and had also adhered to the consultation requirements included within the County Council's own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The County Council was confident that the HA would continue to share details as they were developed ahead of the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission.

Reference was made to comments provided in advance from the local Member for Sawtry and Ellington, Councillor Bywater. It was orally confirmed that officers had already contacted him regarding the issue he had raised in relation to the provision of a cycle path to connect Spaldwick to Eastern Ellington to link up Brampton. On the other issue raised regarding retro fitting noise abatement measures along the Ellington A14 Corridor, as this related to the existing road, this was not part of the current scheme.

Members comments included congratulating officers for the degree of thoroughness relating to the response and also asking them to convey to the HA the need to ensure that going forward their IT infrastructure was robust, to ensure the on-line difficulties experienced during the recent consultation exercise were not replicated.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To approve the proposed response on the adequacy of community consultation; and
- b) To delegate the agreement of final amendments to the Executive Director Economy Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee.

62. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2014

This report provided the Committee with the September 2014 Finance and Performance information for the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Service and had been

reformatted so that the Performance Information section of the report only provided information relevant to the Economy and Environment Committee.

It was highlighted that at the end of September, ETE was forecasting a year-end underspend on revenue of £692,000 (of which £78k was on cost centres under the stewardship of the Economy and Environment Committee) and a year-end underspend on capital of £22,759 million.

It was highlighted that there were four significant areas of forecast capital underspend within the Committee's responsibility, of which two, the Science Park Station and the Connecting Cambridgeshire project had been reported on in the previous report. The significant new underspends were in relation to the Guided Busway and the Huntingdon West of Town Link Road as detailed in paragraph 2.5 of the report.

Of the eleven Committee performance indicators, two were currently red, two amber and seven green. None were expected to be red at year end. The indicators that were currently at red status 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.

It was resolved:

To review and comment upon the report.

63. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE FINAL DRAFT REVENUE PROPOSALS 2015/20

This report provided details of the overview of the final draft Business Plan Revenue proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment.

Issues raised included;

- In relation to the key risks the Vice-Chairman expressed surprise that Cambridgeshire Future Transport was not included, following previous discussion on the potential impact on adult social care services from funding reductions. In response it was explained that it had not been included in 2015/16 as there was no impact expected from reductions in the first planning year as one off community grant would be used to cover the financial saving. Officers however recognised a risk moving forward.
- One Member making reference to a member led review referred to in Section 4 B Table 3 page 12 B/R 6.211; titled 'Review of effectiveness of Community Transport and Cambridgeshire Future Transport (CFT) and reduce funding to CFT and Community Transport' requested details of who was on it and what its terms of reference were. In response it was explained that the review had not yet been set up, or terms of reference agreed (Note: *for the reasons explained in the previous bullet response*) but that the Chairman and Vice Chairman were due to meet officers to discuss issues as the review would be looking at effectiveness from 2016/17. **There was a request to provide the current Steering Group with a progress update and to facilitate this officers**

should arrange a meeting to discuss issue with the Chairman / Vice Chairman and Councillors Butcher and van de Ven. Action: Bob Menzies.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2015-20 Revenue Proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment.
- b) To comment on the final draft proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment's 2015-20 revenue budgets and endorse them.
- c) To consider the proposed levels of fees and charges for Economy, Transport and Environment in 2015-20 and endorse them.

64. PROPOSED ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR 2015/16

This report provided the opportunity to review Economy and Environment key performance indicators which had already been reviewed by Heads of Service and ETE Senior Managers with the proposed indicators attached to the report as Appendix A under three headings A1 'Business Plan Indicators' which were key outcomes to manage the Business Plan, 'Deprivation Indicators' (included as part of the set of Business Plan Indicators using data already available to monitor deprivation and help narrow the gap, and A2 'Other Business and Performance Indicators'

Members' comments included:

- Under deprivation factors, whether consideration should be given to including other benefits claimants.
- Whether busway passengers statistics could be further broken down by location.
- It was suggested that the Business Plan Indicator 'the proportion of Cambridgeshire residents aged 16-64 in employment' should be broken down further between part time and full time employment, as otherwise this masked the growth of part time employment which was potentially at the expense of full time jobs.
- In relation to the indicator titled 'average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the congested routes' it was suggested these should be broken down between public and private transport. Another member suggested that an additional deprivation indicator should measure access to public / private transport and should also include details of the length of journey time.

In the ensuing discussion it was made clear by the officers that the proposed indicators were those where statistics were already available nationally / locally, and that some of the proposals being suggested e.g. total number of bus passengers involved commercially sensitive information. The Executive Director urged that Members should not add additional performance indicators, as with ongoing budget reductions there was

not the officer capacity available to research the additional information, which represented a great deal of additional work. On that basis,

It was resolved:

To approve the proposed Economy and Environment key indicators for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix A of the officer report and attached to these minutes as Appendix 2.

65. BUSINESS CHAMPION NOMINATION

This report asked the Committee to consider the creation of a Member Business Champion to act as a focal point.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To agree to the creation of the role of Member Business Champion.
- b) To appoint Councillor Shuter as the Council's Business Champion.

66. SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the Agenda Plan.
- b) To agree that an updated Plan should be circulated to the Committee Members after the meeting.

67. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. 25th NOVEMBER 2014

Noted.

Chairman
25TH November 2014

Minute 60 Agreed Car Parking Charges

Waiting time/period	St Ives CGB Park and Ride	Longstanton CGB Park and Ride
Up to 1 Hour	Free	Free
Between 1 hour and 18 Hours	£1	£1
Season Tickets For Pre-Purchased 1-18 Hours Parking only	Annual £230 Four weekly £18 Weekly £5	Annual £230 Four weekly £18 Weekly £5
Between 18 hours and 24 hours	£10	£10
Between 24 hours and 48 hours	£20	£20
Between 48 Hours and 72 Hours.	£30	£30
Maximum Time Limit	72 Hours	72 Hours

Proposed Coach Parking Charges

	St Ives CGB Park and Ride	Longstanton CGB Park and Ride
Parking Charge	Buses and Coaches £10 per day or per visit whichever is the shorter	Buses and Coaches £10 per day or per visit whichever is the shorter
Maximum Time Limit	72 Hours	72 Hours

Minute 64 Agreed Economy & Environment key Performance indicators for 2015/16

A1. Business Plan Indicators

- The proportion of Cambridgeshire residents aged 16-64 in employment
- Additional jobs created per year
- The number of people starting as apprentices
- The number of people completing courses to directly improve their chances of employment
- The number of bus passenger journeys that start in Cambridgeshire
- Growth in cycling from a 2004/05 average baseline
- The average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes

Deprivation Indicators (included as part of the set of Business Plan Indicators)

- 'Out of work' benefits claimants – narrowing the gap between the most deprived areas (top 10%) and others
- Number of adult learners completing courses to improve their chances of employment
- Wider outcomes of adult learning - Contextual (no target)
- Levels of cycling and walking - narrowing the gap between Fenland and others
- % of households and businesses using superfast broadband.

A2. Other Finance and Performance Report indicators

- Guided Busway passengers per month – Contextual (no target)
- County matter planning applications determined within 13 weeks
- % of Freedom of Information requests answered within 20 days - ETE
- % of complaints responded to within 10 days - ETE
- Staff Sickness - Days per f.t.e. – ETE