

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday, 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 10.50 a.m.

**Present:** Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, D Giles, L Harford (Substitute for Councillor Fuller), N Kavanagh, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice- Chairman)

**Apologies:** Councillors H Batchelor, R Fuller and S Tierney

**194. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**195. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

**196. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

As an update on Minute 163 titled 'Waterbeach New Town Spatial Framework and Infrastructure Delivery Plan Supplementary Planning Document Flood Zone Query' it was reported that officers were finalising the response to the application but could confirm it was within flood zone 1 and therefore low risk. However, additional mitigation might still be required to counter an extraordinary flooding event which could lead to a breach of the River Cam defences. This was being looked at with the developers.

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

**197. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS / REQUESTS TO SPEAK**

None received at the relevant deadlines.

**198. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROPOSALS**

This Report asked the Committee to consider the proposed allocation of the Integrated Transport block funding (ITB) for 2019/20 seeking Members' comments and support for the proposed projects to receive ITB funding for Delivering Transport Strategy Aims for the rolling 3-year period from 2019/20

An earlier version was reported to the Highway and Community Infrastructure (H&CI) Committee on 3rd December 2018. Following discussion, the report, (the same also was included on this Committee's December meeting) was withdrawn from both meetings to allow officers time to clarify some points raised around the prioritisation methodology. The Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of the two committees subsequently

agreed that the revised report only needed to come forward to this Committee. The requested full explanation of the prioritisation methodology and the criteria that was used was set out in Section 3 paragraphs 3.4 - 3.8 of the report.

As background it was explained that before the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CA), funding for Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital grants from the Department for Transport (DfT) was received by the County Council as the local transport authority. With devolution, the CA was now responsible for the LTP and the associated funding, including the Integrated Transport Block capital grants. For the first two years the CA passported the LTP capital grant funding to the County Council. The LTP capital grants allocations received from the CA for the current year 2018/19 included:

- Integrated Transport Block (ITB) £3.190M,
- Highway Maintenance Block needs element £12.076M,
- Highway Maintenance Block incentive element £2.535M, and
- Pothole Action Fund £0.412M

The recommendations in the current report were subject to the CA's final budget due to be considered by the CA Board in February 2019 and in answer to a question, the expectation was that the amounts were expected to be approved at that meeting.

The report highlighted that most of the schemes with approved 2018/19 ITB funding were on track for completion, with variations explained in section 3 of the report. In view of the small annual budgets and cost of schemes, funding was on a multi-year basis to ensure that larger schemes with longer delivery timescales, but with potentially greater benefits, were not ruled out due to limited annual funding availability.

Schemes with the highest Total Score were proposed for allocation up to the limit of available 2019/20 funding, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report. As funding was limited to £1,178,500 (detailed in paragraph 3.3), larger high-scoring schemes were proposed for multi-year funding profiling. Appendix 3 listed Schemes scores from highest to the lowest. Eligible schemes assessed but not proposed for funding allocation in 2019/20 would remain in the Transport Investment Plan to be considered for other appropriate funding sources or for the next round of ITB funding.

In discussion:

- Referencing Appendix 3, one Member queried whether the schemes would still be decided on the criteria set out, as no scheme costs were included in the table and he further queried where the funding would come from and who would make the final decision on whether a scheme should go ahead. In response it was explained that this Committee in October had received a report with the suggested schemes and that in terms of funding, lower tier Councils should be looking to fund schemes from their developer contribution Community Infrastructure Levy and section 106 funding streams where possible. Where a Member believed there were other schemes that should be included for consideration in their area, it was up to them as the local Member to use the appropriate mechanisms to seek to have them added to the list.

- The same Member from Huntingdonshire again on Appendix 3 with reference to TIP ID 702 titled 'St Neots Eaton Ford, Great North Road, Cycle Route 4 – widening footway between Lowry Road and Queens Gardens' queried why this had the highest weighted score for the Huntingdonshire schemes, as in his opinion it was little used and had previously been widened. It was agreed that Officers should write to Councillor Giles with more detail on the justification for the eligibility scores. **Action: Elsa Evans Funding and Innovation Programme Manager.**
- In reply to a query from one Member to clarify the text under Paragraph 3.4 on which schemes would be eligible, it was confirmed that if they were not Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) schemes, Cambridge City schemes would be eligible for inclusion and would not automatically be taken out as had been suggested at an earlier Committee meeting.
- With reference to paragraph 5.7 'Public Health Implications' a Member highlighted the importance of encouraging sustainable forms of travel through the provision of footpaths and cycle paths in new developments in terms of their health and well-being benefits.
- One Member with reference to the funding allocation proposals asked why the air quality monitoring allocation of £23k was so low in view of the current well known concerns on air quality / pollution and asked how the figure was arrived at. It was explained that it was a historical figure that had been used for the last few years and only represented the County Council contribution which was only a small part of the overall budget for such activity. The District Councils, the responsible bodies, contributed far larger sums and also were responsible for deciding their priorities.
- In respect of the above, there was a query regarding whether the Greater Cambridge Partnership contributed to the air quality monitoring budget and if not, whether they could be approached. **Action: Officers to investigate**
- One Fenland Councillor made reference to a large development in Whittlesey which required a cycle-path to cross the A605 to enable access to a new school and asked how this could be achieved, as land values in Fenland were too low to yield the significant section 106 monies required to fund such schemes. The Member was advised to speak to the officers after the meeting on the mechanisms available to add schemes to the Transport Investment Plan, including information on seeking partner contributions, from the district council, the Highways Improvements budget and from the school itself.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Support the allocation to the ITB budget categories and
- b) Support the prioritised projects in Appendix 1 of the officer's report for allocation of ITB Delivering Transport Strategy Aims category funding in 2019/20, and earmarked for 2020/21 and 2021/22, subject to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's final budget allocation.

## **199. COMMUNITY TRANSPORT MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY**

The Committee was reminded of the major review of Community Transport in Cambridgeshire that had culminated in an agreed Action Plan at a special Audit & Accounts Committee meeting in July 2018. One of the actions agreed read;

“Include in the revised Grant Agreement more detail around the expected checks of eligibility that recipients must undertake on new members. This should include some form of checking to independent documentary evidence to verify e.g. age, proof of address or other relevant documentation relating to the criteria under which membership is sought.”

The issue of eligibility criteria and the checks was discussed at a further meeting of the above referenced Committee on 31 October 2018 where it was agreed “That full checks should be required for all new members retaining documentary proof of said checks, along with spot checks being undertaken on members to ensure continued compliance.”

The report highlighted that the current eligibility criteria used by community transport operators in Cambridgeshire was inconsistent, both between schemes and against the requirements of the grant agreements. In addition, the schemes checking processes to ensure that members met the criteria were not as rigorous as was required by the Community Transport Action Plan, with no documentary evidence currently provided to any of the schemes.

In developing a consistent set of membership eligibility criteria for all schemes as a proposed best practice model, officers reviewed eligibility criteria from a sample of other schemes. The report suggested both new membership eligibility criteria to be used by community transport operators for community transport schemes grant funded by Cambridgeshire County Council and a process to check the eligibility and the evidence that should be used to assess applicants against this criteria.

The report proposed that criteria for eligibility should be standardised and restricted to the following:

- a) Must live within the area covered by the respective Dial-a-Ride scheme.
- b) There is no public transport available (limited or no transport).
- c) Although public transport is available, it does not run at times suitable (limited or no transport)
- d) Difficulty using public transport due to disability.
- e) Difficulty using public transport due to other reasons (including short term)

In addition, having assessed the eligibility checks carried out by schemes in London, Hertfordshire and Richmond, officers proposed a process for checking the eligibility of applicants against the above criteria detailed in Appendix 2 to the report. The proposal required evidence for members applying under the category ‘difficulty using public transport due to disability’ was listed in Appendix 3.

In discussion:

- Audit and Accounts Committee and the relevant officers were congratulated on the work undertaken which had resulted in the majority of the action plan recommendations having already been actioned.
- Regarding a discussion on paragraph 4.3 'Statutory, Legal and risk implications' reading "There is a risk that some Community Providers Transport operators may refuse to introduce these new eligibility criteria particularly where Cambridgeshire County Council was not the majority funder to the scheme..." this was considered by the officers to be a low risk, as co-ordination and discussions to harmonise the criteria, had taken place with counterparts in Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire. **It was suggested that once agreed, the report should be circulated for information to other operators who don't have contracts, to encourage adoption of the same criteria / evidence requirements.**  
**Action: Paul Nelson**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree the membership eligibility criteria, eligibility checking process and acceptable proof documents contained in the report, for inclusion in the Community Transport Grant Agreement and to circulate the detail to other Councils with their own operator schemes for their information to encourage a consistent eligibility status approach.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the eligibility criteria.

## 200. DRAFT CAMBRIDGESHIRE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)

The County Council is required to have a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) setting out how stakeholders, including the local community, district and parish councils, and statutory consultees, can participate in the land use planning processes undertaken by the County Council in its role as the Mineral and Waste, and County Planning Authority. It provides details of the minimum level of community involvement that would take place in respect to the preparation of planning policy and the Local Enforcement Plan; as well as that related to the determination of planning applications.

The report detailed the proposed revisions to the Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement from representations received following the consultation undertaken between 1 October and 12 November 2018. In total 22 stakeholders responded to the consultation, 10 of which confirmed that they had considered the draft SCI but had no comment. The remaining respondents raised 42 detailed points. These representations were set out in Appendix 1 to the report, together with the proposed response and any consequential changes to the SCI. Appendix 2 provided the revised SCI, highlighting the changes included from the representations received. Subject to the Committee's agreement, the revised SCI as amended, would be reviewed again after a further five years.

In response to a query referencing paragraph 4.1 in respect of those consulted and why

there was no reference to parish councils, reassurance was given that parish councils were always consulted regarding planning applications in their area. It was explained that Parish councils were not considered to be statutory consultees, which had a clear definition in planning but the SCI confirmed the Council's commitment to consulting them. Other Members highlighted that in the case of high profile planning applications, the lead County Council Planning, Minerals and Waste Business Manager attended the relevant parish council meetings. Further to this, the Committee placed on record its appreciation of the exemplary work carried out by Emma Fitch and her team.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement (set out in Appendix 2 of the report).
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, the authority to make any minor non-consequential amendments to the document attached, prior to publication.

## **201. JOINT PROCUREMENT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

The significant economic and population growth in Cambridgeshire in recent years has placed an increased demand for additional infrastructure, requiring significant levels of funding from a number of sources as detailed in the report. The funding streams aimed to deliver a large number of transport projects. In order to deliver them, access was required to a wide range of professional and technical services. The report therefore proposed the procurement of a Professional Services Contract/Framework for use by Cambridgeshire County Council, the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, to support transport infrastructure delivery.

The report highlighted that whilst the County Council had access to highways and transportation professional services through the recently procured Highway Services Contract, that contract's primary function was focussed on the provision of highways services, rather than transport consultancy services, and was not able to provide the capacity necessary to support the scale of transport infrastructure coming forward.

Following discussions with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), it was proposed to jointly procure a transport consultancy professional services contract/framework, which all three parties would be able to draw on to support local delivery.

The estimated procurement cost was £300k-400k with the majority of the costs to be funded by the GCP and CPCA, based on the proportion of expected future use. The County Council would contribute up to £10k through the provision of resources covered within existing overheads but that the procurement exercise would not incur revenue costs.

In discussion, a Member commented that she hoped that consultant costs would be reduced with the appointment of additional officers. In reply it was explained that the proposal was not for CPCA to employ additional staff directly, but to ensure the

appropriate technical expertise was available when this was not possible from in-house staff when required. This by its nature required consultants but with reduced risk regarding costs, as the proposal would be to contract with them directly through a formalised procurement arrangement.

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve commencement of procurement of a joint Professional Services Contract/Framework, to support transport infrastructure delivery, for use by the County Council, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

## **202. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER 2018**

The Committee received the report in order to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position as at the end of November 2018.

The main issues highlighted were:

**Revenue:** The Service had started the financial year with two significant pressures for both the Coroners Services and Waste (both which came under Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee). The Place and Economy Service was now forecasting an underspend of £59K at year end, while cautioning that the forthcoming end of the month figures could increase or decrease from the figure estimated before the end of year projected balanced budget figure was achieved.

**Performance:** Of the twelve performance indicators, one was currently red, four were amber, and seven were green. The indicator currently showing as red was 'The average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes' At year-end, the current forecast was that the above performance indicator would remain as red, five would be amber and six green.

Issues raised included:

- Seeking an update regarding the action being taken in reaching agreement over the £900k of savings referred to in the report. It was explained that a paper would be going to General Purposes Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> January to fund a package to achieve the required savings. While it was disappointing that the savings had not all been achieved in the current year, there was the current expectation of a balanced budget by year end.
- There was a request for an update regarding the amount of Community Transport funding that would be made available from the Combined Authority to support subsidised bus routes in the new financial year. The Chairman explained that this was still the subject of ongoing discussions, including the future of those bus routes currently subsidised by the County Council. It was emphasised that decisions on funding going forward were now the responsibility of the Combined Authority who were now the transport authority, rather than the current Committee.

- Another Member highlighted the success that had been achieved in obtaining sponsorship funding to fully finance the current Bikeability Scheme for the forthcoming year. It was agreed that as a good news story officers should co-ordinate a press release, ensuring it highlighted those officers and elected Members who had been involved in the negotiations that had secured the additional funding.  
**Action: Andy Preston/ Mike Davies / Sarah Silk**

It was unanimously resolved to note the report.

## **203. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN**

The report invited the Committee to review its training plan. It was highlighted that the only training still to take place was the 15<sup>th</sup> March Member Seminar on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. The Chairman reminded the Committee that any Committee Member could suggest additional training by contacting Democratic Services between Committee meetings.

The Training Plan was noted.

## **204. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee noted the following changes to the Agenda Plan since the agenda was published.

### **Reports moved from the February to the March meeting:**

Highways response to West Cambridge Master Planning Report

Kennett Garden Village Outline Planning

Non Statutory Consultation East West Rail

### **Additional reports to the March Committee meeting (All non-key decisions):**

Welcome Trust Genome Campus

Land North West of Spittals Way and Ermine Street Great Stukeley

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan

Local Full Fibre Network (LFNN Review)

## **205. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 7<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2019**

**Chairman:  
7<sup>th</sup> February 2019**