

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 16th September 2014

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 1.15 p.m.

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

Apologies: Councillors R Butcher and A Walsh

Apologies for lateness were also received from Councillor Bates who was required at an business meeting being held earlier in the day. The Vice Chairman initially chaired the meeting with Councillor Bates taking over the Chairmanship at the commencement of the Kings Dyke Report discussion (Minute 31).

Also present: Councillors Ashwood, Downes, Nethsingha and Mason

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

- Councillor Hipkin in Minute 30 as his daughter attended St Mary's School, Chaucer Road, Cambridge

The following Councillors declared non-statutory disclosable interests in accordance with paragraph 10.2 b) of the Members' Code of Conduct in order not to fetter their discretion when the final planning application came forward to the Planning Committee of which they were both members.

- Councillor J Reynolds in Minute 31 (A605 Kings Dyke Level Crossing Crossing Replacement as the Chairman of the County Council's Planning Committee. He left the meeting during discussion of the item.
- Councillor Jenkins also in Minute 31 as a Member of the Planning Committee. He left the meeting during discussion of the item.

26. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2014 were agreed as a correct record. The action log was noted.

In relation to Minute 12 'Minutes and Action Log' referring to page 10 of the previous minutes whereby the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment had agreed to ask officers leading on the economic agreement with Nanjing to contact Councillor Lay, as an update the same Member indicated that he had asked to be involved as fully as possible. He considered he had not been kept adequately informed

of progress. As there was an item later on the agenda no further discussion was undertaken at this point in the meeting.

In relation to Minute 13, Councillor Schumann reported that he would be liaising with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman on the work he had undertaken previously on adult learning and skills to establish whether the work should be continued and whether there was any appetite to establish a working group. He would report back to the Committee Spokes in due course.

From Minute 16 'Hills Road and Huntingdon Road Cycleways' there was a request from Councillor Reynolds for an update on whether there was yet a date set in relation to the before implementation traffic impact schemes. **Action: Graham Hughes would find out and write back outside of the meeting.**

Minute 17 'Lighting the Guided Busway Maintenance Track' which had been deferred at the last meeting with the decision being to come back to the current meeting, it was explained that following discussions with Spokes it had been agreed that as this involved ring fenced money, it was more appropriate to come back to the October meeting so that it could be considered following a report on Section 106 Recommendations. The local Member who had spoken on it at the last meeting had been notified of the change.

Minute 9. 'Mobilising Local Energy Investments (MLEI) Project – Key Risks' as reply to a request for a progress update it was indicated that a report would be coming back by December 2014 (*Post meeting note: The report has been scheduled for the late November meeting*) In addition, attention was drawn to a report and the recommendations agreed at the 9th September General Purposes Committee titled 'A Finance Framework within which Energy Performance Contracting and Renewable Energy Projects for Schools, Cambridgeshire County Council Sites and Buildings can be delivered'

Councillor Cearns indicated that his ongoing discussions in relation to reducing re-offending would initially be reported to Spokes.

27. PETITIONS

There were no petitions to be considered.

28. NORTH ELY SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

This report had been withdrawn following consultation with the Chairman in order for further negotiations on planning obligations to take place with one of the developers and East Cambridgeshire District Council. An update was currently expected to come forward to the October meeting.

29. A14 DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER – PROCESS AND NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE ON ISSUES RAISED THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION RESPONSE

This report briefed the Committee on the Development Consent Order (DCO) process

and the likely timetable of actions requiring County Council consideration and input. It was highlighted that the Highways Agency (HA) was still under strict instruction from the Government to commence works by no later than the agreed timetable of December 2016. In addition, Section 3 of the report advised on the progress of how the HA was addressing the key issues raised in the County Council's A14 consultation response.

The Local member for Brampton and Kimbolton having requested to speak, expressed his concern about the impact on local traffic of the proposals arising from the removal of the viaduct in Huntingdon. Although he agreed that it was necessary for the overall success of the A14 project, he considered that the impact on local traffic had not been fully considered in the proposed road layouts. Referring specifically to Paragraphs 3.7 - 3.9 of the report, he believed that the stretch of Brampton Road from Hinchingsbrooke to the station junction would be heavily overloaded and cause delays which would have a backwash effect into Brampton and Huntingdon. He proposed three possible mitigating developments as follows:

- A) The current road through Kingfisher's Way to be opened to traffic so that some of the vehicles from the Hinchingsbrooke estate could get out on to the main road network without using the Hinchingsbrooke./Brampton Road junction.
- B) Proposing that consideration should be given for a new road to be built from Parkway across to the de-trunked A14, to enable easier access to and from the hospital and the estate.
- C) On Brampton Road, he suggested that the stretch opposite Scholars' Avenue should be widened by reducing the grass verge on the north side, with the road under the current viaduct to be fully used for traffic, providing three lanes (one left for Edison Bell Way, one straight ahead for the town and one to the right for access to the station and to the de-trunked A14). This would however necessitate the building of a new footpath and cycleway bridge, a proposal which had already been rejected by the Highways Agency. His concern was that the footpath / cycleway along this stretch was very busy accommodating pupils from a very large secondary school, people accessing the hospital as well as pedestrian traffic from a growing estate.

The Local Member indicated that along with the two local members for Huntingdon East he would be happy to help officers develop the additional options should the Committee support more detailed work being undertaken. He also took the opportunity to welcome the HA proposal's to mitigate noise as detailed in paragraph 3.5 of the report. This particular point on noise mitigation was also widely welcomed by other Members of the Committee in the ensuing discussion of the report, although one Member made the point that reference in the report to noise mitigation measures appeared to have omitted Bar Hill. The Committee noted the issues raised by the local Member for Brampton and Kimbolton, but did not request any further clarification, or propose any additional action be taken by the officers.

The local member for Sawtry and Ellington provided written comments to the Committee bringing its attention to a request from local residents in his area that retro noise abatement measures should be undertaken to villages at Ellington and Spaldwick. He also drew attention for the need for a cycle path to connect Spaldwick

and Ellington and to also link to Brampton. These proposals were supported by the Clerk for Ellington Parish Council.

Issues raised by Members of the Committee included:

- Seeking explanation of why issues raised in the previous report in relation to cycle routes and footpaths had not been included and asking when noise pollution mitigation measures would be undertaken. It was explained that the former were the subject of further traffic forecasts work which was still being progressed. Further environmental impact work was also being undertaken and would be included in the HA's Environmental Statement, having already confirmed that enhanced noise mitigation would be provided where sensitive areas had been identified. Following their completion, officers would undertake scrutiny and further liaison with their respective HA officers which was in addition to the work already being undertaken as detailed in the report and in the indicative timetable as set out in Appendix 2.
- Members of the Committee sought clarification of when further reports would be forthcoming to ensure that they would be able to input into them. In response it was indicated that a report would be taken to Committee in November outlining officers' assessment of the adequacy of the Consultation to seek views and endorsement. In terms of the Statement of Common Ground this needed to be submitted ahead of the Examination, anticipated that this would be reported around March 2015. After this, a Local Impact Report would need to be submitted by the County Council to the Planning Inspectorate detailing the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area. The timing for this was anticipated to be May or June 2015.
- There was concern expressed by some Members to ensure that the imperative to build the road within a tight timescale should not result in the mitigation measures to reduce its impact on local people being lost. Members agreed that they wished to see a progress report on the issues highlighted in the current report as soon as practicable. It was agreed that a further report should be prepared and reported back to Members December (*Post meeting note: The next appropriate meeting would be the 13th January Committee meeting*).
- One Member commented that with reference to paragraph 3.13 'Floods and Water' he had hoped that the recent severe flooding of the A14 would be recognised by the HA as not just a historical event but an ongoing issue and that suitable mitigation measures required to be included. In response it was indicated that mitigations would be included following the aforementioned traffic forecasts / Environmental Statement work.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the process, timescales and progress with the Highways Agency on addressing issues and comment on this and the way forward.
- b) To receive an interim report to update the Committee on the results of the

ongoing negotiations with the Highways Agency by the end of the year to go to the next available Committee.

30. TRUMPINGTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE PROPOSED CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS

This report provided the details of the results of the consultation on proposed cycleway improvements on Trumpington Road, Cambridge for the Committee to consider the implementation of the proposals.

The proposals aimed to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, whilst not impacting on traffic flow or road capacity for motorised vehicles. The starting point for the proposals was that many school children and less confident cyclists currently cycled on the footpath next to the Botanic Garden on Trumpington Road. Using this footpath meant that, when heading north, they did not need to cross Trumpington Road twice to access the schools and colleges in the Bateman Street area; and when heading south, did not have to cycle in a narrow cycle lane alongside parked cars on one side, with the risk of carelessly opened car doors, and a busy traffic lane on the other. However, this footpath was also well used by pedestrians and frequent conflict occurred between users. As a result two proposals had been drawn up that had been the subject of widespread consultation as detailed in the report.

Option 1 involved widening the grassed bank supporting the existing footway adjacent to the watercourse known as Hobson's Conduit on the east (Botanic Gardens) side of the road. This would allow a segregated foot and cycleway to be accommodated on top of the bank, whilst also providing a wide segregated on road lane at the bottom. Option Two retained the existing bank in its present form, and the footway on top of the bank, but provided for a wide segregated on road lane, again at the bottom. There was no provision for south to north cycling on the east side in this option. Both options involved the loss of parking bays. In addition, a number of other scheme 'elements' suggested at the stakeholder workshop were consulted on as set out in section 3.4 of the report. Of the two options undertaken in the consultation 55% preferred Option 1 with 27% preferring Option 2. And 18% supported neither option.

Dr Kate Brett spoke in support of the report proposals. She also highlighted that the current location of the cycle lane between moving vehicles and parked vehicles posed a serious threat of cyclists being either knocked off by motorists or swerving into traffic as a result of motorists in the parking bays opening their doors. She provided examples of her own experiences to illustrate her points. In addition she highlighted that cycle traffic was likely to increase as a result of the new developments and if made safer would encourage more people to switch from cars to cycles and give confidence to more parents allow their children to cycle. She also suggested that the majority of the time during weekdays most of the parking spaces were unoccupied. On being asked her preference was for Option 1.

Rupert Goodings from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign also supported the report on the grounds of safety, citing Trumpington Road as one of the most dangerous for cyclists in Cambridge and which was not currently suitable for children. He made the point that the loss of parking should not be put above safety. Their preference was for Option 2.

The local Member for Trumpington while supporting any measures to improve road safety had serious concerns in relation to the loss of parking in Edwardian / Victorian streets where there was already insufficient parking for residents. She also disputed the contention of one of the other speakers that the parking bays were generally empty during weekdays, citing building works as having had an effect, and that in her experience they were generally well utilised. Of the two options she preferred Option 1 but felt that the real issue was the need to improve the junction with Brooklands Avenue and the access to the roundabout at the Fen Causeway junction.

The Local Member for Newnham speaking as a parent of children attending one of the local schools and speaking on behalf of other parents, very much favoured Option 1. She highlighted that parents cycling with small children for safety reasons required the provision of an off road cycle track. This would also help encourage nervous cyclists to take up cycling.

Using Chairman's discretionary powers a late request from a senior teacher from the Leys School was also allowed. He highlighted the fact that two or three pupils from the School were knocked off their cycles every year which understandably discouraged parents from allowing their children to cycle along the route. He supported the proposed improvements set out in Option One, which he believed would help improve the perception of cycling being a safe option.

In debate, for the reasons already put forward by the previous speakers, the majority of members of the Committee supported the proposals to make cycling safer, citing not only the new housing developments as a factor in future increasing demand, but the increase in new employers locating in and around Cambridge. (Astra Zenica and the Cambridge Assessment moving to Brooklands Avenue). It was also agreed that the loss of revenue from lost parking spaces should not override safety concerns. One Member did express concerns that the lack of parking spaces could stifle economic growth where it made it more difficult to drive into Cambridge and find parking, when the Park and Ride provision was not always suitable.

It was resolved:

To approve the implementation of improvements for cyclists and pedestrians on Trumpington Road, subject to Traffic Regulation Orders, consisting of:

- a) the widening of the grassed bank on the east side of Trumpington Road to accommodate a foot and cycleway, segregated by level difference in accordance with Option 1 in this report;
- b) the provision of traffic signals for pedestrians and cyclists to assist them in crossing the exit of Chaucer Road at its junction with Trumpington Road, together with reducing the two lane exit from Chaucer Road to a single lane;
- c) the introduction of a cycle lane in Chaucer Road;
- d) switching the positions of the bus stop and the pedestrian crossing that currently lie on either side of the Bateman Street junction;

- e) removal of the pinch point for cyclists by converting the two stage crossing on Trumpington Road, near Fen Causeway, to a single stage, and;
- f) the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders.

31. A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING REPLACEMENT

This report provided details of the current progress on the development of proposals to relieve congestion on the A605 at King's Dyke level crossing and the findings of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report.

It was reported that following a high level investigation of the seven options set out in Paragraph 3.2 of the report, the evaluation had identified three options (3, 4 & 5 from the list originally put forward) which were considered deliverable in engineering terms. The investigation had concluded that a bridge was technically feasible with the buildable options being:

- Option 3 Part on line, contiguous to the existing highway keeping one or more main line traffic lane flowing under the traffic management control during construction
- Off line alignment to the north
- Off line alignment to the south

It was therefore proposed to hold a public consultation on the above three options in the autumn – the response being considered as a factor in the choice of a single preferred option. In addition, there was a request to appoint a Committee Member to the Project Board. After debate it was proposed by Councillor Schumann and seconded by Councillor Bates to nominate Cllr Clarke as being suitable, being both a local member and also the Leader of Fenland Council. This was supported by the Committee. The key dates in the outline programme were noted as follows, which assumed a straightforward planning and procurement process.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| • Public consultation | November 2014 |
| • Selection of preferred option (via a report back to the Committee) | January 2015 |
| • Planning application and approval | January - June 2015 |
| • Detailed design and procurement | July - January 2016 |
| • Construction | Jan to September 2016 |

Members noted the following clarifications / made comments including:

- A contribution would be sought from Network Rail on the basis that they would

receive benefits from the scheme,

- In response to a question of whether Network Rail had a preferred option, it was reported that they broadly supported any of the bridge options as any scheme to close level crossings where it was practicable to do so was in line with their policy to close level crossings.
- The Vice Chairman expressed concern that again a report was stating that there were no Equality and Diversity Implications while in this case there were clearly issues of access / disability in any proposals for a bridge that would need to be considered and addressed. He expected them to be addressed in the final report.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the findings of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report;
- b) support public consultation on the deliverable options, Option 3 Part on-line, Option 4 off-line alignment to the north and Option 5 off-line alignment to the South;
- c) to approve the appointment of Councillor John Clarke as the Committee member to sit on the Kings Dyke Project Board.

32. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY (CGB) LESSONS LEARNED REVIEW

Following the opening of the Busway in August 2011 the Council had agreed that it would be appropriate to review the CGB construction contract, and that the review should take place once the dispute over the final cost of the CGB was resolved. The views of the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee were sought and in October 2013 Cabinet having taken into consideration the Committee's views, agreed terms of reference for a lessons learned review of the CGB construction contract.

Mr Bill Edwards of EC Harris LLP an independent reviewer was selected from the Institution of Civil Engineers register. His Lessons Learned Review was attached as an appendix. It was noted that his overall conclusion was that the procurement process, the contract conditions and contract administration were appropriate for the time. He did however make some recommendations to improve future contract arrangements as detailed in his report, all of which were acceptable to the officers.

Councillor Mason spoke as a councillor who had always been opposed to the building of the Guided Busway, expressing his disappointment that only one named officer was interviewed, noting that other officers and Cabinet Members were in the past directly involved in the project and their views and experiences could have added value.

He queried:

- That the reviewer had found no engineering problems which could have caused the

problems experienced, and expressed his personal view that the design responsibility having been split between Arup and Bam Nuttall had been a disaster.

- the contractual relationship between several of the named parties.
- the numbering of the report which omitted paragraphs 4.3.4 and 4.35 and asked whether this was a numbering error or whether they had been purposely omitted. In response it was clarified that this had been a numbering error and the report was complete with no sections suppressed.
- Whether the huge difference in the number of compensation event notices issued by the Project Manager compared to those issued by the contractor (the latter having issued nearly four times as many) reflected the Council's weakness during the legal arbitration proceedings.

He concluded that the recommendations having been carefully worded required to be carefully considered, in particularly highlighting Recommendation 8 concerning contract administration being undertaken by appropriately and experienced staff as being one that Members should take on board and implement as soon as possible.

Questions / issues raised by Members of the Committee included:

- Asking what action the Council would be undertaking in relation to the recommendations. In response it was explained that officers had no issues with any of the recommendations which would be taken on board.
- The Vice Chairman echoed Councillor Mason's concerns that so few officers were interviewed and that the report did not refer to the Member appetite for the scheme, which had ensured that the Project had kept to a robust timetable and itself could have been seen to have contributed to the problems the Project encountered. In response it was reported that a list of all the officers from all sides involved in the project had been provided, and it had been the independent reviewer's decision on who to interview. The assessor was also provided with all copies of relevant Cabinet reports from April 2004. It was however acknowledged that Councillors names had not been provided to him. There was criticism on this later point, as it was suggested that the list provided should have also included councillors closely involved, even if they were no longer serving. It was proposed and fully supported by the Committee that Mr Edwards should be invited to attend a future Spokes meeting to present his report findings personally and answer further questions. **Action Bob Menzies.**
- In relation to a question on where the Council now stood in that Atkins had been taken over by Skansa, it was clarified that the former still remained responsible for work they had undertaken in the past.
- Another Member was disappointed that the report focused on the structural consequences of the project and did not provide much commentary on the breakdown of the relationship between the Council side and Bam Nuttall.

- What was agreed was that 10 years ago the ECI Model type of contract, now being recommended, was discouraged by the Department of Transport's major funding scheme requirements. The report did not suggest any officers had acted irresponsibly. In reply as an update, it was indicated that there was now more scope to use ECI framework contracts and they had been used in respect of the Addenbrooke's Access Road and the Huntingdon West of Town Centres Link Road.
- The major theme of independent design decisions being left to the contractor was one of the main lessons which needed to be taken on board, especially with the Council due to become involved in major schemes as part of the City Deal etc. There was the need to ensure necessary in-house contractual expertise or if this was not available, this required to be purchased. In response to this later point, it was highlighted that the Council do employ external expert consultants when there was not the in-house expertise and this was the case with this project, supervised through Atkins.
- There was a request for explanation on the section of the report in relation to project governance and the Steering Group in relation to the criticism that it became involved in more detailed issues. In response, details were provided of the Steering Group's membership. While the intention had been to take a strategic overview, it became involved in more detailed issues as a result of the contractor's continuous poor performance.
- In respect of lobbying the Government to put pressure on the Department for Transport (DfT) to change their funding mechanisms to make ECI contracts more feasible, it was indicated that this was a national issue, but that the Treasury was starting to take notice of the concerns that local government and other sectors continued to express about the impact of funding approval mechanisms on contract options and infrastructure delivery.
- In reply to a question from one Member of whether there were any bonds in place that the Council could fall back on to require Bam Nuttall to put the defects right, details were provided of the 10 Year Reducing Bond which still had seven years to run.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the findings of the Review.
- b) To invite Mr Edwards the independent reviewer to a future Spokes meeting to be agreed.

33. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - JULY 2014

This report provided the Committee with the July 2014 Finance and Performance information for the ETE Service.

It was highlighted that at the end of July, that ETE was forecasting a year-end underspend on revenue of £24,000 and a year-end underspend on capital of £17.283 million. It was highlighted that there were two significant areas of forecast underspend

within the Committee's responsibility, in relation to the Science Park Station, where the expectation was that the project would be taken over by Network Rail and as such, the Council would not incur any further costs, and on the Connecting Cambridgeshire project, where the take up of funding by businesses in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire has been lower than predicted.

On the twenty-three ETE performance indicators, three were currently red, six amber and fourteen green. None were expected to be red at yearend.

On a number of issues raised the Committee was reminded that it should limit itself to issues within the Economy and Environment Committee remit and in relation to street lighting, waste recycling and road safety statistics concerns, these should be referred to colleagues who were Members on the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee.

Issues raised / queries answered included:

- Whether the Park and Ride collection equipment was fit for purpose, following the introduction of parking charges. In response it was indicated that new machines were on order which would increase the number of machines available at each site, and that there were a number of options for on-line payment for both regular and occasional users. The Chairman indicated that he would be visiting the various sites after Christmas to review the operational effectiveness of the new machines and any Committee Members would be welcome to join him.
- Members were advised that as a result of issues of a number of thefts, the option of paying cash at the Guided Busway Ticket machines had been withdrawn and the machines would only take credit or debit cards with cash payments now accepted on the buses. However for clarification it was indicated that cash payments were still being accepted at the Park and Ride sites, with the machines being emptied every evening.
- As a further issue in relation to the above, one Member raised the issue of the size of keys to input data being an issue for some elderly or disabled people and asked if larger size keys to allow greater accessibility for them could be looked into, for the new machines. **Action Bob Menzies to raise with manufacturer.**
- In reply to a question it was confirmed that there was sufficient parking space capacity to accommodate the additional demand expected to arise from new developments in and around Cambridge for the foreseeable future. In terms of additional buses being placed on Busway routes, this would depend on demand.
- In relation to issues of capacity on the southern section of the Busway where the bridges limited the operation to single deck vehicles on sections of the route, one member explained the concerns that had been expressed by Stagecoach.
- There was also discussion regarding safety issues on the Busway and the minimum gap required between buses. The Member who raised the issue agreed to share a letter he had received from the Department for Transport with officers. **Councillor Williams to action.**

- It was clarified that it was necessary to pay the Park and Ride parking charge before boarding and not as part of a return journey and that parking was only free if a vehicle was on site for less than an hour. There was a request from the Chairman for the Committee to be provided with a copy of the operational leaflet included at park and ride sites in relation to the new charging arrangements.

Action: Bob Menzies

It was resolved unanimously:

To review and note the report.

34. BUSINESS PLANNING CAPITAL PROPOSALS AND RELATED ISSUES

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Capital Programme for Economy, Transport and Environment.

An update on table 4.3 on page 5 of the report showing how ETE's borrowing position has changed since the 2014-15 Capital Programme was set had been provided to Members of the Committee in advance of the meeting with hard copies made available at the meeting. The revised table information was as follows

Borrowing Figures	2015-16 £'000	2016-17 £'000	2017-18 £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	Later Yrs £'000
Previous borrowing as per 14/15 plan	45,934	35,873	12,494	4,423	-4,576	-7,182
Proposed borrowing	20,329	12,741	16,675	11,255	4,055	5,424
Change in borrowing	-25,605	-23,132	+4,181	+6,832	+8,631	+12,606

Specific attention was drawn that the Government had confirmed that Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding allocations had been reduced from £5.707m in 2014 to £3.190m in 2015 due to the funding being top sliced towards the Government's City Deal process. Paragraph 4.6.4 set out details of other successful grant bids. The reduced ITB Funding had resulted in an initial review of the ITB across services to reduce and rationalise the programme as detailed in 4.6.8. The proposed budget allocations were:

Budget head	Proposed allocation(000's)
Air Quality Monitoring	23
Major scheme development	400
Strategy Development and Integrated Transport Schemes	345
Delivering Strategy Aims / Transport Delivery Plan	700
Cambridgeshire Sustainable Transport Improvements	646

It was highlighted that:

- The Cambridge Science Park Station scheme was expected to be taken on by Network Rail who would fully fund it and therefore no Council contribution would be required. However until this was confirmed, funding remained in place.
- The total scheme cost of Ely Crossing had increased from £31m to £35m with the increase to be funded from Prudential Borrowing. King's Dyke borrowing had reduced to £2m from the previous £5m, with growth funding award of £5m, while the previous assumption that Network Rail would contribute £3m was still to be confirmed.

In reply to a question on Member input, it was confirmed that the schemes were not yet fully finalised and local member suggestions / engagement would be welcomed.

Members' comments included:

- Concern being expressed at the poor performance by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership in bidding for central government Growth Deal monies and asking what assistance could be provided to improve future bidding success. In reply it was reported that the County Council, Peterborough City Council and the districts were already offering increased officer expertise going forward.
- With reference to the programme proposed, one Committee Member representing St Neots expressed his concern that the proposed programme provided no specific allocation to support infrastructure to support the growth in the St Neots area, highlighting the need for additional river crossing bridges. In reply it was indicated that currently with the limited resources available from Government, the Council was restricted in relation to the schemes it could take forward. The Chairman made the offer to meet with the Councillor and other County and District Councillors for St Neots to look into possible partnership solutions.
- With reference to the tables in paragraph 4.2 and 4.3 it was suggested that more contextual detail should have been provided in terms of the current year allocations as the programme started from 2015/16. It was explained that the tables showed the position going forward and the current allocation details for 2014/15 was in fact set out in the text of the report.
- One Member made reference to a City Deal Wing Project being proposed by Marshall. The Chairman asked him to provide more detail to the Committee outside of the meeting. **Cllr Henson to action**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the overview and context provided for the 2015-16 Capital Programme for Economy, transport and Environment.

- b) note the draft proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment's 2015-16 Capital Programme and endorse their development.

35. ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT (ETE) RISK REGISTER UPDATE

This report provided the Economy and Environment Committee with details of Economy, Transport and Environment Directorate risks.

In accordance with best practice it was explained that the Council operated a risk management approach at corporate and directorate levels across the Council seeking to identify any key risks which might prevent the Council's priorities, as stated in the Business Plan and in service plans, from being successfully achieved. It explained the respective roles of the General Purposes Committee and the Audit and Accounts Committee and this Service Committee's role in relation to receiving a half yearly update report to ensure:

- service risk registers are maintained on a timely basis, i.e. subject to quarterly review by service management
- that actions designed to better manage risk are implemented on a timely basis
- to discuss specific risk issues as appropriate.

It was explained that risks were identified on the basis of their inherent risk if no action was taken, along with key controls and actions to mitigate them, resulting in a revised residual risk rating. Section 2.3 set out the detailed risk management process used with Appendix 3 illustrating the 16 identified Directorate risks, none of which were currently showing at red residual level. The appendix provided details of the risk, key controls, actions and owners of the risk and actions, along with target dates.

Issues raised by Members included:

- On CCR9 - Failure to secure funding for infrastructure - whether this was rated as a high enough scored residual risk on the basis of the perception from some Members that there appeared to be increasing pressure on Members to agree reports with reduced Section 106 settlements. In response it was indicated that the risks rating was based on the mitigation in place or in the process of being developed.
- CRR22 - Cambridgeshire Future Transport failing to deliver effective, efficient and responsive passenger transport services around Cambridgeshire – that some members saw this as being one of the highest risk areas for potential failure.
- ETE RR2 – Failure to effectively plan how the Council will deliver services to cover over the five year business planning commencing 2015/16 – discussion on the larger role for continued digital transformation in the future delivery of services and the risks that it involved.
- ETE RR9 – Significant changes to service provision and organisational structure within ETE as result of implementing business plan proposals – in relation to recent business planning workshops and the discussions on opportunities for change, a

question was raised on how much feedback was being given to staff from the discussion at the meetings. It was explained that at the current time this would not have been appropriate, as they were confidential discussions on proposals that were only at the formative stage.

- A number of Members questioned why there was no information on how risks had changed from previous reports. In reply it was indicated that as this was the first report to the new Committee, it showed the current position as a starting point and that future reports would highlight changes in any risk as well as any new risks requiring to be added.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the position in respect of Economy, Transport and Environment Directorate Risk.

36. ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT WITH NANJING

This report provided an update on the progress of discussions with business organisations and the universities on their involvement in an economic partnership agreement with Nanjing.

The Committee was reminded that when this issue was considered by Full Council, it was agreed that any partnership agreement would need to be led by the private sector as the principal benefits would fall to them and due to the very limited capacity available in the Council's Enterprise and Economy team. At the time of writing the report, the discussions with businesses and business organisations had produced mixed results, with some interest expressed in exploring an agreement further (providing it did not exclude agreements with other areas in China), but a limited willingness to lead on co-ordinating the resulting activities. In addition to this mixed response from the business community, a draft of a 'co-operation plan' from the Nanjing Foreign Affairs Office was still awaited and there been no further contact since the 9th June visit.

In discussion it was suggested by two Members that the slow progress indicated that the initiative had failed and that no further scarce County Council officer time should be deployed. It was clarified that Nanjing had approached the Council to facilitate an agreement. Those who had business dealings with the Far East recognised that progress was often very slow and patience was needed, but to not respond if further interest was shown would send out the wrong message in terms of Cambridge being ready to do business. It was clarified in terms of further Council officer time, that this would be restricted to a small number of follow up telephone calls, as to take forward the initiative further now required the lead being taken over by the business community.

An amendment to the recommendation was moved by Councillor Hipkin and seconded by Councillor Lay amending the original recommendation to read: "To note the **slow** progress made in exploring an economic partnership agreement with Nanjing **and agree that no further action is taken by the Council in respect of this partnership**". On being put to the vote it was defeated.

It was resolved to:

To note the progress made in exploring an economic partnership agreement with Nanjing, and agree that further progress be reported to a future meeting.

37. APPOINTMENT OF HEALTH CHAMPION: HEALTH COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

The Committee received a report seeking it to appoint a Health Champion to promote joined up working on transport issues between the Economy and Environment Committee, Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, the Health Committee and Public Health.

It was resolved unanimously:

To appoint Councillor Joshua Schumann as the Committee Health Champion to promote joined up working on transport issues between the Economy and Environment Committee, Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, the Health Committee and Public Health.

38. APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS, AND PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

The Committee was asked to consider three further partnership, liaison and advisory group appointments which had been identified since the last Committee meeting.

It was resolved unanimously to agree the following appointments to the following Groups:

a) Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group

To endorse the current appointments to the above Group agreed initially by Spokes, namely Councillors Ian Bates, John Hipkin and David Jenkins in order to ensure continuity and the also the revised substitute arrangements as follows:

- Cllr van de Ven to be replaced by Councillor Ed Cearn as the substitute for Councillor Jenkins
- Councillor Mike Mason to be the substitute for Councillor Hipkin
- Councillor John Reynolds to be the substitute for Councillor Bates

b) The East-West Rail Consortium Central Section Member Steering Group.

To appoint Councillor Bates to this Group and Councillor Cearn as his substitute.

c) Joint East Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Member and Officer Steering Group for Planning and Transport.

To appoint the following three Members to this Group:

Councillor Ian Bates with his substitute being Councillor Shuter
Councillor David Brown
Councillor Joshua Schumann.

39. 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.

40. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. 21ST OCTOBER 2014

Noted

Chairman
21st October 2014