

## **ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> January 2016

**Time:** 10.00a.m. to 11.38p.m.

**Present:** Councillors: P Ashcroft (substitute for Councillor Lay), I Bates (Chairman), E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), J Clark, L Harford, R Henson, N Kavanagh, M Mason, M McGuire, J Schumann, M Shuter, A Walsh and J Williams.

**Also present:** None.

**Apologies:** Councillor A Lay.

### **COUNCILLOR STEVE VAN DE KERKHOVE**

The Chairman reported the death of Councillor Steve Van de Kerkhove who was a substitute member on the Committee and a popular and valued Member of the Council. As a mark of respect, all those present stood and observed a minutes' silence.

### **183. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bates declared a non-prejudicial interest in Minute 187 'Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board Delegations' as a substitute Member on the City Deal Executive Board.

### **184. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

Minute 177 Planning Obligations Strategy deletion in bullet 3 under 'Members comments' the words "South Cambridgeshire" and after the words "District Council" adding an 's' at the end so it reads "District Councils".

It was unanimously resolved:

To note the updates on the Minutes Action Log.

### **185. PETITIONS**

There were no petitions to be considered.

### **186. CHERRY HINTON HIGH STREET – APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT**

In the early 1990s a traffic calming scheme was introduced in Cherry Hinton High Street which has been successful in reducing traffic speeds and accidents. However, by modern standards, the High Street is dominated by pedestrian guardrails, signage and general street clutter. In addition, cyclists often fail to use the narrow lanes currently provided. In 2012 the Council's Cabinet approved the use of £275,000 of Section 106 / area corridor planning funds to develop a scheme to enhance facilities for cyclists and

to improve the general street scape, with the current report explaining the scheme development process followed and seeking the Committee's approval to build the scheme.

Section 2 set out the details of the consultation process undertaken. It was highlighted that 431 responses had been received, mainly from local people. 78% of responders supported the removal of cycle bollard islands, 86% supported removing unnecessary signs, railings, bollards and street furniture and 64% supported the introduction of 1.5 metre wide cycle lanes. There was less support (50%) for removing the mini roundabouts in the High Street.

It was explained that the narrow road width limited the possibilities for improving cycling infrastructure as there was insufficient width to provide segregation for cyclists by moving kerb lines. Shared use paths for pedestrians and cyclists had been ruled out in such a busy local centre. As a result, they could only be designated as advisory cycle lanes. The key components of the scheme proposed the removal of numerous traffic islands and narrow cycle bypass lanes, the omission of the road centre line, amendments to two bus stop areas and the introduction of advisory cycle lanes. The proposals were shown on Plan 1 and Plan 2 of the officers' report with the detail, set out in Section 4 of the report.

It was highlighted that the scheme had the support of local Councillors, and efforts had been made to ensure that all initiatives within the High Street, including the City Council's Public Realm Scheme were joined up to ensure the best value for public funds and a minimal period of disruption for local residents and businesses.

The local County Council Member for Cherry Hinton spoke in support of the scheme proposals, explaining that the existing layout contributed to the massive congestion at peak times. She had concerns that the proposed advisory cycle lanes could still result in cyclists being forced onto pavements at peak times. She highlighted that once the scheme was implemented, there should be careful monitoring, to ascertain if further modifications were required. She also queried whether the popular suggestion in the consultation for gates at each end of the village (to force traffic onto the bypass points) could be brought back into the Plan. In response, paragraph 4.8 of the report was highlighted which explained the post scheme monitoring to be undertaken. In terms of adding gates, this could not be included, due to the limit on funding received from the section 106 agreement. Should additional monies become available from further developments at a later date, other enhancements might be revisited. The point was made that current signage did encourage use of bypass points.

Comments / queries from Members of the Committee included:

- One Member supported the removal of the islands to aid the movement of buses but had concerns regarding buses and large commercial vehicles straying into the cycle lanes and also asked how the cycle lanes would cope with the laybys included in the scheme. In response, it was explained that the current block paving and high kerbs were to be removed and replaced with asphalt to stop cyclists having to move out into the road. In addition the 20 mile per hour speed limit to be introduced would also help improve the overall safety of cyclists.

- With reference to the City Council urban realm improvements to shop fronts and the picture shown in the report, one Member expressed concern regarding proposals to plant trees near the highway and asked for details on the relevant Policy governing tree planting on / near highways, as he had concerns regarding potential damage. In response it was agreed to provide the details outside of the meeting, with the point made that the area shown was on private shop frontage and was therefore not on the public highway. The expectation was also that planting would involve tree species which would not damage pavements. **Action**
- Members praised the use of illustrations in this report to help with the visualisation of the proposals and it was suggested that they should be included as standard in future development / transport improvement scheme reports.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the scheme development process set out in sections 2 and 3 of the officer's report.
- b) approve the scheme proposals set out in Section 4, paragraph 4.3 of the officer's report and
- c) note the programme for delivery of the scheme as set out in paragraph 5.3 of the officer's report.

## **187. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD DELEGATIONS**

This report had been referred from Constitution and Ethics Committee to this Committee and Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee in order to consider and comment on proposals to clarify the delegation of powers previously made to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board for promoting and exercising different types of orders for projects included in the City Deal. The aim was to facilitate the smooth functioning of the governance arrangements (particularly the delivery of the infrastructure investment programme on a very tight timescale) and to recommend them to Full Council to make the appropriate changes to the Constitution.

The proposals included a definition of City Deal Infrastructure schemes, Compulsory Purchase Orders, Side Roads Orders, and Transport and Works Act Orders as detailed in paragraphs 2.5 to 2.14.

Committee Members comments included:

- In response to one Member asking how the two relevant service committees would be consulted on before the Board agreed specific matters for which there was a statutory duty to consult (as the relevant highways authority) it was explained that the terms of reference for the Board agreed by all three Councils surrendered sovereignty on specific functions, in order to be able to speed up the decision making process without having to refer back to each individual council. Without this streamlining of the decision making process, the millions of pounds of additional funding from Central Government would not have been secured.

- One Member sought guidance on local member involvement in the decision making process. In response, it was explained that there would be an agreed protocol which would include the development of a liaison forum for each area with local members to be consulted on all schemes developed in their area, with the final decisions to then be taken by the Board. The Executive Director suggested that this protocol could be made available to the Committee following its agreement through the City Deal. **Action**
- One Member asked how voters' views would be taken into account. As a response another Member made the point that each Council had agreed to appoint elected members to sit on the Board to help represent their constituents' views. Councillor Bates indicated he would be happy to explain the governance arrangements to Councillor Henson outside of the meeting.
- A number of members voiced their support of the proposals which they agreed were needed to enable speedier decision making.

It was resolved unanimously to recommend and endorse and propose to Council that:

- a) the powers for promoting and exercising Compulsory Purchase Order powers for City Deal infrastructure schemes is confirmed as being delegated to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;
- b) the powers for promoting and exercising Side Roads Orders for City Deal infrastructure schemes is confirmed as being delegated to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board; and
- c) the power to promote Transport and Works Act Orders for City Deal infrastructure schemes is confirmed as being delegated to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.

## **188. REVIEW OF ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR 2016/17**

As a result of adopting the Operating Model, and the Council moving towards an outcome-based approach, there were implications for how performance would be monitored going forward. This report therefore sought a review of the Committee's key performance indicators with the proposed set of Economy and Environment (E&E) performance indicators for the 2016/17 Strategic Framework attached as Appendix A to the officers' report.

The current report set out proposals for the "high level" E&E performance indicators in the Council's Strategic Framework document. It was proposed that the remaining, "lower level", E & E indicators would be reviewed in February / March 2016 following publication of the Council's Business Plan.

The report proposed the following changes to the Strategic Framework for 2016-17:

- the indicator titled 'Wider Outcomes of Adult Learning' should be removed. The intention was still to retain the key adult learning indicator measuring adult learners in the most deprived wards completing courses to improve their chances of learning or employment. This had been changed by the Committee in May 2015 so that its focus was on just the most deprived electoral divisions.
- a new indicator was proposed to be added titled '% of premises in Cambridgeshire with access to at least superfast broadband'. Additionally, the intention was to report on take-up in the intervention area, as part of the superfast broadband rollout programme.

Members' comments included:

- One Member querying the definition of 'access' in the new indicator as she had concerns relating to the access being offered. In response it was explained that the Council was only providing access to a provider in areas where there was no current commercial provider, or access to superfast broadband. The Council was not providing a greater choice of provider and where there was already a commercial provider for the area, the Council would not be providing an alternative.
- One Member queried why the top three indicators in Appendix A were Economy and Environment Committee indicators when he thought there was a case for them being classed as corporate indicators. (i.e. 'Proportion of Cambs residents aged 16-64 in Employment', 'Additional Jobs created per year' and 'Number of people starting apprenticeships') As a response it was indicated that this was due to economy and jobs creation being within E and E Committee's remit. The Member accepted this on the basis that they were recognised as a whole Council responsibility and not just E&E's.
- A question was raised regarding what future cycling / walking schemes were in the pipeline for Fenland to help increase levels of cycling / walking. In reply the response was that currently there were not many, other than upgrading footways in Wisbech. This was mainly due to the challenges in securing necessary funding. ETE officers were working with Health colleagues to try to access additional funding.
- One Member queried the indicator titled 'the average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes' which had as its primary outcome 'The Cambridgeshire economy prospers to the benefit of all Cambridgeshire residents' as currently congestion was getting worse. It was suggested the target should be looked at again in terms of alternative wording such as 'To reduce journey times to improve the economy'.
- One Member queried whether the change in legislation regarding the requirements to be in training or education until the age of 18, impacted on the indicator reading 'The Proportion of Cambridgeshire residents aged 16-64 in employment' and if it should be changed to '18-64'. Officers agreed to look at this and other issues raised and to report back. **Action**

Having commented, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the proposed Economy and Environment key performance indicators for the 2016-17 Strategic Framework as set out in Appendix A of the officer's report.
- b) Officers investigating and reporting back on whether it was more appropriate to change the age group for the performance indicator on the proportion of Cambridgeshire residents in employment from '16-64' to '18-64' to reflect the change in the law requiring people to undergo education or training until the age of 18.

## **189. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER 2015**

This report provided the Committee with an opportunity to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position as at the end of November 2015, with the presenting officer highlighting that the figures on page 2 were for November even though all references stated they were still for the period to the end of September.

The key issues highlighted were:

- at the end of November, ETE was forecasting a year-end underspend on revenue of £204,000.
- At the end of November, ETE was forecasting an underspend on Capital of £33.3m with two changes highlighted since the last Committee in relation to the Guided Busway and the City Deal as set out in paragraph 2.4. of the report.

In relation to the twelve E&E Committee performance indicators set for 2015-16, two were currently showing as red, two amber and eight green. The indicators currently red were 'the number of people in deprived wards completing courses to improve their chances of employment or progression in work' and 'the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area'. The updated current forecast for year-end, was that none of the indicators would be red, seven would be amber and five green.

Members raised issues including the following:

- One Member noting the capital slippage on the Guided Busway to 2016/17 was due to the uncertainty on the timing over the final land deal and retention payments, queried whether the slippage related mainly to one location? In reply it was reported that the large land deals had been settled, with the money being held for smaller land deals and as a contingency against possible compensation claims from adjacent properties.
- Another query from the same Member was on concessionary fares and whether where a bus journey involved a change of buses and a concessionary card had to be shown, the Council was charged twice. It was confirmed this would be the case, but that individual breakdowns were not provided to the Council.

- A further query from the same Member was regarding the progress on being reimbursed by central government for the monies the County Council had spent on the development of Cambridge North Station. In response it was reported that discussions were still ongoing and the subject of further reminders, now that construction work was underway.
- Another Member queried the underspend on the City Deal, expressing his concern regarding whether it would be possible to spend the money already allocated. In reply it was explained that the estimates at the start of the year were very broad brush and that the programme of schemes was on course. It was clarified that the £20m provided as part of the City Deal each year was given at the beginning of the year, as opposed to only being provided on delivery of the scheme. There was therefore a benefit to the Council in having the money even when it was not fully utilised in any one year, and that the expectation was that spend would accelerate on schemes in the later years of the agreement.
- On the Adult Learning and Skills performance indicator relating to the number of people in the most deprived wards completing courses to improve their chances of employment or progression in work, one Member expressed her doubt whether the year-end target would be met, and asked if it was possible to provide in future reports an indication of whether it was believed the target would be achieved. She also asked whether there could be included, a measure of the quality of the courses provided. Officers responded highlighting that with the upturn in the economy unemployment was reducing across the County, including in the most deprived areas. As a result, some people would not have completed their courses, having secured employment. There was to be a report to a forthcoming meeting on 'Adult Learning & Skills Review' which would look at the issues raised. **Action**
- With reference to Appendix 6 (page 73 of the sequential numbering and page 15 of the original report) and the text reading "land acquisition and licence agreements need to be completed to allow construction to commence on Yaxley to Farcet and the new link through Babraham Research Campus" as this agreement had been outstanding for a considerable period of time, a question was raised regarding at what the point in the Council's Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) policy was the trigger reached to go ahead with a CPO. It was explained as a response that there was no one trigger point as each CPO was different and treated on its own merits.
- A further query was also raised by another Member regarding the land sale issues above asking whether, as land had just been sold in the area, this would require the Council to go through the CPO process again, it was agreed an update on the current position would be sought from Legal and a written response provided outside of the meeting to Councillors McGuire and Henson. **Action**
- With reference to appendix 5 the reserve schedule, Councillor Shuter requested an explanation of the budget line titled 'Discover Cambs Tourism Brochure' and whether it was money for the new DMO post or to the City Council, querying why the County Council was involved, in tourism, a district responsibility. It was

agreed this would be looked into and a written response provided outside of the meeting. **Action.**

- In response to a question regarding concessionary fares, it was explained that the Council would not be looking to take over a route from a commercial operator who had withdrawn on commercial grounds, while also clarifying the commonly repeated misconception that the previous bus operators Whippet had provided inaccurate information on concessionary fare numbers, when this was not the case and the issue was in respect of total passenger numbers only.

Having commented and requested updates in certain cases outside of the meeting, It was unanimously resolved:

To note the report.

## **190. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2016/17 TO 2020/21**

This report provided the Committee with an updated overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue proposals for the Economy, Transport and Environment Service including the elements of that budget that werewithin the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee.

Section 2 of the report provided a summary of the Draft Revenue Budget. In order to balance the budget in light of the cost increases and reduced Government funding, savings, efficiencies or additional income of £42.9m wererequired for 2016-17, and a total of £121m across the full five years of the Business Plan. The savings target for ETE in 2016/17 was £6,815k with further significant savings required in subsequent years. The current expected savings requirement for the next five years was shown in Table 2.

The report updated the Committee that the November Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee and this Committee had asked officers to re-consider six savings proposals totalling £1,666k as set out in the table below. The Executive Director highlighted the following savings in ETE recommended to be removed by Highways & Community Infrastructure and Economy & Environment Committees in December:

The Executive Director highlighted the following savings in ETE recommended to be removed by Highways & Community Infrastructure and Economy & Environment Committees in December:

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>2016/17 Impact £'000</b>	<b>2017/18 Impact £'000</b>
ETE	HCI	Reactive highway maintenance	452	
ETE	HCI	Cyclic highway maintenance	217	
ETE	HCI	Mobile libraries	55	105



<b>ETE</b>	<b>EE</b>	<b>Fenland Learning Centres</b>		<b>90</b>
<b>ETE</b>	<b>EE</b>	<b>Reduction in Passenger Transport Services</b>	<b>694</b>	
Total			1,418	195

The next table on the same page of the report highlighted further savings of £1,229,000 were being proposed to be recommended to General Purposes Committee of which the following addition related to Economy and Environment Committee:

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>2016/17 Impact £'000</b>	<b>2017/18 Impact £'000</b>
ETE	EE/Health	Market town transport strategy – public health impact	40	

In addition to the changes recommended by Committees and included in section 2 of the report, ongoing reviews of the Business Plan proposals by officers had resulted in further proposed changes. These were detailed in a table with explanation provided and also included in the budget tables at Appendix 2 with those relating to Economy and Environment Committee shown below:

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Previous figures</b>	<b>Change</b>
B/R.6.213	Market Town Transport Strategy – savings required due to change in Public Health Grant. The Health Committee would be looking at this.	2016/17 £0k	£40k
B/R.6.214	Fenland Learning Service – Savings required due to change in Public Health Grant. This was to be taken out of the Health Services Budget with the expectation that the Health Committee would be bidding for its replacement from Corporate funding.	2017/18 £0k	£90k
B/R.7.118	Review of charges across ETE	2016/17 £45k	Increased by £80k to £125k to fund the shortfall in B/R.6.114 Withdrawal of funding

			for school crossing patrols.
--	--	--	------------------------------

It was reported orally that Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee had with the exception of the withdrawal of County Council funding for school crossing patrols (ref: B/R6.114) and an adjustment to the hours the Council will keep street lights on endorsed the proposals as set out to go forward to the General Purposes Committee as part of consideration of the Council's overall Business Plan.

It was highlighted that the draft Capital Programme which had been reviewed individually by service committees in September had subsequently been reviewed in its entirety, along with the prioritisation of schemes, by General Purposes Committee (GPC) in October. No changes were made as a result of these reviews, though work has been ongoing to revise and update the programme in light of changes to overall funding or to individual schemes and any changes, if required, being presented to the December service committee meetings.

Members' comments / questions included:

- Councillor Clarke thanking the Committee for their support in relation to the Fenland Learning Centre.
- One Member asking whether it was likely that there would be further reductions in income as a result of the Park and Ride Charges previously introduced. In reply there was no expectation of any further reductions from the current plateau following their introduction in July 2014. Going forward there was an expectation with more growth that demand leading to subsequent increased income. To put it in context, the Chairman made the point that he had recently visited Oxford's Park and Ride System who were charging £2.50 per parked car.
- The Vice Chairman made the point that in relation to the challenges raised by the need to raise more revenue, a more commercial approach was required to be adopted and that corporate funding was needed in order to be able to transform services. Officers highlighted that there were very few areas within ETE where it was permissible legally to raise fees beyond cost recovery, other than for example in land holding and property letting.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the overview and context provided for the 2016/17 to 2020/21 Business Plan proposals for the Service updated since the last report to the Committee in November.
- b) Note on the draft revenue savings proposals that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2016/17 to 2020/21, and endorse them for the General Purposes Committee, as part of consideration of the Council's overall Business Plan.
- c) Note the changes to the capital programme that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee and endorse them.

- d) Note the ongoing stakeholder consultation and discussion with partners and service users regarding emerging business planning proposals.

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

The Committee was asked to note progress in developing the Committee Training Plan and to consider if invitations should be extended on any sessions to other Members. In respect of the latter, and in order to have a discussion on suggested additions to the Plan, plus changes to the standard presentation, it was moved by Councillor Cearns and seconded by Councillor Bates to have an item on the next Spokes agenda.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) to note the future training sessions as listed in appendix one (as updated in the Member briefing).
- b) In terms of extending invitations to any of the listed sessions to members of other Committees, this should be considered along with any other new training requests and suggestions on changes to presentations format by including a discussion item at the next Economy and Environment spokes meeting.
- c) To note the need to sign an attendance sheet when attending training sessions, so that their attendance is accurately recorded.

#### **192. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS AND THE HEALTH AND WELL BEING CHAMPION**

The Committee were asked to agree appointments as follows:

- i) Appointments to a new Outside Body –One Member and substitute appointment to the Ouse Washes Steering Group.

It was reported that in discussion, Spokes supported that these should be the Chairman Cllr Bates and Cllr Mason as his named substitute in cases where Councillor Bates was unable to attend.

- ii) New appointments to Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups

- a) Member Project Board for Soham Station – Three County Council Members - preferably from those representing East Cambridgeshire and not already appointed from the district council

An oral update by the Chairman indicated he had received the three appointments to be made by East Cambridgeshire District Council and he therefore proposed councillors, Palmer, Rouse and Schumann to represent the County Council.

b) England's Economic Heartland Strategic Alliance - Strategic Transport Forum – Leader of the Council and Councils Transport Portfolio Holder.

Each authority on the Alliance had been approached with the recommendation that the above new Forum should have as their representation their Leader and their Strategic Transport portfolio holder. As Cambridgeshire does not have a Cabinet system and relevant Portfolio it was proposed that the Chairman should represent the Economy and Environment Committee to accompany the Leader. Officers highlight the need to amend the recommendation to read “the Leader and to appoint one Economy and Environment Committee member” to make clear the intention of the appointments to this Forum.

The nominations moved by the Chairman and seconded by the Vice Chairman were agreed without challenge.

Democratic Services provided the following update to the Committee Forward Plan since publication of the agenda:

- Rescheduling the following Committee report from 19<sup>th</sup> April to 24<sup>th</sup> May:
- Ely Southern Bypass - Award of Contract for Design & Construction

On the basis of the number of reports now scheduled for the reserve date in April, it was noted that this meeting would now need to take place and should no longer be classed as a reserve date.

It was resolved to:

a) approve the following outside appointments:

- i) Ouse Washes Steering Group - Councillor Bates as the main Council representative and Councillor Mason as his substitute
- ii) Soham Station Project Board - Councillors James Palmer, Mike Rouse and Joshua Schumann.
- iii) England's Economic Heartland Strategic Alliance Strategic Transport Forum - The Leader and Chairman Cllr Bates.

b) note the agenda plan as updated at the meeting including the April meeting changing from a reserve date to a confirmed date.

**193. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10A.M.TUESDAY 8<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2016**

Chairman  
8<sup>TH</sup> March 2016