

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 10th August 2017

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 12.15 p.m.

Present: Councillors: D Adey, D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, N Kavanagh, L Harford (substitute for S Tierney), T Sanderson (substitute for D Giles), J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman).

Apologies: Councillors D Giles and S Tierney.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

22. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th July 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

23. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minute Action Log update which was considered under Chairman's discretion, as it had not been finalised in time to be included in the initial agenda despatch, was noted.

24. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No petitions were received.

One general question on safety issues on the guided busway was received from John Lloyd, which, while it did not relate to a report on the agenda, the Chairman agreed to allow using his Chairman discretionary powers due to the public concern raised by recent high profile incidents.

Question " Are there any guidelines issued to drivers on maximum speed limits on different areas of the busway; are they monitored and enforced and are there any proposals to reduce them?"

As an initial oral response it was confirmed that there were written guidelines for drivers and monitoring was undertaken. Discussions were currently being undertaken on introducing additional automated checks. There were no plans to revise the different speed limits already operating on sections of the guided busway as if adhered to, they were considered appropriate.

A more detailed written response would be sent to the questioner no later than 10 working days following the meeting.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

With the agreement of the meeting, the Chairman proposed to change the order of the agenda to take item 5 the Kings Dyke level Crossing closure report later on the agenda and to take the next three reports before it, due to the public interest and the number of speakers for items 6, 7 and 8.

25. CHANGES TO WHIPPET SERVICES

The Committee received a report explaining that the County Council had received notification from Whippet Coaches two months previously that they would be deregistering the following bus routes from 3rd September 2017:

Commercial services

Service 1	Hilton – Hemingfords - St Ives
Service 1A	St Ives – Fenstanton – Cambridge
Service 5	St Ives - Hemingford Abbots - Hemingford Grey - St Ives
Service 16	Huntingdon - Oxmoor Circular
Service 21	St Ives - Earith - Somersham – Ramsey
Service 45A	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 117	Cambridge City Centre - Fen Estate

Contracted services

Service 2	Cambridge - Hardwick - Toft - Caldecote – Boxworth
Service 3	Papworth St Agnes – Papworth Everard – Huntingdon (Saturday journeys only)
Service 7A	Whittlesford - Babraham Road Park & Ride
Service 8	Cambridge - Dry Drayton - Papworth Everard
Service 9	St Ives - Elsworth – Hilton
Service 12	St Ives Town Circular
Service 15	St Ives - Swavesey – Over
Service 18	Newmarket - Fulbourn – Teversham – Cambridge
Service 45	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 114	Cambridge City Centre - Grafton - Beehive – Addenbrookes

While the commercial services had no resource implication at the time the report was written, the contracted services had a net annual budget commitment of £268,857. As the County Council had a duty under the 1985 Transport Act to consider whether replacement services were required, officers had discussed with Whippet Coaches if replacement services could be provided within existing resources. This had been on the basis of not duplicating other commercial services where replacements would not be provided, or where areas were considered to be better served by existing community transport schemes. However, as set out in the detail of the report, Whippet Coaches could not provide the reduced level of service within the existing resource envelope. Officers had therefore issued tender invitations in order to test the market for alternative providers.

As the tender closing date was after the original report was written, with the agreement

of the Chairman, a supplementary report setting out brief, non-commercially sensitive details of the tender exercise was published on the web and electronically circulated to the Members of the Committee in advance of the meeting. Due to the resources implications, that while there was already a delegation to officers to agree contracted bus services tenders, the Committee's views were sought on a steer regarding which contracts should be supported. It was therefore agreed that the supplementary report should be considered in conjunction with the original report, with paper copies made available at the meeting.

The supplementary Report highlighted that tenders were issued for replacement services for the following:

Service 2	Cambridge - Hardwick - Toft - Caldecote – Boxworth
Service 7A	Whittlesford - Babraham Road Park & Ride
Service 8	Cambridge - Dry Drayton - Papworth Everard
Service 9	St Ives - Elsworth – Hilton
Service 12	St Ives Town Circular
Service 15	St Ives - Swavesey – Over
Service 18	Newmarket - Fulbourn – Teversham – Cambridge
Service 21	St Ives - Earith - Somersham – Ramsey
Service 45	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 45A	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 114	Cambridge City Centre - Grafton - Beehive - Addenbrookes
Service 117	Cambridge City Centre - Fen Estate

Responses had been received for all routes apart from service 18 as no interest in terms of bids had been received. From the responses received, the cost of awarding the above tenders was £455k, an additional £186k above the current contract costs. The report proposed that not all the services would be directly replaced and therefore no additional costs were included for the following services:

- Service 16 which was considered to be covered by alternative services within reasonable walking distance with details provided on a map at Appendix 1 of the supplementary report.
- Options were continuing to be considered for service 1A with the report highlighting that it was covered by a twenty minute frequency service between Bar Hill and Cambridge with Whippet Coaches providing peak journeys via the Busway to Cambridge as part of their C service from Fenstanton. Bids were being sought for an off peak service between St Ives, Fenstanton and Bar Hill.

In view of the current financial pressures on the County Council, The Committee was asked to consider whether services 12, 117 and 114 should be let, as there were alternative services within a reasonable walking distance with details provided on maps for each set out in Appendices 2-4 of the supplementary report. It was explained that if the three tenders were not awarded, the revised total cost would be £380K, an additional annual cost of £110k.

A number of Speakers had requested to speak and were taken in the order they had been received, with a summary of some of their main comments included below.

- Clare Tevlin spoke for residents and the large number of students from Fenstanton who were highly reliant on the services of the Go Whippet 1A service which used to go from Huntingdon via St Ives via Fenstanton via Bar Hill to Cambridge rather than from St Ives to Cambridge. She was particularly concerned regarding the isolation effect on villages who were reliant on the bus services between Cambridge and Huntingdon (i.e. including Fenstanton, Connington and Elsworth) and as a result of the lack of reliability, the effect this was having in further deterring people from using Public Transport altogether.

She highlighted that there had been a drastic decline in the 1A service, after changes made in previous years and following the introduction of the Guided busway in 2010, when the service had declined from buses every 20 minutes to once an hour and with no Sunday service. She highlighted that even with this revised service, there was increasingly poor reliability. This was a real issue for students trying to get to their lectures on time.

She made reference to the Guided busway not being on the route of all the villages and that from Fenstanton it was a considerable walk. Regarding talks of a Cambridge light rail, she highlighted that again there would be the issue of ensuring those villages previously fed by Go Whippet were not overlooked like they had been for the Guided Bus.

Councillor Bates highlighted that Fenstanton was within his electoral division so he had a local interest.

In terms of any questions of clarification from Members of the Committee, with reference to the lack of reliability of the 1A service, there was a request for further detail of the impact that this was having. In response it was indicated that what had been a bus every 20 minutes service to Cambridge had, since the introduction of the Guided Bus, now become an hourly service and sometimes two hourly, if one scheduled bus was cancelled. She had recently shared a taxi with a student who ordered it as the bus had not arrived on time and needed to ensure that they reached their college in time for the first lecture.

- Councillor Douglas Dew Huntingdonshire District Councillor for The Hemingfords Houghton, Wyton and Hilton and the Chairman of Hemingford Grey Parish Council spoke on behalf of his parishes also emphasising the point of bus reliability which was a huge issue in Hemingford Grey and Abbots Ripton, suggesting more people would have used the bus services if they could be relied on, rather than having to resort to sharing taxis etc. The demography of the area was that there was a substantial elderly and retired population, the very people who would use the buses. He supported the retender of the number 9 service as if the number 5 service was lost, the 9 became the only bus option for people without cars.
- Councillor Paul Kent Chairman of Fenstanton Parish Council spoke regarding the 1A stating that specific consideration needed to be given to Fenstanton (as well as to other Parishes) in respect of elderly, young and widowed residents who did not have access to a vehicle of their own, or could not drive to the St Ives Guided Bus route for their onward journey. The current service only went to certain destinations on particular days and with a 9.30 a.m. start (and even this was at the

discretion of the driver) was also not convenient or appropriate for students attending college or for people without cars travelling to their work place. Currently the timetable took no account of frequency of travel or peak time usage.

He also drew the Committee's attention to the possibility of Fenstanton Post Office closing which many local residents used as a way of obtaining cash. Should this happen, there would be an increased demand for public transport for those having to travel further to find alternative provision. In addition, he highlighted the projected growth forecasts for local housing (240 plus homes was referenced) whose occupants would require future transport. He suggested that the growth agenda was not planning appropriately for future public transport requirements when at the same time it was seeking to reduce congestion and improve air quality by switching people away from cars and taxis. He supported the continuation of the 1A service whilst alternative provision was investigated, and highlighted the need to look to linking it to major arterial routes. In his submission provided in advance, he had also emphasised that the current Fenstanton HACT service was not an acceptable long term solution for those who needed access to regular daily transport for study or work attendance.

- Councillor Steve Criswell spoke as the local member for Somersham and Earith. While understanding Whippet's decision from a commercial operator point of view, he expressed his concern by their lack of customer consideration in seeking to make their timetables sustainable and also the short notice given for officers to be able to consider alternative options. This latter point was echoed by Committee Members later in the debate. With reference to paragraph 2.10 and recognising that many of the services were not sustainable, he supported officers undertaking a full review of contracted bus services and community transport provision with a view to identifying further efficiencies and alternative means of provision. The sooner the Review was undertaken the better, especially the need to look creatively in terms of the potential for replacing services with community transport provision. He highlighted that the loss of Service 21 would leave some residents stranded as a result of other changes made by Whippet. He thanked the officers for the work they had undertaken to secure tenders for routes such as the 21 in order to be able to provide a continued service, while alternatives were further investigated.
- Councillor Amanda Taylor as the local member for Queen Edith's Cambridge raised concerns regarding the 114 Service which took in Coleridge Road, Mowbray Road, and Cherry Hinton Road an area with many elderly residents. She highlighted that the route passed Lichfield Road and Neville Road which had sheltered housing, as did Wulfstan Way. The 114 bus was used by the elderly to access essential services such as GP's, Shops and dentists. She highlighted that with Papworth and AstraZeneca moving to the Addenbrooke's site it made no sense to reduce this bus service. She suggested that what was required was creative timetables which took account of demand currently not catered for and should be looked at in terms of both ends of routes. In answer to a question in respect of whether the City Council contributed to the service, it was clarified in further discussion that the Council contributed to the Saturday service.

- Councillor Mandy Smith the local member for Papworth and Swavesey welcomed the proposed review and volunteered to be a member on it. As she would be holding public meetings on the subject of bus routes affecting her division, she requested that the relevant officers kept both her and all local members with affected bus routes, updated on developments. She also suggested that if a replacement service was identified for any of the affected routes before the end of the nine month review period, they should be actioned for earlier implementation.

Having heard all the speakers, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the contents of both reports taking account of the comments already made by the speakers.

Issues raised included:

- The officers highlighted the high frequency of service provision on the Guided Busway and that in terms of Whippet reliability, a contributory factor was that the company did not pay their drivers comparable rates to those employed by Stagecoach.
- There was a query in respect of Fenstanton regarding the phrase "... bid were being sought for an off peak service..." as it was suggested this was not what was being requested by previous speakers. On officer in explanation highlighted that in terms of route 1A, this paralleled a service provided by the Guided Busway and the Council was strictly forbidden under current legislation (following bus deregulation) to seek to provide a competing service to an already established commercially provided bus route. What the Council could do was to see if other provision was available to fill in gaps in the service provided by the commercial operator. Cambridgeshire Community Transport were already engaging with parishes to look at alternative ideas for future provision.
- The Member for Fulbourn made the point that there was no alternative community provision to be able to step in and replace the 18 Service. This particular service was an example of one where when the cessation of the service was announced, a petition was raised with over 100 signatures. He made the point (that would also apply to other routes) that if even just a proportion of those that had signed had actually used the bus service, it would have been viable and the commercial operator would have continued with it. Another issue was if, on some routes, the proportion of concessionary fares made up the majority of bus users, the revenue obtained would not cover the running costs of the operator.
- The member for Romsey highlighted that his division had two services under threat: the 114 and 117. He highlighted wording in the Supplementary Report suggesting Members should consider whether the tenders for routes 12, 117 and 114 should be let when they "...could be seen to have alternative services within a reasonable walking distance..." In terms of the 114 this service provided a lifeline for those in sheltered housing to services already referred to earlier by Councillor Taylor and stated that for the elderly and infirm, the alternatives routes highlighted were not within reasonable walking distance as the current service was very much on their doorstep. Removing the service would be a false economy as they would then become isolated with all the complications that

could then arise as a result. The same applied to the 117 which served the Fen Estate.

- Regarding the lack of bids for the 18 service, it was suggested that officers should review the basis of the original tender and see if a revised specification would attract any interest.
- Members in discussion considered that they required details of the terms of reference for the Review and that Members would need to be involved.
- It was clarified in regard to a question on the Service 16 map that the reference to a light green route was in fact yellow.
- The Committee member for St Ives North and Wyton highlighted when referencing service number 12 that since the advent of the Guided Busway, more buses travelled around St Ives but that less buses now ran through it, with the emphasis being on the St Ives to Huntingdon station. It was currently very difficult to get to Huntingdon if a person lived in the north of the town. He acknowledged that there was an excellent busway, but as already highlighted by other speakers, it had been at the cost of other routes and the impact this had had on some of the surrounding villages.
- In a request for a breakdown of figures for the tenders for routes 12, 114 and 117 it was orally reported that the new figures for the 12 route had substantially increased, route 114 had reduced considerably while 117 had been a commercial service and therefore no tender had been sought. There was a request that the Review should look at the detail of the costings and reasons why one had increased substantially while one had fallen to such a large degree.
- The need to ensure that the officers were provided with sufficient resources to carry out the full review that was being requested, and that contributions should be sought from all levels of local government e.g. town councils, combined Authority, district councils and parish councils.

In terms of the steer required on services 12, 114 and 117 it was proposed in discussion that they should continue to be funded for the next 12 months.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) agree to fund replacement of the following bus services for up to one year from local bus reserve funding:

Service 2	Cambridge - Hardwick - Toft - Caldecote – Boxworth
Service 7A	Whittlesford - Babraham Road Park & Ride
Service 8	Cambridge - Dry Drayton - Papworth Everard
Service 9	St Ives - Elsworth – Hilton
Service 12	St Ives Town Circular
Service 15	St Ives - Swavesey – Over
Service 18	Newmarket - Fulbourn – Teversham – Cambridge
Service 21	St Ives - Earith - Somersham – Ramsey

Service 45	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 45A	Huntingdon - Houghton - St Ives
Service 114	Cambridge City Centre - Grafton - Beehive - Addenbrookes
Service 117	Cambridge City Centre - Fen Estate

- b) request that officers undertake a full Countywide review of contracted bus services and community transport provision with a view to identifying further efficiencies and alternative means of provision including those for the de-registered commercial services 1, 1A and 5,
- c) for the Contracted Service 18 where no tender interest had been received, officers to investigate the possibility of a revised option to potentially attract a commercial operator,
- d) To come back to Committee with Terms of reference for the Review to include members as part of the review group and.
- e) to report back to Committee on this work within 9 months to allow a decision to be made on the provision of contracted bus services and Community Transport with the proviso that if alternative provision can be found for some routes before this time, the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman and the local Member be authorised within the already existing delegation, to approve the alternative provision to avoid unnecessary delay.

26. CAMBRIDGE MINERALS WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME AND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

The County Council as a Mineral and Waste Planning Authority has a statutory duty to prepare and maintain a minerals and waste local plan to guide development decisions. The current adopted Plan sets out forward planning policies and allocations for mineral and waste management development up to 2026. As current Government guidance was that local plans should *'be drawn up over an appropriate timescale, preferably a 15 year horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date'* and as new regulations were to be introduced to require local plans to be reviewed every five years. To help further this, the Committee was asked to approve the preparation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan and approve the associated Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2017 attached as appendix 1 to the officer report.

It was proposed that the new Plan would be prepared with Peterborough City Council, with key evidence documents to be commissioned from Northamptonshire County Council. The Plan would involve significant expenditure, estimated for the County Council to be in the region of £325,000 across a period of four financial years with the details as set out in paragraphs 2.10 to 2.13 of the report. A request had been made to General Purposes Committee to set aside £54,200 from the General Fund to finance the work required in the current financial year, with future years' expenditure to be addressed through the Business Planning Process.

In the ongoing discussion:

Councillor Criswell in his role as Chairman of the Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCV) Working Group, expressed concern that the current report made no mention of Transport strategies in the proposals for the Plan, highlighting the following issues, which in further discussion the Committee also endorsed:

- a) The Need for a joined up approach with the Transport Strategy / local transport strategies to keep HCV's off unsuitable roads and to specify in the Plan the need to use strategic routes to carry minerals and waste and avoid, where, possible villages.
- b) Consideration needed to be given to ensuring there was appropriate transport routes next to identified sites to mitigate transport issues.

In reply, it was recognised that the transport of mineral and waste by HCVs was a significant issue, especially as many of the County mineral deposits i.e. sand and gravel, were fen edge deposits located some distance away from the development areas. While transport strategies could not be prepared as part of the development work for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the County Council did have a road hierarchy that included identification of routes suitable for HCVs. The officer confirmed that transport strategies would be taken into account as the Local Plan was developed.

In response to a question in respect of how Members could be involved, it was explained that as part of both the draft and the final plan there were statutory consultation requirements which would enable both Members and the public the opportunity to contribute.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) approve the preparation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan in partnership with Peterborough City Council.
- b) approve the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2017, and,
- c) note the cost of the preparation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the proposed funding arrangements.

27. FINDINGS OF THE MEMBER LED REVIEW ON CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

In September 2016, the Economy and Environment Committee agreed to setting up a Member-Led Review to assess the success and failures of recent cycleway schemes, including floating bus stops and crossings through a review of 6 cycleway schemes constructed around the County. The purpose was to develop the understanding of what makes a successful, and well-implemented, cycling infrastructure scheme and to propose recommendations to help guide officers when planning future cycleways.

The review was conducted via online surveys for which 760 responses from the public and one response from a Member were received. The Chairman of the Review Group in introducing the report highlighted that communication was key and required to be improved going forward. The key findings from the surveys included:

- That 71% of respondents used the cycleways.
- 88% of respondents felt safe using the cycleways.
- Almost half of the respondents (49%) used the cycleways daily or almost daily.
- The respondents use the cycleway mostly for exercise (18%), to avoid traffic (18%) and as a quicker travel option (17%). In addition, some praised the value of cycleways as a safer route of travel.
- Almost a third of respondents (32%) cycle more frequently following the creation of the cycleways.
- Of those who did not use the cycleway most (75%) said that their reasons were not due to the facility itself.
- In terms of the implementation process, most respondents felt that the following areas were adequate: the quality of public consultation; the quality of information provided; the consideration shown for public safety; and the level of consideration shown for residents' needs.
- The majority of respondents indicated that the efficiency of the construction process was very good.

The Local Member for the Cambridge Queen Edith's electoral division, who was also a member of the review group, had requested to speak and highlighted that local residents concerns in respect of the Hills Road cycle scheme had been the main factor in the Committee agreeing to set up the review group. She highlighted that a survey specific to the Hills Road cycle scheme had received nearly 600 responses, by far the highest number for any of the schemes looked at by the review group. As she considered that they had not been sufficiently represented in the report, she had prepared her own summary of the comments received on the design, working practices and safety issues which she had been sent to the Committee in an e-mail in advance of the meeting. She highlighted some of the issues raised in the responses including:

- the length of time taken to construct the cycleway which was still not finished two and a half years later and was a major disruption to all road users.
- That some working practices had been dangerous to pedestrians.
- Concerns expressed regarding the safety of the floating bus stops due to their design and the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians.
- The need to address safety issues which had been referred to in 300 of the responses. She highlighted in particular an accident which had occurred outside a school.

Questions of clarification of the local member included:

- whether she considered the overall cycle lane segregation in Hills Road to be a success in terms of being a safer route for cyclists and encouraging more people to cycle. As part of her response she acknowledged that there had been a slight increase in cycling but the survey did not show a great increase. The survey did highlight positive comments received from cyclists regarding no longer having to overtake buses.

- Asking what action locally had been taken to address the issues raised. In response she indicated a working group had been set up for people living in Hills Road attended by 12 residents focussed on the lack of action taken to address their concerns regarding incidents that had been reported at floating bus stops.
- One Member of the Committee whose electoral division, Trumpington was on the boundary of parts of the route, highlighted a statistic stating that there had been a 100% increase in cycling usage in the area and asked would she agree with this statistic? She replied that she did not.

The officer present clarified for the Committee that the current second phase of the Hills Road cycleway was running according to the scheduled timetable and that the Trumpington cycleway had been completed on time, so it was wrong to make the assumption that all cycle schemes were running behind schedule. Lessons had been learnt from Phase 1 of the Hills Road cycleway construction.

In debate issues raised included:

- another Member of the working group, also on the Committee, clarified that health and safety had been a huge concern to the Group and believed the recommendations in the report addressed the issues raised by the local member for Queen Edith's. On picking up on a point the Member had highlighted regarding that not everyone was on a bike, she suggested that future consultations should ensure views on outcomes were sought not only from cyclists, but also pedestrians, bus users and other motorised road users.
- Members agreed that going forward project management lessons required to be learnt to ensure the speedier delivery of future schemes.
- Concerns regarding the finances being available to ensure ongoing maintenance of the cycleways to ensure they were kept free of weeds and had necessary repairs undertaken. As a counter point to this, the County Cycling Champion wished to celebrate the success of schemes such as the A10 scheme where money had been made available to ensure maintenance was kept up. Attention was also drawn to the good work already undertaken by several volunteer groups to keep cycleways clear of weeds and whose efforts deserved to be recognised and formal appreciation of a word of thanks was endorsed by the Committee.
- A question of clarification was directed to the Working Party Chairman regarding the reasoning behind the wording in recommendation in para 3.3 reading "where possible cycleways should be opened up to all non-motorised users and this should be clearly signposted". The Vice Chairman made the point that opening it up to horseriders presented dangers to cyclists due to the dung they often left behind. In addition, where walkers were also encouraged to use cycleways, this presented further potential conflict points. In response, the Chairman of the Working Group replied that she came from a rural area and believed that as public money was being used to finance the cycleways, they should be for the benefit of as many residents as possible. In terms of conflict with pedestrians, cyclists needed to be more careful and considerate in the way they cycled. The

point was also made that the statement did include the words “where possible” which reflected that the Group were aware of the potential dangers being pointed out, hence the wording and the acceptance that this level of inclusiveness might not be possible on all routes.

The Chairman, in summing up, thanked all those on the working group and the officers involved for the positive recommendations presented to the Committee.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the key findings of the review asset out in section 2 of the report,
- b) Approve the following recommendations from section 3 of the report:

Public consultation: Officers should continue to encourage stakeholders (including pedestrians, bus users and motorists) to participate in public consultations, and consultation documents should be presented in a way that they are easily understood by stakeholders.

Signage: Cycleway schemes should wherever possible provide signage to show:

- distances in miles and journey times in minutes
- identify which users are permitted on the cycleway
- provide directions to key destinations
- indicate any cycle links across the network

Inclusive use of cycleways: Where practicable, cycleways should be opened up to all Non-Motorised Users and this should be clearly signposted.

Regular updates: Officers should provide stakeholders with regular updates on cycleway schemes, particularly where delays take place. This could be done for example through local community meetings, via social media, on the Council website, etc.

Consideration for local residents: contractors to be considerate to local resident's needs/safety.

Maintenance: Cycleways should be regularly cleared of weeds/plants and hedges trimmed, to ensure that their full width can be used safely. The surface structure should also be inspected regularly.

Post-implementation surveys: Following the launch of new cycleways, there should be a follow-up survey(s) to identify and address any concerns from the public. These surveys could be done using feedback cards through doors, an online survey, etc.

Publicity and promotion: In order to encourage more frequent use of the cycleways there should be regular publicity campaigns evidencing positive feedback from users. In addition, any positive feedback received from the public should be publicised to highlight the Council's successes.

c) agree to the publication of the detailed report.

28. A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE – AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

This report informed the Committee of the outcome of the procurement process for the Design and Construction Contract for the Kings Dyke level crossing bypass with the report explaining the background to why the bypass was required, providing an update on the land acquisition process and seeking approval to award the contract to the preferred bidder.

This Committee on 19th April 2016 had approved the use of the competitive process within the Eastern Highways Framework Contract (EHF2) for the detailed design and construction through an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI), two-stage Design and Construct contract. The procurement had been completed with the outcome detailed in section 2 of the officers' report. Significant work had been undertaken to secure the land for the scheme and informal agreement has now been reached with all the landowners for the purchase of the land. The legal conveyancing was ongoing, but would be completed before the project reached the construction stage with the detail provided in section 3 of the report. The total scheme costs had been reviewed with the use of the preferred bidder's tendered price for the scheme, and land prices agreed with land owners as detailed in section 4 of the report. It was explained that the cost of land acquisition had increased from the original estimates and as the land had not yet been purchased, there was a risk if Stage 1 did not proceed.

The report explained that all six invited contractors had submitted a tender. The overall score as set out in Table 1 of the report had been calculated on a ratio 60% quality to 40% price and showed that Bidder 1 had provided the most economically advantageous tender. Details of the bidders' tendered prices, which were business sensitive information, had been provided in a confidential appendix circulated separately in hard copy form to Committee members. (on orange confidential paper)

It was highlighted that while there was an initial presumption that the scheme would be delivered as a single package, no guarantee was being given to the contractor that they would be allowed to move directly from detailed design to construction. This would be conditional on satisfactory performance and agreement of a construction target price based on the detailed design. Given the aspiration to deliver the scheme as quickly as possible, it was proposed that if the cost remained within the currently allocated budget, agreement of the construction target price and commencement of construction should be via a delegation. If post design, the target price was significantly higher than the tender stage construction price and or the scheme exceeded the scheme budget allocation, the decision to trigger construction and seek additional funding from General Purposes Committee would be referred back to this Committee.

The costs and funding were set out in section 4 of the report with Stage 1 able to be funded from the agreed funding in the Business Plan. The award of Stage 2 of the contract would be dependent on cost. Section 5 set out details of the contractors tender stage programme for construction.

In subsequent discussion issues raised included:

- Noting that the tender for Bidder 1 had received the highest financial score (a 40% maximum score) they were only fourth out of six in terms of their quality score (41.48% out of a maximum of 60%). One Member wished to ensure they were able to undertake as good a job as for example bidder 3, who was scored as 48.6% quality and 28.73% on price. It was explained that quality scores from the framework contract were carried over and were added to the individual scores for the current contract.
- As a follow up to this, another Councillor sought clarity if, what was being stated was that the score of bidder 1 was influenced by previous work the bidder had carried out, whether the same criteria had been extended to the other bidders. It was clarified that this process was carried out across the board with the quality score being a mix of both framework scores and project specific tender scores with an overall score added to the separate target costs. It was explained that there were no concerns regarding the quality of Bidder 1, as all of the contractors on the framework contract had already been assessed as being able to undertake the work before being invited to tender.

Councillor Connor a Committee member who had been appointed onto the project board indicated that he would be able to monitor any issues Members might have going forward and would be happy ask questions on their behalf.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the procurement process and the revised scheme cost.
- b) Approve the award of the Design and Construction contract to the preferred bidder, Bidder 1 as detailed in Section 2 of the officers' report.
- c) Delegate the decision to commence the second stage of the contract (construction) to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Economy and Environment Committee as detailed in Section 2 of the officers' report.
- d) Note the need to conclude some land acquisition in advance of the stage 2 contract award and the associated risks; and
- e) Note that approval from the General Purposes Committee for an increased budget for the project may be required following Stage 1 (Design) of the contract.

29. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – JUNE 2017

Economy and Environment Committee received the latest Finance and Performance Report for the period to the end of June 2017 to enable them to both note and comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position.

It was highlighted that:

Revenue: That at this early stage of the year ETE was forecasting an overspend of £116K. There was a £1m pressure on waste which came under Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee with underspends on the concessionary Fares budget estimated at £400k being used to partially offset this pressure.

Capital; Pressures relating to land purchase for the Kings Dyke overpass were referred to under a separate report on the agenda while pressures on the Ely Southern bypass scheme were due to be reported to a future meeting of the committee.

Performance: on the revised suite of fourteen performance indicators, two were currently showing as red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area with the second being the average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes) three were showing as amber, and nine green. At year-end the current forecast was that only one performance indicator would be red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area)

One Member queried why money was being vired from the E and E Committee Controlled budget to HCI Committee and whether the monies could be used to subsidise bus routes which had been the subject of a report earlier in the meeting. It was explained that budget pressures needed to be considered across the whole of the ETE directorate and if underspends were not utilised, this would require additional savings (including possible redundancies) to be made in other areas of the Directorate. In addition, the earlier report on the agenda on Whippet Coaches had already identified the monies sufficient to pay for the next 12 month period.

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was resolved to:

note the report.

30. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE OUTSTANDING APPOINTMENTS TO PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

This report provided an update on outside bodies where appointments were believed to either still be outstanding or needed to be made as they were new outside body appointments. Having been moved and seconded by the Chairman and Vice Chairman and as no other nominations were offered,

It was unanimously resolved:

a) to agree the following:

- A47 Alliance Steering Group and A47 Corridor Feasibility Study; Stakeholder Reference Group – Cllr Bates
- Anglian (Northern) Regional Flood and Coastal Committee – Cllr Connor
- Cambridge Bid Board – Cllr Shuter was appointed as he had agreed that if no nominations were received he would be prepared to carry on until October when the Board was to review its membership.
- Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Committee – Cllr Wotherspoon

- Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Committee – Cllr Harford volunteered for one of the three places. As this Committee had not met for a period of time, the other two appointments would only be sought once a firm meeting date was confirmed.
- Transport Strategy for Fenland – Councillor Connor appointed to one of the two places. One appointment still to be sought.

b) Huntingdon Bid Board – As no nominations were received, Councillor Sanderson volunteered to approach the Independent Group for a nomination to the one place required.

31. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

The current training plan was as set out on the agenda. It was reported that only six members had attended the Budget and ETE Business Planning meeting held the previous day. Councillors Connor and Fuller indicated that they had been unable to attend as it clashed with a planning meeting the same morning. (*note this was a district council meeting*) and suggested that if possible, future seminars of this nature should be linked to this Committee's meetings cycle.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the report.
- b) To request were practicable that training should be offered on the same day as the Committee meeting as a way of increasing attendance.

32. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FORWARD AGENDA PLAN

Having received the forward agenda plans as stout in the agenda:

It was resolved to note the agenda plan with the following additions / potential additions:

- Addition to 14th September Committee meeting Non Key decision report - Risk Management
- Advance notice of reports provisionally to be added to December Committee:
 - a) Wisbeach Access Strategy – Recommendations of schemes for access to £10.5m Growth Funding
 - b) St Neots Northern Foot and Cycle Bridge Update

33. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 14th SEPTEMBER 2017

Chairman: 14TH September 2017