

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

**Date:** Thursday, 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018

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

**Present:** Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, D Giles, L Harford (substituting for Cllr Wotherspoon), D Jenkins (substituting for Cllr Batchelor), N Kavanagh, S Tierney and J Williams

**Apologies:** Councillors H Batchelor and T Wotherspoon

### **155. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **156. MINUTES**

Subject to deleting the words in the record of those present to delete the words: “(substituting for Councillor Ambrose Smith)” the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

### **157. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

Matters arising:

A) A Member challenged the following as actions having been completed suggesting that no actions should be shown as completed where no timescales for a report back / resolution of the issue raised, were provided

- 1) Minute 140 Finance and Performance Report b) Review of Key Performance Indicator for “Average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes” for continued relevance stating that the future approach to this PI was under consideration as may partner organisations had an influence.

**There was a request for a timescale for this future consideration. Action Andy Preston**

- 2) Minute 151 Finance and Performance Report Cycle Way Uptake on whether data from traffic counters could monitor take up on new cycle-ways, with the response suggesting that realistically this could only be achieved on a six monthly basis. **There was a request for a timescale for the first six monthly update. Action Andy Preston / Sarah Heywood**

B) Matters raised in respect of the response note on the Guided Busway Development Build Out Assumptions included:

- 1) querying the assumption in paragraph 2.3 reading “....that based on the current growth rates the comparable number of busway passengers could be assumed

to be nearer 13,000 passengers” In response this was in respect of passengers expected from Northstowe and other new developments.

- 2) Suggesting that Paragraph 2.3 which stated that the ten year milestone for patronage would not be reached until 2021 and paragraph 2.8 suggesting that patronage in 2021 would be in line with the original transport assessment figure 10 years after opening were conflicting statements. It was clarified that as the opening of the busway was later than originally planned, the original date would not be met.
- 3) Councillor Jenkins a substitute member on the Committee highlighted that in Northstowe, Stagecoach were reducing their service and Whippet were completely withdrawing their service and asked how these issues would be taken forward. The Chairman undertook to discuss the issues raised with officers and get back to him. **Action: Councillor Bates / Christine May**

## **158. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS / REQUESTS TO SPEAK**

No petitions were received. Two public speakers Lynne Hester and Michael Wordingham from the Royal National Institute for the Blind spoke in opposition to one of the potential options in the Report at Item 10 on the ‘Revenue Service Committee Review of Draft Revenue Business Planning Proposals’ regarding withdrawing the ability for blind and visually impaired people to use concessionary bus passes before 9.30 a.m.

A summary of their main points is included as Appendix 1 to these Minutes

## **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

With the agreement of the meeting, the Chairman altered the running order of the agenda to take item 10. “Service Committee Review of Draft Revenue Business Planning proposals for 2019-20 to 2023-2024” as the next item of business so that the two members of the public who had spoken would be able to hear the debate on the proposals in the report that they had particular concerns regarding.

## **159. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2019-20 TO 2023-2024**

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the Draft Business Plan Revenue proposals for services within the remit of the Committee. Sections 1-4 were general information that had been provided for all Service Committees.

Section 5 provided an overview of Place and Economy’s draft Revenue Programme with a summary of the Economy and Environment Committee proposals set out in:

- paragraph 5.3 – B/R 6.101 Passenger transport – Remove Discretionary Concessions and Taxi Vouchers (-260k in 2019-20)
- paragraph 5.4 – B/R 6.103 Historic Environment (-10k in 2019-20)
- paragraph 5.5 – B/R 6.105 Transformation of the Infrastructure and Growth Service into a profit centre (-79k in 2019-20)

Issues raised by Members in the discussion included:

- Highlighting that Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee receiving the same report earlier in the week had expressed their opposition regarding the proposals in paragraph 5.3 the same opposition was also expressed by several Members of the Economy and Environment Committee in the ensuing debate and further to this, Councillor Harford proposed and Cllr Connor seconded an amendment to the recommendations to delete paragraph 5.3 and for the proposal not to come forward in further reports.
- One Member questioned the robustness of the savings proposals and suggested that officers should be asked to produce a risk register in respect of the budget and the level of confidence in the achievability of the savings being put forward and income to be generated. In response it was explained that all the proposals were closely scrutinised by the Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer and all those put forward in the Business Plan had to be shown to be deliverable. There was already a corporate risk register which included the budget, along with all service committees having their own risk registers detailing the main risks to their services.
- Raising a question on the levels of income generated by the service. As a response to the issues raised on this question it was explained that officers were pushing for income where it was feasible and where the Council's expertise could be charged for (e.g. the transport strategy was moving to be a profit centre and work carried out on behalf of the Combined Authority was re-charged) but many of the fees were set nationally and could not be varied. (e.g. Planning and Environmental areas).

The Executive Director explained that the approach to the budget was always to seek to protect services and to raise income and to avoid cuts but where options proposed were not taken forward equivalent savings from other areas of the Directorate would then be required.

Having commented on the draft revenue proposals within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee, on being put to the vote the amendment was approved unanimously and further to this,

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2019-20 to 2023-24 Business Plan Proposals for the Service services.
- b) To delete the proposal under paragraph 5.3 titled 'B/R6.101 Passenger Transport – Remove Discretionary Concessions and Taxi vouchers'

## **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

As there was a local member who had requested to speak and as the other local Member was required at another meeting and would need to leave early, with the agreement of the meeting, the Chairman altered the running order of the agenda to take item 12 the Key decision report "A605 Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure" as the next

item of business. The Chairman highlighted that Members of the Committee had, as part of their agenda pack, a confidential appendix with business sensitive information that was not for public disclosure. Therefore any Member wishing to discuss any of the detail would trigger the need to consider excluding the press and public.

## **160. A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE**

The report explained as background that the A605 between Whittlesey and Peterborough carries over 12,000 vehicles per day with some 120 daily train movements across the level crossing that crosses the road. The resulting closure of the King's Dyke level crossing barrier caused significant delay to traffic impacted on local businesses and commuters. Future plans by the rail industry to increase the number of trains along the route would further increase delays. This situation was exacerbated during the winter months, when local flooding often closed the North Bank, an alternative route between Whittlesey and Peterborough, for long periods of time.

Three options were previously presented and this Committee agreed to progress the preferred option with the least impact on local businesses identified through public consultation. Very early estimates indicated a scheme cost of £13.6m and it was subsequently reported to this Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2015 that the budget required could be almost £17m due to the constrained nature of the site, but that the final total budget required would need to be informed by the detailed design stage. The use of a competitive tender process within the Eastern Highways Framework contract (EHF2) was also approved as detailed in the report.

It was reported that the detailed design was now nearing completion and the more significant engineering requirements identified particularly relating to increased ground improvement and stabilisation works had resulted in the overall budget required to commence the construction phase of the scheme being considerably higher than originally estimated. Additional funding to construct this scheme was therefore required.

The land for the scheme had been secured through negotiation and contracts were now ready to be exchanged which required to be completed in advance of construction. As the total scheme budget required was now much higher than previously reported, the acquisition of the required land had been placed on hold until the additional funding was determined.

Officers highlighted that in accordance with DfT guidance, the Business Case had been re-assessed and the benefits were showing as being even greater than previously calculated with this revised Major Scheme Business Case having also been through an assurance review by an independent external consultant. This showed the scheme continued to provide extremely high value for money along with the significant wider benefits to the community and local economy and this was despite the large increase in the final cost of the project.

The current agreed funding in the County Council's Business Plan was £13.6m and with the detailed design almost complete and the target construction price now known as being at just under £30m, the identified funding gap was now £16.4m. As the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was now the responsible transport authority, with overall responsibility for strategic transport

schemes. Discussions with the CPCA had taken place and the CPCA Executive Board was to meet on 31st October to consider taking on responsibility for the scheme and meeting the funding gap. If they did not support the scheme as alternative funding options were not currently forthcoming, the Committee was advised that they would need to consider cancelling the project. If the project received the go ahead it could be completed by 2020 and officers would seek to reduce this timeframe further.

The Local member Cllr Boden spoke in support of the scheme highlighting that;

- it was astonishing that when the DfT assessment framework placed any scheme with a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2 or more in the high value for money category and with 4 being very high value, the calculated increase in benefits outweighing the cost increases for this scheme had an astronomical BCR rating of 8.37 which was almost unheard of. (In response to a question from the Chairman asking the Executive Director, the Team leader major Infrastructure delivery and Assistant Director Infrastructure and Growth if they had ever come across scheme with such a BCR, all confirmed that they had not).
- he believed the latest estimates of delays as set out in the report being up to 13 minutes was still an underestimate, as just the previous day a freight train had caused a delay of 30 minutes. He also stated that the report's estimate of over 200 vehicles queueing at peak times was also in his opinion an underestimate, as his house was more than a kilometre away and he often saw vehicles queueing from a considerable distance further from his house.

In discussion issues raised included:

- One Member stating that the Council's financial position was such that it could not afford to borrow to finance the high cost of the scheme as it was beyond the prudential limit as there was also the Ely bypass overspend. It was therefore vital that the Combined Authority should take on the additional financial burden.
- The Government changes to the Compulsory Purchase Order guidelines on land purchase had significantly contributed to the additional cost of the project,
- There was a request for more information on the BCR increase. It was explained that the initial Business Case used delay times at the level crossing calculated using accepted observation and modelling methods. Recent comparisons from other schemes indicated that such methods had not captured the full extent of delays caused at heavily used level crossings. Actual delays had therefore been re-surveyed using cameras, rather than being theoretically modelled and the associated delays had been shown to be far greater than the original estimates.
- Lessons would need to be learned in the future as to ways of ensuring there is not such an underestimate on the early estimates given to Committee compared to the escalation of cost at detailed design stage.

The other local member on the Committee moved that the officers' recommendations and the Committee's support for the scheme should be by way of a recorded vote and this request was supported by the required number on the Committee.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the design development and increase in budget now required to deliver the scheme, along with the independent review of the construction target cost.
- b) Note the revised Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the scheme remains high, indicating that the scheme delivers excellent value for money, despite the required budget increase.
- c) Approve the scheme and award of the stage 2 construction contract to Kier and complete purchase of the required land, subject to the approval of the additional funding by the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority.

(Voting pattern: In favour: Councillors D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates D Connor, R Fuller, D Giles, L Harford, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, S Tierney and J Williams, none against and no abstentions)

## **161. TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP) SCHEME LIST**

This report provided the Transport Investment Plan (TIP) for Cambridgeshire, setting out the transport infrastructure, services and initiatives required to support the growth of Cambridgeshire. The TIP Scheme List in the report was presented by city/district and was updated throughout the year and was considered for sign-off annually in the autumn. The listed schemes were for all infrastructure investment required, but were not prioritised. In addition not all schemes had committed funding. The schemes as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018 were attached in Appendix 1 to the report. The proposed TIP Policy Document 2018 was attached as Appendix 2. A snapshot of some mapped TIP schemes is shown in Appendix 3.

Throughout the year, projects were identified and added to the TIP through development related Transport Assessment processes and by the adoption of new transport strategies. New schemes were also able to be proposed through dialogue with local Members and put to the TIP Officers Group quarterly for a policy compliance review. In addition to approving new schemes for the TIP, the Group also reviewed any schemes proposed for removal from the TIP.

Issues raised in debate included:

- Page 26 Scheme 41 'Promotional Campaign for the Guided Busway' - a Member suggested this appeared to be a revenue rather than capital.
- Page 27-28 Schemes in respect of the Cambridge Orbital Bus corridor - a question was raised on who would be responsible for these schemes as the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) did not currently have them in their programme. It was explained that these schemes were in the original City Deal

scheme list but were not schemes to be actioned in the first tranche of the GCP programmes,

- Page 27 Schemes 54 and 56 regarding Coldhams Lane and schemes to do with the Cambridge Orbital Bus Corridor. Reference was made to the need for fundamental improvements to Coldhams Lane as the issue of speeding traffic was a major concern to local residents.
- One Member suggested that what was needed was a county division column and asked what the Committee was being asked to approve, as there was little detail regarding the priority order. It was explained that it was a list identifying all the infrastructure potentially needed, brought forward from the various transport strategies and did include many GCP projects. The Chairman highlighted that paragraph 3.1 clearly stated that the schemes were not prioritised.
- The Member for St Neots and the Eatons, (who was also a district and town councillor) commenting on the list for St Neots, stated that he did not see any of the local highways initiatives that the local councils required, some of which were to help alleviate flooding. It was suggested that he should speak to the lead officer outside of the meeting regarding the mechanism on how to get schemes included onto the list, which involved the local councils referred to and for them to identify the needs of their local area.

On being put to the vote, all but one Member who abstained voted in favour.

It was resolved:

To approve the Transport Investment Plan 2018.

## **162. RESPONSE TO THE GOVERNMENT CONSULTATIONS ON PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT FOR SHALE EXPLORATION AND INCLUSION OF SHALE GAS PRODUCTION PROJECTS IN THE NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (NSIP) REGIME**

The County Council has the opportunity to respond by 25<sup>th</sup> October to the Government on two consultation papers in respect of proposals for non-hydraulic fracturing (better known generally as fracking) shale gas exploration and production. The report presented the proposed responses to the Government's Consultation Papers on:

1. Permitted Development for Shale Gas Exploration, and;
2. Inclusion of shale gas production projects in the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) regime

The first paper sought views on the principle of granting planning permission for non-hydraulic shale gas exploration development through a permitted development right; and the second on the proposed inclusion of major shale gas production proposals under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) regime, and any related criteria which may apply. It was highlighted that due to the geology of Cambridgeshire, it was very unlikely that fracking would be undertaken in Cambridgeshire. The main points in the response were that:

- the proposal for prior planning approval for exploration through a permitted development right instead of being part of a planning application was not appropriate as it was such a controversial subject.
- Decisions should be undertaken at a local level with full community involvement.
- That the fee proposed via a prior approval fee would not reflect the amount of officer time that would be involved as the fee should reflect the amount of officer time involved, especially as any response arising from any public consultation was likely to be significant.

On the second question the principle of moving decision making on proposals for shale gas production could not be supported as the retention of a local decision would allow further information to be sought and specialist local knowledge sought and further public consultation undertaken.

Sheena Mooney a local resident originally requested to speak, but after reading the report, had instead asked that the following comments were brought to the attention of the Committee:

*“As a local resident and environmental campaigner I'd like to urge the Economy and Environment Committee and the Council as a whole to agree the Officer's report recommendations to reject government proposals to change the rules and include exploratory drilling for shale gas within "permitted development". These proposals make no sense whatsoever either in terms of the principle of local democracy, or of the impact on the climate at a time when it is imperative we move away from fossil fuels. I think it is of the utmost importance too, that the County Council follows many other institutions and divests its pension fund from fossil fuels. Please advise me when and if it plans to do so”.*

In discussion, points raised included:

- As the officer report had been written before the release of the latest scientific report on Global Warming / Climate Change, it was suggested that some reference should be made in the response to climate change implications based on the latest science. Another Member understood that an Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change report that had been issued that week recommending that there should be no further fracking. Some of the Committee Members supported the view that in the era of widely accepted evidence of global warming, fossil fuels should be kept in the ground with the urgent need to invest more in renewables. As a counter to this, one Member said he absolutely supported fracking, as gas /oil reserves were the equivalent of sitting on gold.
- Reference should be made to Examinations in Public being very resource hungry.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Agree the proposed responses to the above consultations, as set out in Paragraphs 4.1a and 4.1b respectively of the report.



**163. WATERBEACH NEW TOWN SPATIAL FRAMEWORK AND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

This report asked the Committee to consider and approve the County Council's response to the consultation draft Supplementary Planning Document for Waterbeach New Town.

It was highlighted that the County Council had contributed to the preparation of the draft SPD at officer level, working with the Local Planning Authority its consultants and the two developers. Officers considered that the draft SPD represented a fair reflection of the engagement with the County Council to date.

The infrastructure delivery plan in the SPD was based on the policy compliant development for a range of 8,000 to 9,000 dwellings. The Council generally supported the proposed education provision proposing: 5 primary schools; two secondary schools; one sixth form centre site, and land being made available for one special educational needs site. The Council wished to ensure that the SPD, and particularly the delivery plan, was sufficiently flexible to address the additional infrastructure demands from the current applications for 11,000 dwellings and that the objectives of the local plan policy and SPD to deliver comprehensive development across the whole site, needed to be translated into greater co-operation between the developers to achieve the successful delivery of the development.

Paragraphs 3.6 to 3.36 contained further comments on the current draft that the Committee was asked to endorse under the headings: Education, Minerals and Waste, Transport and Public Health. Under the Waste Management section on the Minerals and Waste response the County Council welcomed consideration of a connection between the potential energy from waste at the Waterbeach Waste Management Facility and a heat network.

In discussion:

- The Chairman indicated that before the meeting, he had a conversation with an officer (Chris Swain) from the Environment Agency on their concerns regarding flood issues and officers would need to liaise with him so they could be included in the final response. Officers in reply indicated that the Environment Agency could also make their own response. **Action: Juliet Richardson Business Manager, Growth and Development**
- A Member following up on the above later in the discussion asked which flood zone (1,2 or 3) was the site within? As it could not be confirmed at the time, Officers would write to Cllr Connor outside of the Meeting. **Action: Juliet Richardson Business Manager, Growth and Development**
- A Member suggested reference should have been made in paragraph 2.4 to Housing delivery. It was pointed out that this was a district council responsibility and therefore did not need to be included in a County Council response.
- A Member highlighted that he had previously expressed concern about primary schools being built next to main roads in this development due to the risks of pollution and noise damage to young children and asked whether there was more information on the proposed school sites since the last time it had been raised? In response the officer was able to confirm that the previous report had

only been in outline and that the site specifications would ensure any final sites would be within permitted pollution and noise requirement regulations.

- On the issue of encouraging people to cycle instead of using motor transport, there was a need for facilities such as bike parking to ensure they could be securely stored in close proximity to new homes. In response it was indicated that such detail would be included in the design code.
- That in future, walking and cycling should be encouraged through the provision of routes for recreation and commuting purposes. It was highlighted that figure 19 made reference to the key cycling routes within the new town that would link to all parts of the town. Officers were keen to ensure that good cycle routes were provided that were direct, safe, continuous and attractive.
- School design needed to be realistic for car access and to reflect the reality that many parents for perceived safety reasons would still wish to drive their children to school. This point would be taken back to the team responsible.
- The need to raise as part of the planning requirement for houses design, the issue of solar power / renewable energy sources such as electric charging points being provided. Officers undertook to speak to South Cambridgeshire District Council officers regarding strengthening sustainability.
- Water supply was also an issue as it was a dry area and this needed to be carefully looked at.
- A Member asked how officers would make recommendation b) work in respect of obtaining co-operation between the two developers to help achieve a comprehensive development. In reply, this was recognised as being difficult, but the County and District officer teams were working hard to achieve a comprehensive development with the two developers being brought together to work on the detail. This was especially true of the proposed education provision across the site, especially the secondary school proposals, where officers had expected much better.

Having considered the County Council's response,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the County Council's response to the consultation draft SPD as set out in section 3 of this paper with additions as suggested at the meeting regarding;
  - providing secure bike storage facilities
  - addressing potential flood issues
  - Design of schools taking into account access by motor vehicles.
  - Seeking sustainability provision in new dwellings in respect of renewable energy / solar panels / electric charging points.
  - Strengthening the response regarding the provision of health and community facilities.
  - Ensuring any sites proposed for primary school sites do not breach pollution and noise regulations and endanger the health of pupils.
  - Providing a map of walking and cycling routes.

- b) Endorse the comments at paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 regarding the need for flexibility in the delivery plan and for cooperation between the developers to achieve comprehensive development; and
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

#### **164. APPROACH TO THE AGREEMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) AND SECTION 106 FUNDING**

This report outlined the Council's approach to the negotiation, agreement and distribution of CIL and Section 106 Funding following up on the request made at the General Purpose Committee on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

With regard to CIL, it was highlighted that only two authorities (Huntingdonshire District Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council) had to date adopted a charging schedule. Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire submitted a CIL draft schedule with the Submission Draft Local Plan for consideration by the inspector. However due to the time elapsed, the submission was withdrawn and would be reconsidered on the adoption of the Local Plan. Fenland District Council had not introduced a CIL schedule because of development viability, as land values were lower, but this would be re-visited should there be a significant improvement in the economic climate.

County Council officers never failed to make a claim for Section 106 monies when it was practicable, but officers were restricted on what could be taken, as contributions had to be appropriate and directly related to the needs of the site.

In discussion, issues raised included:

- The need to impart this information more widely to make all Members of the Council more aware. Officers indicated that they were happy to organise a workshop. This proposal was supported by the whole Committee with a request that all district councillors on their respective planning committees should also be included in the invite. There was also a request that all Councillors should be sent the current report. **Action: Juliet Richardson.**
- With respect to the above workshop, one Member stated that it should provide more detail on the County Council approach to Section 106, as this was not currently included in the current report.

Having commented, it was resolved

- a) to note the report.
- b) To agree to officers organising a workshop on the subject with invitations to be extended to district councillors.

## 165. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2019-20 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

This report provides the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Capital Programme for Place and Economy as follows:

<b>Capital Expenditure</b>	<b>2019-20 £'000</b>	<b>2020-21 £'000</b>	<b>2021-22 £'000</b>	<b>2022-23 £'000</b>	<b>2023-24 £'000</b>	<b>Later Yrs £'000</b>
Place & Economy	33,203	19,681	19,109	18,768	15,114	16,800

Which was anticipated to be funded by the following resources:

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>2019-20 £'000</b>	<b>2020-21 £'000</b>	<b>2021-22 £'000</b>	<b>2022-23 £'000</b>	<b>2023-24 £'000</b>	<b>Later Yrs £'000</b>
Grants	16,547	18,043	18,066	18,081	18,218	20,370
Contributions	7,400	253	762	767	812	8,490
Borrowing	9,256	1,385	281	-80	-3,916	-12,060
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,203</b>	<b>19,681</b>	<b>19,109</b>	<b>18,768</b>	<b>15,114</b>	<b>16,800</b>

The full list of P&E capital schemes was shown in the draft capital programme at appendix one to the report with Table 4 listing the schemes with a description and with funding shown against years. Table 5 showed the breakdown of the total funding of the schemes. Changes to existing schemes, such as re-phasing, re-costing, and revised funding were highlighted. For Economy and Environment Committee these were shown under the headings: Integrated Transport Schemes, Ely Crossing; Kings Dyke; and Soham Station.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2019/20 Capital Programme for Place and Economy and
- b) Endorse their development.

## 166. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – AUGUST 2018

The Committee received the Finance and Performance report for Place and Economy Services (P&E) in order to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position, as at the end of August 2018. It was again explained that there had been little change since the previous month's report as there were still the same pressures previously reported.

The main issues highlighted were:

**Revenue:** The Service has started the financial year with two significant pressures for Coroners Services and Waste (both which came under Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee). The P&E service was showing that it will make £586K savings by year-end to bring the budget back into balance, and this would either be through new underspends and additional income, or planned reductions in service if required at the later stages of the year.

**Capital:** King's Dyke had been the subject of a separate report on the agenda.

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

An issue was raised in relation to the update on Community Transport on page 121 with a Member highlighting that Whippet were withdrawing the X3 service as of 10<sup>th</sup> November and following withdrawal of the C route, asking whether officers had been in contact with the Combined Authority on providing a replacement service / providing funding to continue the service, as it was the only service from Cambridge to Papworth Everard. In response the Chairman indicated that it was being looked into, but that it would be a decision for the Combined Authority.

Having reviewed and commented on the report, it was unanimously resolved to:

note the report.

## **167. COMMUNITY TRANSPORT GRANT PROCUREMENT AWARD**

A recent internal audit report had identified that grant funding for Dial-a-Ride services had never been formally procured and had recommended that the market for the grants should be tested to ensure value for money was being achieved via a formal procurement exercise. The requirement to invite bids for the grant awards had also been identified as part of a new policy governing the awarding of all grants by the Council, issued by the Chief Executive in July 2018.

Further to this, a procurement exercise had been undertaken and tender bids invited for four grant awards:

- Fenland (£40,265),
- Huntingdonshire (£12,095),
- Cambridge City (£27,280)
- Villages in East Cambridgeshire (£18,071).

Bidders had been invited to submit bids for providing Dial-a-Ride services within the current grant funding levels available, with bidders encouraged to bid for a lower level of funding.

For both Cambridge City and East Cambridgeshire area grants, only one bid had been received. As a result, the grants were recommended to be awarded to the sole bidder. For the Huntingdonshire and Fenland areas, two submissions had been received for each of the areas. Following an evaluation exercise undertaken by County Council officers based on quality and price and having sought both legal advice and procurement advice, preferred bidders had been identified. The Confidential Appendix A, which had only been provided to the Committee as it contained business sensitive information, set out the results of the procurement process, including identification of

the preferred bidders. Of the two bidders for each of the Huntingdon and Fenland areas, it was recommended that the highest scoring tender for each should be awarded grant funding.

The Chairman noted that on further advice received from procurement and legal colleagues it was therefore moved by and duly seconded as an amendment to the original recommendation that additional wording should be added reading “*subject to confirmation from all operators that they will agree to the full terms of the Grant Agreement*”

Members of the Committee had been provided with business sensitive information in a separate confidential appendix with details of the scores. A Member requested discussion of the detailed appendix scoring figures and details of the appraisal. As none of the bidders were aware of the scores, and as there was a strict protocol of how and when bidders would be notified of the Council’s decision surrounding the award decision and preferred bidder,

It was resolved:

To exclude the press and public as the appendix contained exempt information under paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 123 A of the Local Government Act 1972 – as amended - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information), as it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed.

Having discussed the detail of the confidential appendix the meeting reverted back to being a public meeting.

It was resolved unanimously:

a) To agree to award the grant funding for dial-a-ride services in accordance with Appendix 1, subject to confirmation from all operators that they will agree to the full terms of the Grant Agreement.

b) To agree the following awards:

Community Transport Cambridge Area: Dial a Ride (CamDAR)

Community Transport East Cambridgeshire Area: The Voluntary Network

Community Transport in Huntingdonshire: Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (HACT)

Community Transport for Fenland: Fenland Association for Community Transport (FACT)

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

The report invited the Committee to review its training plan. There had been no updates since the last meeting apart from the addition agreed earlier in the meeting.

It was resolved:

To note the Training Plan with the addition of the workshop on the approach to the agreement and distribution of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) And Section 106 Funding.

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

This report invited the Committee to review its agenda plan and training plan, The following updates were orally provided to the agenda plan at the meeting:

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

Addition to January Committee:

Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement.

Moved back from March to February:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Further Draft

It was resolved:

To note the agenda Plan as updated.

#### **170. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 15<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

**Chairman:  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2018**

#### **Appendix 1**

#### **SUMMARY OF SPEAKERS CONTRIBUTIONS MINUTE 159. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2019-20 TO 2023 TO 2024**

#### **LYNNE HESTER**

In 2018 75% of visually impaired people of working age are still not in work. It is also challenging for severely visually impaired people to gain voluntary work. A major barrier for visually impaired people of all ages is accessed to transport and getting around. The barriers

for visually impaired people living in rural areas such as Fenland are much greater, because of the lack of bus services, with most focusing on routes to get people into work.

Many people need to start their journeys before 9.30 a.m. to enable them to take part in voluntary work, exercise classes, or other social activities. Many also need to attend medical appointments. Many people have other health conditions in addition to the visual impairment.

This comes at a time when many bus services are being cut, or routes changed. For example, recently an older couple were in the media talking about a bus in Trumpington having been re-routed, and has left them stranded, unable to get to hospital appointments or into the city.

Visually impaired people of all ages need to get out of the homes and connect with other people to reduce isolation and loneliness. Like the general population, some visually impaired people have more opportunities than others, some have more resources than others.

Everyone is being encouraged to get out of their homes, and get active and involved for the benefits of the physical and mental health.

I would ask you not to vote for this change. We are the low hanging fruit, but we refuse to be squashed.

### **Michael Wordingham**

RNIB would like to register our objection to this proposal. There are 3,035 people registered sight or severely sight impaired in Cambridgeshire and an estimated 20,540 living with sight loss. Blind and partially sighted people encounter a number of barriers to transport and accessing their communities. We cannot drive, ride a bike and in many areas the design of public realm schemes mean that even walking independently has become difficult.

- 75% of blind and visually impaired people of working age are unemployed, not having free access to public transport before 9:30am is another barrier to looking for work and taking up voluntary work. It is also a barrier to getting out and about to meet up with people to combat loneliness and keep active.
- 180,000 people with sight loss rarely leave home alone.
- 43% of people who lose their sight suffer from depression.
- Almost 50% of people who are blind or partially sighted feel cut off from the people and things around them.
- More than 70% of people who are blind or partially sighted lack confidence to join in everyday activities.

A decision to cut the discretionary bus pass will increase isolation and add to the barriers that stop blind and partially sighted people from living independently. We would urge you to vote against this proposal.