

## **MEETING OF HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> July 2017

Time: 10:00am- 11.30am

Present: Councillors I Gardener, H Batchelor, M Howell, B Hunt (Vice-Chairman), S King, P Raynes, T Sanderson, J Scutt, M Shuter (Chairman) and A Taylor

In attendance: Councillors A Bailey and P Downes

Apologies: None

### **9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **10. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Action Log was noted. Members noted the commitment to include Tree Policy figures in the Finance & Performance reports on a six monthly basis, and that this information was therefore due to be presented to the next Committee meeting.

### **11. PETITIONS**

The Committee considered a 27 signature petition requesting the traffic-calming roadblock on Ermine Street, Little Stukeley. The petitioners were concerned that the traffic calming sometimes caused tailbacks all the way to the main "Make Grow" entrance to Alconbury Weald, causing significant needless delays to those trying to get into Huntingdon, and were concerned that the problem would worsen as more people moved to the Weald.

As there were fewer than 50 signatures, there was no right for the petitioner to address the Committee.

The Committee noted the petition and the Chairman advised that the petitioners would receive a full written response within ten working days of the meeting. It was noted that the Local Member, Councillor Rogers, was aware of the petition, and agreed that the response to the petitioner would be copied to all Committee Members. **Action required.**

## **12. NEW PROCESS FOR LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND PRIVATELY FUNDED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS**

Members considered a report on the introduction of new processes that would enable the recovery of all costs associated with the Local Highways Improvement (LHI) Initiative and Privately Funded Highways Improvements (FPHI). Following publication of the agenda, amended recommendations plus a revised appendix had been circulated to Committee Members.

One of the key drivers behind the proposed changes was full cost recovery, which was included in the Business Plan for both 2017/18 and 2018/19 - there were currently no resource costs attributed to the LHI initiative and FPHI. The proposals would also ensure applications were sufficiently developed so as to ensure assessment and prioritisation of applications could be more effective and meet the objectives and aspirations of local communities. Whilst to date applicant had been urged to contact Highways Officers and seek their input prior to applications being submitted, this did not always happen, and the proposed approach should ensure that all applications followed the same process and were delivered to a consistent level. Members noted the process for FPHI, which was very similar in terms of stages and decision points.

Members noted:

- the “pre application phase”, when applicants were contacted, and options explored to find the most appropriate solution. Officers would provide estimated costs, which would include fees i.e. to fund the costs of officers developing and delivering the scheme. Estimated delivery timescales would be provided, and a fully documented summary would go to the member panel. Each applicant would then have the opportunity to consider if they wanted to continue to the member panel stage, as any issues would have been flagged up at this stage e.g. significantly increased budget requirement;
- the proposal to make all information accessible on the website, including the full applications. The new webpages were still under construction, but it was envisaged that they would be launched in time for this year’s LHI application process;
- the process once applications had been submitted and scoring had been finalised by the Member panel. Scores would be prioritised and the final list submitted to the March H&CI Committee meeting. After that, there was a further decision point for the applicant, where they have to commit in writing to contribute the necessary funding for the scheme to be delivered;
- implementation would be quicker, as much of the feasibility and early development work would already have been carried out;
- how the process for PFHI differed from LHI, including the option for other contractors to deliver schemes. In total a privately funded scheme would take around 12 months to deliver.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Downes spoke on this item. In response to a question on who had cleared the original report, the Chairman confirmed that he and the Vice-Chairman had been briefed on it, and it was also noted that a previous version of the report had been considered by Spokes.

With regard to PFHI, Councillor Downes asked if there was a way in which some of the highways authority's requirements could be relaxed, for very minor works, e.g. not involve the County Council at all, as the bureaucratic burden seemed disproportionate to the outcomes. Some Members commented that whilst this approach may appear attractive, the national context in which highways authorities operated was still essentially bureaucratic, even in the current financial climate, and this impeded authorities. Councillor Downes suggested that authorities should lobby nationally on this issue. Another Member observed that whilst it may be desirable in some instances to reduce bureaucracy, the regulations in this case were about fairness, enabling local residents to object or agree to proposed schemes and changes.

Arising from the report:

- a Member welcomed the proposal to provide better quality pre-application advice, which had been lacking in the past, and observed that the £500 deposit originally proposed was unaffordable for communities, and she was therefore very happy to support the removal of the deposit;
- Members noted that the new webpages would be launched at the end of July;
- a Member commented that whilst the proposed process would increase transparency, getting communications and expectations right was absolutely key, which was usually a cultural issue of ensuring individual officers were engaged and on-message. Officers confirmed that this was the case;
- Members noted that the top-slicing, and the original proposal for a £500 up-front fee, was to resource officer time spent on developing proposed schemes;
- noting that Town Councils would be granted "one bid per division", a Member asked about those divisions which covered two towns e.g. Huntingdon West and Godmanchester & Huntingdon South: it was confirmed that there would be one bid per division, so in the example given there would be a bid each for both Huntingdon West and for Godmanchester & Huntingdon South;
- a Member commented that LHI was effectively resourcing vital schemes due to a lack of funding nationally;
- a Member commented that there had been confusion in the current process, as applicants had been told not to be specific in their requests, but then had applications turned down for not being specific. Officers reassured Members that any such ambiguities would be cleared up in the proposed process. Most notably, there would be less confusion on scheme costs from the outset;

- it was clarified that the process as proposed would not mean that more schemes could be delivered, but that they could be delivered more efficiently. In particular, the Chairman observed that a lot of time was being wasted by prospective applicants on schemes that would not be implemented, due to a lack of understanding of the process. The proposed changes should make the process smoother;
- a Member suggested that Cambridge City residents needed to be reassured that despite lacking Parish and Town Councils, the processes for them to make applications was available and well-defined, and she suggested that Members with City divisions were consulted on the webpages prior to launch.  
**Action required.**
- Members noted that the revised recommendation was now to top slice pre-application costs rather than charge a £500 flat fee.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

- a) approve the introduction of a non-refundable application fee for PFHI applications to enable appropriate resourcing and full cost recovery;
- b) approve the introduction of the LHI & PFHI processes outlined in appendix A & C of this report, which include the recovery of resource costs associated with scheme delivery;
- c) approve changes to the restriction on multiple LHI applications from Town Councils, allowing the same number as there are County Council divisions in their authority area;
- d) to approve the top slice of pre-application costs associated with the feasibility phase of the LHI Process from the annual capital LHI budget.

Councillor Scutt asked for the minutes to record that she had voted against the proposals, because whilst she favoured the process, she did not support the financial aspects.

### 13. **PROPOSED NETWORK RAIL (CAMBRIDGESHIRE LEVEL CROSSING REDUCTION) ORDER**

The Committee considered a report on the County Council's formal response to Network Rail's proposed closure of a number of level crossings across the county. These closures would impact on 25 public rights of way or roads and four private crossings. Members were advised that this issue had been considered in depth at the Committee on three occasions over the last year.

In the presentation of the report, points raised included:

- that this issue would need to be considered at full Council in order to meet the relevant statutory provisions;
- whilst the County Council recognised the value of reducing the number of level crossings, it would be objecting to 15 of the proposals, for the following reasons (i)

- lack of a safe alternative; (ii) reduction in connectivity of the network; (iii) diminution in enjoyment for users and access to green space for physical and mental well-being; (iv) an unreasonable increase in liability for the Highways Authority; (v) a significant impact on promoted routes and a lack of evidence for closure;
- Holding objections to four crossings were proposed because further information was required to enable a full assessment of the proposals;
  - the Transport & Works Act Order, as proposed by Network Rail, would cost the Council well over £100,000;
  - how every effort would be made to work with communities and Network Rail to agree solutions, and therefore Members were being asked to delegate any changes to the Council's position to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport & Environment) in consultation with the Chair of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee;
  - that the Council was proposing to object to the proposed closure of the Weatherby crossing in Newmarket, which was located in Suffolk but affected residents in Cheveley and Woodditton.

A number of Members praised the officers involved for their excellent work in this very long and detailed process. Members noted comments from Councillor van de Ven, one of the Local Members, who similarly passed on her thanks for officers' sterling work in this matter.

In response to a question on what would happen if Network Rail did not take on board the objections, the officer explained that there would be a formal public enquiry, with the County Council represented by an advocate, and Camilla Rhodes as a witness. In total there had been 51 objections to the Orders, three letters of support, and many representations. The County Council, as highways authority, would have the opportunity to put forward those formal objections. Likely timescales for a public inquiry were noted.

It was unanimously resolved to:

1. update Members at full Council on Network Rail's project to reduce level crossings affecting the highway network;
2. seek approval from full Council of the County Council's proposed full response to the legal Order;
3. allow officers to continue negotiations with Network Rail, with any changes to the Council's position being delegated to the Executive Director (ETE) in consultation with the Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee.

#### **14. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – FINAL OUTTURN 2016/17**

The Committee received a report setting out financial and performance information for Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE), for May 2017.

Members noted emerging potential pressures on the waste service, and that work was underway to model and evaluate the implications on the budget of different levels of performance at the waste plant. In response to a Member question, it was noted that the Waste Steering Group had had its first meeting. It was not possible to share the minutes of that meeting or the presentation given on the basis of commercial sensitivities. The Member commented that she did not agree with the

process by which representatives were appointed to the Group and the lack of transparency in how it had been set up.

With regard to the Performance Indicator for Road Safety, officers agreed to follow up the work being done on the causes for the recent increase, discussed at the previous Committee meeting. **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

1. review, note and comment on the report.

## **15. HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Members noted the updated Agenda Plan, and agreed to cancel the provisional August meeting. The report on Library Service Transformation was unlikely to be ready for September and would be removed from the agenda. In response to a Member question, officers would confirm whether or not Huntingdonshire on-street parking would be incorporated in to the Cambridge on street parking report that was scheduled for September. **Action**

With regard to the Training Plan, it was noted that the site visit to Amey Cespa on 12<sup>th</sup> July had been cancelled, and would be rearranged.

The Committee considered a schedule of appointments to outside bodies, internal advisory groups and panels, and partnership liaison and advisory groups, which had been tabled. The Clerk cautioned that many of the nominations had been put forward shortly before the meeting so some of the detail needed to be checked and confirmed, and a revised schedule would be approved by the Chairman, under delegated authority, and circulated to Committee Members. **(updated schedule attached).**

A Member felt that changes to the Cambridgeshire Waste Steering Group should have been determined by the Committee, as the process lacked transparency. There was a discussion on the political proportionality of outside bodies, and it was noted that proportionality was only an issue if the outside body required it: only Committee and Sub-Committees of the County Council needed to be politically proportional. The Chairman said he would take advice on the Waste Steering Group, but the intention behind the appointments was to have a smaller core of Members involved, all of whom had experience in this area. The Member raised similar issues with regard to the Libraries Steering Group, and the Chairman commented that he was open to nominations from all parties being put forward for the latter group.

It was resolved to:

1. Note the agenda plan, training plan and appointments to outside bodies.

**Chairman**

## APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
<b>Cambridgeshire Waste PFI Member Steering Group</b> A Steering Group to consider reports from officers on the negotiation of disputed matters and future savings of the Waste PFI contract	12	3	1. <b>Councillor M Shuter (Con)</b> 2. <b>S Count (Con)</b> 3. <b>R Hickford (Con)</b> <b>Confirmed on 21/06/17</b>	Daniel Sage Strategic Project Manager (Waste)  07587 585457 <a href="mailto:daniel.sage@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">daniel.sage@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
<b>Cycling Safety Working Group</b> An ad-hoc working group to review and suggest improvements to cycling safety within the County. The Group consists of four Members and representatives from Road Safety, Transport Strategy, Road Engineering and Public Health.	As required	5	Previously 1. Councillor S Criswell (Con) 2. Councillor N Kavanagh (Lab) 3. Councillor A Taylor (LD) 4. Councillor J Schumann (Con) 5. Councillor S van de Ven (LD)	<a href="mailto:road.safety@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">road.safety@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
<b>Strategic Collaboration Board</b> <b>[Previously Highway Transformation Board]</b>  The Strategic Collaboration Board has overall responsibility for the success of the highway service (excluding street lighting). The Board provides strategic direction and decision making, developing the service vision, values and principles through a collaboration charter. Leading by example, the Board will maintain a long-term focus (3-5 year plan), developing and agreeing a suite of strategic performance indicators aligned to strategic outcomes. Monitoring delivery of a transformational route map.	4	2	Member representatives: 1. Chair of H&CI 2. Chair of E&E  (Subs will be the vice-chairs of both committees)	Contacts: Richard Lumley Emma Murden
<b>Libraries Steering Group</b>		3	1. Councillor Raynes 2. Councillor Criswell 3. Councillor Joseph <b>Confirmed on 21/06/17</b> 4. Councillor A Taylor 5. Cllr J Scutt	Christine May, Interim Service Director (Infrastructure Management)



# CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS TO PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

## Appendix 2

<i>NAME OF BODY</i>	<i>MEETINGS PER ANNUM</i>	<i>REPS APPOINTED</i>	<i>REPRESENTATIVE(S)</i>	<i>CONTACT DETAILS</i>
<b>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership Strategic Management Board</b>  The Partnership (CPRSP) is a public sector initiative formed in April 2007 to provide a single point of contact for the provision of road safety work and information.	4	1	M Shuter (Con)	Matt Staton Road Safety Education Team Leader  01223 699652  <a href="mailto:matt.staton@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">matt.staton@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
<b>Clay Farm Centre Advisory Group</b>  The Advisory Group will support and make recommendations to the Centre Manager and /or Partnership review meetings.	4	1	Councillor D Adey (LD)	Sally Roden, Neighbourhood Community Development Manager, Cambridge City Council  <a href="mailto:Sally.rodan@cambridge.gov.uk">Sally.rodan@cambridge.gov.uk</a> 01223 457861 mobile 07920210957
<b>County Advisory Group on Archives and Local Studies</b>  The County Archives and Local Studies Advisory Group exists to provide a forum for those who share an interest in the preservation and use of the documentary heritage of Cambridgeshire (including the historic county of Huntingdonshire).	2	4	1. J Scutt (L) 2. A Taylor (LD) 3. Councillor P Topping (Con) 4. T Sanderson (Ind) 5. N Harrison (LD) ( <u>substitute</u> )	Alan Akeroyd Archives & Local Studies Manager  01223 699489 <a href="mailto:alan.akeroyd@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">alan.akeroyd@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
<b>Highways and Improvement Panels</b>  Established to consider and make recommendations to the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on the allocation of funds for locally led minor highway improvements.			See listings below – Previous appointments listed	Andy Preston Highways Projects & Road Safety Manager  <a href="mailto:andrew.preston@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">andrew.preston@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>

<i>NAME OF BODY</i>	<i>MEETINGS PER ANNUM</i>	<i>REPS APPOINTED</i>	<i>REPRESENTATIVE(S)</i>	<i>CONTACT DETAILS</i>
<b>East Cambridgeshire LHI Panel</b>	1	6 (subs allowed)	Previous appts. Listed: 1. Councillor B Hunt (Con) 2. Councillor P Raynes (Con) 3. Councillor A Bailey (Con) 4. Councillor J Schumann (Con) 5. Councillor L Dupre (LD) 6. Councillor D Ambrose Smith (Con)	
<b>Fenland Rural LHI Panel</b>	1	6 (subs allowed)	1. Councillor S Tierney (Con) 2. Councillor D Connor (Con) 3. Councillor S Count (Con) 4. Councillor S Hoy (Con) 5. Councillor S King (Con) 6. Councillor J Gowing (Con)	
<b>Huntingdonshire LHI Panel</b>	1	7 (subs allowed)	1. Councillor I Gardener (Con) 2. Councillor S Bywater (Con) 3. Councillor S Criswell (Con) 4. Councillor T Sanderson (Ind) 5. Councillor M McGuire (Con) 6. Councillor P Downes (LD) 7. Councillor G Wilson (LD)	
<b>South Cambridgeshire LHI Panel</b>	1	6 (subs allowed)	1. Councillor T Wotherspoon (Con) 2. Councillor R Hickford (Con) 3. Councillor D Jenkins (LD) 4. Councillor S Kindersley (LD) 5. Councillor H Batchelor (LD) 6. Councillor M Smith (Con)	
<b>RECAP Board</b>  RECAP (Recycling in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough) is a partnership of authorities across Cambridgeshire & Peterborough working together to provide excellent waste	4	1	<b>Confirmed as</b> Councillor M Shuter (Con) Councillor W Hunt (Con) – substitute <b>on 06/06/17</b>	Neil Slopes  <a href="mailto:neil.slopes@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">neil.slopes@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>

<b>NAME OF BODY</b>	<b>MEETINGS PER ANNUM</b>	<b>REPS APPOINTED</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIVE(S)</b>	<b>CONTACT DETAILS</b>
and recycling services to meet local needs. The RECAP Board is the Member level group of this partnership.				
<b>Traffic Penalty Tribunal</b>  The Traffic Penalty Tribunal is an independent tribunal whose impartial, independent Adjudicators consider appeals by motorists and vehicle owners whose vehicles have been issued with penalty charges, removed or towed away or immobilised by a Council in England or Wales (excluding London) that enforces parking contraventions under the Traffic Management Act 2004.	As required	1 + substitute	Councillor M McGuire (Con)  Substitute – Councillor A Taylor	Philip Hammer Parking Operations Manager  01223 727903  <a href="mailto:Philip.hammer@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Philip.hammer@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>