

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 12 noon

**Present:** Councillors: I Bates (Chairman), E Cearn (Vice-Chairman and Chairman from Minute 293) , J Clark, B Chapman (substitute for Councillor Mason) L Harford, D Harty (substitute for Councillor Shuter), R Henson, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, A Lay, M McGuire, J Schumann and J Williams

**Apologies:** Councillors M Mason and M Shuter.

**233. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Although the bidding contractors were not named in the report as a precaution Councillor Clark declared a potential personal interest in item 5 titled 'Ely Southern Bypass – award of Contract for Design and Construction' as his sons worked for Kier Construction.

**234. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> June were agreed as a correct record. The action log which had not been finalised for inclusion would be circulated outside of the meeting.

**235. PETITIONS**

There were no petitions to be considered.

**236. REFIT FRAMEWORK PROCUREMENT UPDATE, ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING**

This report highlighted changes to the Energy Performance Contracting arrangements under the REFIT 2 Framework due to expire on 18th November 2016. It was explained that after this date the Council would be unable to develop new projects with the service provider and enter into new agreements for energy performance contracting projects. It was clarified that new projects would need to be developed under a new procurement arrangement through the new REFIT3 Framework and the report therefore sought the Committee's approval to procure a Service provider from the new Framework.

It was highlighted that the current procurement of Bouygues Energies and Services Limited (BE&S Ltd) under the REFIT 2 Framework had worked extremely well with the benefits as detailed in the report with 24 contracts worth £5.2 million for work in schools and public buildings having been signed, as well as a contract for the 12 Megawatt solar park at just under £10 million with the procurement also facilitating collaborative working with local district councils. It was orally reported that another £5.5m of projects

was likely to be facilitated via the current procurement by the November expiration deadline for REFIT 2.

As Cambridgeshire had more than 240 schools and a 100 of its own public buildings and other assets, it was essential that the procurement changes did not prevent new projects progressing and that any new procurement process was able to develop the Authority's energy ambitions to bring forward larger projects, as well as continue the successful schools programme. Appendix A of the report proposed a process to determine how to progress projects. Advice on how to extend existing procurement arrangements to manage the change from the REFIT 2 Framework to the REFIT 3 Framework as interim arrangements was set out in the detail of the report.

Committee Members comments / questions included:

- Whether secondary academies could make changes to the contract or withdraw from it. In reply it was indicated that secondary academies were subject to a management service contract which agreed the performance expected from the energy measures based on Bouygues designs and performance guarantees, including the reduction in carbon. This service was paid on a monthly basis and contracts signed up to a period of 15 years.
- With reference to paragraph 4.1 - resource implications - and the text reading: *"However there is still a cost to using the REFIT 3 Framework. A levy is charged per contract to contribute towards the framework set up costs and its support services to ensure that clients get the best value from the framework contracts agreements and the service providers"* there was a request for details of the costs, as no figure had been provided. In response it was indicated that the GLA REFIT Framework charged up to 2% for using its framework if a project went to contract unless a support arrangement with Local Partnerships was agreed where levy costs could be negotiated dependent on the support provided. For the REFIT 2 Framework, Council officers negotiated a flat fee per project which was a cheaper, better deal than the 2% levy. Another Member later on in the debate asked if the above were the only costs? As a response it was clarified that Local Partnerships provided consultancy support for the design of the procurement specification for the mini-competition and advice on how to get the most from the REFIT 2 Framework, for a fee of £40,000. The full procurement cost being recovered over time through the school energy performance contracting service.
- Another Member indicated it would have helped with making a final decision if Members could have seen the full options available for procurement and also an analysis of the differences between REFIT 2 and 3 and whether the REFIT 3 framework covered the potential variety of projects. It was agreed that these questions and more detail on the previous query would be dealt with better through a detailed noted being circulated by the officers outside of the meeting. **Action: Sheryl French**
- There was a request for an update on the Council position on wind-turbines and whether circumstances had changed to allow the Council to move on from its original Policy of not siting any on Council owned land. In response the Chairman indicated that this would be better dealt with by a paper coming forward to spokes.

As an update, the officer indicated that Strategic Management Team (SMT) in June had identified the need for a Corporate Energy Strategy to be developed which would look at all opportunities / options for energy generation.

- The Vice Chairman queried the timescale of this wider piece of work (Corporate Energy Strategy) and highlighted that with no future European Funding as a result of Brexit, it should be supported by the Committee, who should also see an early report back. In response it was indicated that timescales had not yet been agreed but any Strategy would require a further 4-6 months to develop. Sheryl French indicated she would be meeting with the Executive Director, Graham Hughes the next day to discuss timescales which would be reported back to spokes.
- Another Member queried whether with the time-lag involved in producing an Energy Strategy and being asked to agree to run a competition under REFIT 3 now, the Council was potentially committing to a worse deal and asked how easy it would be to withdraw from REFIT 3. In response it was explained that when procuring a supplier as a partner, this did not automatically assign all projects to be assessed and delivered by the service provider, as this was undertaken on a project by project basis and was only progressed if the business case, when reviewed, was acceptable. Only then was a project contracted with the service provider. The intention was that the Corporate Energy Strategy work would inform the procurement for a new REFIT 3 service provider.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Manage the expiration of the REFIT 2 Framework and to seek approval to procure a Service Provider from the new REFIT 3 Framework.
- b) Run a mini competition under the REFIT 3 Framework to appoint a Service Provider to facilitate the design and delivery of new projects post-November 2016 to grow the Authority's energy ambitions.

## **237. ELY SOUTHERN BYPASS - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

This report provided details of the outcome of the procurement process for the Design and Construction contract for the Ely Southern Bypass, seeking the Committee's approval to award the contract to the preferred bidder which had been subject to the Department of Transport (DfT) releasing the £16million Growth Deal Funding.

The procurement of the Design and Construct contract was conducted as an European Union (EU) tender process with a Restricted Tender two-stage process. When the initial £16m Growth Deal Funding allocation was approved, the mechanism for the release of funding had been uncertain but was subsequently clarified as requiring a full Major Schemes Business Case (MSBC) with details provided in Section 3 of the report. An oral update indicated that having assessed the MSBC and Ministerial approval had been received to release the money. The first stage of the procurement process was publication of a contract notice in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2016 and the issue of Pre-qualification Questionnaires (PQQ). The PQQ invited interested providers to submit an expression of interest which was evaluated for

financial and safety suitability, along with capacity and relevant experience, particularly with respect to some of the likely risks involved in delivering the Ely bypass such as; liaison with Network Rail, constructing rail and river crossings, resolving poor ground conditions, communications and local community impact and benefits. The PQQ received an excellent response with 11 contractors expressing interest in the Design and Construction contract for the by-pass.

All 11 PQQ submissions were evaluated and the 6 highest scoring contractors were invited to tender. The Invitation to Tender (ITT) was issued on 13<sup>th</sup> April. The 8 week tender period closed on 8<sup>th</sup> June. All 6 contractors submitted a tender. The tender required a quality submission to demonstrate how the contractors proposed to build a high quality product to meet the requirements of the County Council, along with separate target costs for the design and construction. The tenders were submitted on the LGSS e-tendering system and the cost and quality submissions were evaluated by independent teams. The scores for each component were then combined to give an overall score. The overall score was calculated on a ratio 60% quality to 40% price.

The result of the evaluation for the six bidders was set out in Table 1 of the report. Details of the bidders' tendered prices were provided in a Confidential Appendix only provided to Committee members. The table showed that Bidder 1 has provided the most economically advantageous tender with the preferred bidder's target cost for the design and construction being within the budget available for the scheme and was therefore the bidder recommended for approval. The contract process had been divided into two parts, the first phase covering design development and consents process, with construction as a second phase. The presumption was that the scheme would be delivered as a single package, but there was no guarantee that the contractor would move directly from detailed design to construction as this was conditional on satisfactory development of the design and agreement of a construction target price.

As it was possible that the post-design construction Target Price would vary from the current construction Target Price submitted as part of the tender as a result of development of the engineering detail and the clarification of construction methods, and given the aspiration to deliver the scheme as quickly as possible, it was proposed that the agreement of the construction Target Price and commencement of construction was delegated to the Executive Director - Economy Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Economy and Environment committee unless the post-design Target Price was significantly higher than the tendered construction price in which case, the decision to trigger construction would be referred back to this Committee for its final decision.

Following the award of the contract the initial design period is expected to be 4 months with the subsequent construction estimated at between a further 12 and 18 months. The contractors have submitted an outline programme as part of their tender package, which is in line with these estimates.

Councillor Rouse was invited to speak as the local Member for Ely North and East Division and spoke in support of the scheme, welcoming the huge benefits the scheme would bring and urging the Committee to approve it and for the construction to commence as soon as possible, bearing in mind the amount of housing growth in and around Ely. He also highlighted that there would now also be a need to improve the

section of the A10 between Cambridge Road roundabout and the Witchford Road roundabout. Other members later in the discussion supported that officers needed to take this observation on board.

Comments / issues from Members raised included:

- One Member in fully supporting the scheme highlighted the current issues with hauliers' heavy goods vehicles using villages to avoid the congestion on the main road, as well as the impact of agricultural machinery having to access the A10 / Fenland and the subsequent delays that occurred, which had a knock on effect on the local economy.
- The bypass would be a huge milestone for the strategic agenda, especially as Network Rail were proposing to increase the amount of freight traffic along the Ely to Kings Cross line and therefore required the construction to be undertaken as soon as possible to help alleviate the amount of traffic having to use the level crossing on the A142.
- There was a request for clarification on the substantially different quotes on the design fee element. In response it was suggested that contractors had apportioned the Stage 1 and Stage 2 costs to reflect the level of work to be undertaken in each particular stage.
- There was a query regarding the reasons for using the 60:40 ratio. In response it was explained that this was an industry standard rather than the County Council standard, and had been a consideration of officers and the Project Board.
- The Council Cycling Champion raised the issue of whether there were plans for cycling schemes to be included with the project. In response it was indicated that East Cambridgeshire District Council would be bringing forward a number of local schemes under the Ely Station Gateway project which were designed to improve cycling / pedestrian facilities and would include a brand new access to the station. The Member was advised to seek further information from Mike Davies outside of the meeting. It was also noted that improvements to facilities at the existing railway underpass were required as a planning condition and these would be agreed during the construction of the bypass but could only be implemented after the new route was opened to traffic.
- There was a request to provide further detail of the differences between Bids 1 and 2 outside of the meeting. **Action: Brian Stinton**
- A query was raised on the question of the liaison responsibilities regarding Network Rail closures to allow certain construction works. In reply it was indicated that the ultimate responsibility for possession of the rail would be with the contractor, but that costs would be met by the County Council.
- One Member while highlighting that while not everyone had supported the proposed option solution in the original consultation, he welcomed the quality weighting, as looking at a scheme just from the cost point of view was sometimes detrimental to the quality of the final scheme.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the procurement process.
- b) Note that the tendered price from the preferred bidder falls within the budget allocated in the County Council's Business Plan, and within the range in the business case submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) in support of the £16 million Growth Deal Funding.
- c) Approve the award of the Design and Construction contract to the preferred bidder as detailed in Section 2.4 of the report.
- d) Delegate the decision to commence the second stage of the contract (construction) to the Executive Director of Economy and Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee as detailed in Section 2.6. of the Officers' report.

## **238. TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN APPROACH TO FUNDING FOR TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE**

Changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations introduced restrictions from April 2015 on the pooling of Section S106 (S106) contributions requiring that no more than five obligations could be used for any given project. Consequently, there was a requirement for a tool to enable the effective monitoring of pooled S106 contributions. This report explained details of the new Transport Investment Plan (TIP) and how it would help the Council record and manage the delivery of transport infrastructure for growth, whilst also enabling a method to manage the pooling of Section 106 (S106) contributions and other funding sources.

It was explained that the TIP for Cambridgeshire forms part of the Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Plan and is an up to date list that sets out the transport infrastructure and initiatives required to support the growth of Cambridgeshire. The TIP will be used:

- to monitor how many S106 obligations have been secured towards the delivery of each specific project, to ensure the maximum permitted five agreements is not breached;
- to identify and prioritise projects to be added to the Transport Delivery Plan (TDP)
- to identify funding gaps and inform future funding bids as opportunities.

The TIP was complete in terms of current schemes, with work underway to complete the financial and S106 pooling information for all schemes. It was anticipated that this would be complete by August 2016 and it was planned to bring the list of schemes in the TIP to this Committee later in the year in November for Member Approval.

Comments / questions included:

- One Member queried whether Neighbourhood Plans should be at the top of the flow

- diagram shown under paragraph 2.6 illustrating how the proposed TIP related to other policy documents, programmes, information sources and scheme identification processes. It was explained that the flow chart boxes highlighted where resources came from and being at the top of the diagram were not being given more prominence.
- Councillor Henson expressed the view that parish councils would not be happy if Section 106 monies were spent elsewhere from where houses were being built. The Chairman indicated he would be happy to arrange a meeting between the Member, himself and officers to clarify further the Section 106 process if this would be helpful.
- A member queried whether there was an intention to undertake a similar exercise for schools. In response it was suggested that this information was already set out in the Budget Book and the person to contact further was Keith Grimwade the Director of Learning.
- The Vice-Chairman made the point about the restrictions on the ability to spend CIL monies was having a detrimental effect on arts spend which it had been proved that every £1 spent on culture and arts resulted in £10 being received back from leverage. He suggested that Spokes should have a watching brief which was also endorsed by the Chairman when summing up stating that they should be given updates on what projects were
- One Member suggested that the information in the TIP should be more widely distributed, including providing the details to all members. In response it was highlighted that Appendix 1 showed the contents of the Plan that would made available to the public on the County Council website including project details and the position on funding. Contractual negotiation details would however have to be kept confidential.
- The Council Cycling Champion in noting that the TIP included investment for cycleways, made the point that while it was excellent that new cycleways were being built, asked what steps were being taken to maintain the existing cycleways in a good state of repair as he received many complaints regarding their condition. Bob Menzies in response indicated that the responsibility for maintenance was an issue for the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee who were responsible for the Transport Delivery Plan. Councillor McGuire who was the Chairman of the said committee was sympathetic to the concerns raised, but highlighted that the Committee had to make difficult decisions on priorities in the current economic climate and could make no promises going forward.

It was resolved:

To approve the new format and approach in relation to:

- a) Managing information relating to transport infrastructure investment.
- b) Managing the pooling of Section 106 (S106) contributions and other funding sources.

- c) The future Member sign-off process for schemes in the Transport Investment Plan.

## **239. CAMBRIDGESHIRE FLOOD AND WATER SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

This report presented the detail of the revised Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) following public consultation, with the original report recommendation seeking the Committee's agreement to the adoption of the SPD.

However following discussions with the other Cambridgeshire local planning authorities (LPA) over the timing and process for the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document, officers were recommending delaying the adoption until each LPA had endorsed the SPD through their respective member processes. As a supplementary tabled document, the Committee was therefore asked to confirm the County Council's endorsement of the SPD as a technical document in advance of similar endorsement from the other LPAs and subsequent formal adoption. As Local Lead Flood Authority and therefore a statutory consultee on flooding matters, it was important for the County Council to lead the process of technical endorsement. It was clarified in reply to a question that it would not be necessary to receive a further report.

Coupled with the enactment of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (which made the County Council a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)) and the progressing of comprehensive local plan preparation across the County, the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), including the County Council, have agreed jointly to the preparation and adoption of a countywide supplementary planning document (SPD) to ensure that Cambridgeshire has a consistent, locally appropriate, approach to flood risk and water management. The Flood and Water SPD has been prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) in partnership with all the County's district authorities, the Environment Agency, Anglian Water, and the Internal Drainage Boards (including the Middle Level Commissioners).

The SPD had been prepared to support the implementation of flooding and water related policies in each local planning authority's Local Plan, including the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy DPD and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Site Specific Proposals DPD. When adopted, the SPD would be a material consideration when considering planning applications.

The main purposes of the SPD would be:

- To provide guidance to developers on the approach that should be taken to manage flood risk and the water environment as part of new development proposals;
- To provide a step by step guide to address flood risk matters as part of a development proposal, including clear guidance on the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS);
- To support existing and emerging flood risk and water management related planning policies contained within the relevant Local Planning Authorities adopted or draft Local Plans; and



- For Cambridgeshire County Council, the SPD will support the relevant policies contained within the 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan' Core Strategy (adopted July 2011).

The SPD provides detailed guidance for applicants on developing proposals that:

- Are not at risk of flooding and that do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, including providing guidance on the sequential and exception tests, how to produce a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, and measures that can be taken to manage flood risk;
- Include the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) that effectively manage water, are well designed to conserve, accommodate and enhance biodiversity, and provide amenity for local residents; and
- Enhance the quality of the water environment and mitigate the adverse impact of development on the quality of water bodies including rivers, lakes and groundwater.

Appendices to the report included

Appendix 2 – Sustainability, Appraisal and Habitat Screening Report information

Appendix 3 - Equality Impact Assessment information

Appendix 4 - Public Consultation information

After carrying out the public consultation, Cambridgeshire County Council, in conjunction with the Officer Steering Group and other stakeholders considered the representations received on the draft SPD and made appropriate changes with the main amendments in the document reflecting the following:

- A better understanding of the Fen areas and IDBs requirements;
- Managing conflicts between what works in urban and what works in a rural environment ;
- Ensuring the policy document was as user friendly as possible;
- A better quality document in terms of design and clarity of images and graphs.

In discussion some Members sought clarification on who was responsible for surface drains on roads not adopted. In response it was explained that the local planning authorities were required to ensure surface drainage was in place when approving planning applications. As a statutory consultee on new housing, the County Council would object to a development planning application where no surface water drainage measures were shown. Several Members in response suggested that the County Council needed to be more robust in objecting, as it was considered that a County Council objection carried more weight than a local planning committee seeking to overturn a planning objection.

**Action:** Officers were asked to actively ensure that more guidance should be provided to local planning committees on how the new arrangements would work.

It was unanimously resolved:

- a) To confirm the County Council's technical endorsement of the Cambridgeshire

Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document; and

b) To delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor textual and editorial changes to the SPD, in consultation with the Officer Steering Group.

## **240. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN 2015/2016**

This report set out the detail of the ETE Finance and Performance outturn report for 2015/2016 for the whole of the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Service. The cover report set out the main headlines highlighting that the revenue outturn position for ETE as a whole showed a final underspend of £1.336m. Due to a printing error Appendix A had been omitted on the original agenda but had been circulated to Members of the Committee after the original agenda despatch.

In relation to the budgets under the stewardship of the Committee, the under-spend was £738K. The main variances were as follows:-

- Adult Learning & Skills (-£206K) - as some skills schemes were funded by the City Deal.
- Park & Ride (+£67K) – a shortfall in income of £451K was partly offset by increased income of £300K from bus lane enforcement and reduced costs.
- Concessionary Fares (-£334K) - due to the withdrawal of some commercial routes and a decrease in passenger numbers.
- Passenger Transport Other (-£134k) - relates to the Cambridgeshire Future Transport contract renewals during the year achieving higher than anticipated savings.

For capital, the outturn position was slippage of £39.419m. The main variances were as follows, with the detail contained within the Finance & Performance Report:-

- Cycling schemes (-£2.6m)
- Huntingdon Town Centre (-£3.0m)
- Ely Crossing (-£9.4m)
- Guided Busway (-£3.4m)
- King's Dyke (-£4.9m)
- Connecting Cambridgeshire (-£6.2m)

E&E Committee had twelve performance indicators reported to it during 2015-16. Of the twelve, the status at the time of the report (which was showing 2014-15 data being reported for some indicators due to time lags in data collection while some were measures over the 2014/15 academic year) was one showing as red and eleven being green.

The indicator that was currently red was 'the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area'. The latest forecast was that none of these indicators would be red, six would end up as being amber and six green.

Members raised the following issues:

- regarding the slippage on Connecting Cambridgeshire, one Member expressed his concern on the underspend, as some villages and rural areas in Cambridgeshire still had technical issues with receiving 'Superfast Broadband' and wondered why the money had not been used to rectify them. As a response it was explained that the programme was still rolling out and was targeting such areas. It was highlighted that payment issues represented why there had been an underspend.
- There was a discussion in respect of bus patronage having fallen, even with an increase in patronage of the 'Guided Busway' which had increased by 3%.
- With reference to the appendix and section 4 'Performance Indicators' a question was raised regarding whether the statistic for 'the Percentage of Complaints responded to within 10 days' (101 complaints were received in March with 92% responded to within 10 working days which was above the 90% target) represented just an acknowledgment or a full response? The Officer responsible for performance indicators believed that this represented a full response, but would double check and respond in writing outside of the meeting. **Action: Graham Amis.**
- A question was raised on whether there was any policy to prevent the same person making numerous minor 'Freedom of Information' (FOI) requests. In response it was explained that every FOI request was treated as a separate request. If the same person had already raised the same issue previously, they would be referred back to the previous answer. If they still persisted making the same enquiry then the Chief Executive and the Director of Customer Services and Transformation had the power to recognise them as a persistent complainer and write to them restricting their access.

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was unanimously resolved:

To note the report.

## **241. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MAY 2016**

This report with the detail included in Appendix A, provides the financial position for the whole of the ETE Service up to the end of May 2016.

The headlines set out in the covering report were as follows:

Revenue: As it was such an early stage of the financial year there were no significant variances and ETE was showing a £50k underspend forecast variance.

Reserves Schedule: Currently the 2015/16 ETE underspend was shown in the reserves analysis (Appendix 5 of the report) pending a decision by General Purposes Committee on how much would be retained by the service (as endorsed by this Committee) and how much will be transferred to General reserves.

Capital: The net reduction in the ETE capital expenditure and funding budgets reflected three adjustments, (1) Slippage from 2015/16 schemes had been carried forward to reflect where expenditure previously planned for 2015/16 would now take place in 2016/17, (2) All 2016/17 budgets had been reviewed and the planned profile of spend updated to reflect the latest information (with some expenditures being moved into future years), and (3) a £10.5m “Capital Programme Variation” adjustment had been made to reflect the underlying nature of slippage where some schemes would inevitably be delayed. The adjustment was made following proposals from a Capital Board which had been set up to aim to bring the likely level of expenditure more in line with the budget (and to help more accurately estimate the required borrowing levels).

E&E Committee will have fourteen performance indicators reported to it in 2016-17. The Committee was asked to note and approve a minor change to the target for the percentage of premises in Cambridgeshire with access to at least superfast broadband should have been stated as 95.2% by the end of June 2017 rather than March 2017 in order to align with contractual targets the target.

Of the fourteen performance indicators, one was currently red and thirteen were green. The indicator that was currently red was:

- Local bus journeys originating in the authority area.

At year-end, the current forecast was that eight performance indicators would be amber and six green.

Issues raised included:

- On performance indicators a Member explained that, in respect of, page 18 showing a fall in the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area where the text indicated ‘that the main change was figures reported by Whippet’, this had been due to the company counting school contract journeys which should not have been included in passenger journey figures. He also queried why the out-turn figures were not included. It was explained that the 2015-16 outturn figures would be included in the September report.
- Explanation was provided in response to a question that where a contextual target was being shown without figures, this was still reported to Members so that they could see the trend.

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was unanimously resolved:

a) To note the report.

b) to approve a minor change to the target for the percentage of premises in Cambridgeshire with access to at least superfast broadband, to state the target as 95.2% by the end of June 2017 rather than March 2017, in order to align with contractual targets.

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

This report presented the Committee with the current version of the Training Plan at the time of publication, showing a record of the training that had already taken place and those currently proposed for 2016/17.

As an update to the published plan included on the agenda, it was orally reported that the E and E Committee Business planning workshop on 27<sup>th</sup> July had been cancelled so the first one would now be the 24<sup>th</sup> August 2016 date as set out in the Plan.

As an information update requested by the Chairman, it was explained that a General Purposes Committee / Strategic Management Team (SMT) workshop had been confirmed for 26<sup>th</sup> July with the expectation of a further workshop being set up in August, the date of which was still to be confirmed.

It was resolved:

To note the upcoming training session dates as listed in Appendix 1 subject to noting that the first business planning workshop originally to be held on 27<sup>th</sup> July had been cancelled.

## **243. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN**

As an update to the printed agenda plan, the following changes were highlighted:

- Deletion of the report titled 'City Cycle Ambition, Huntingdon Road Phase 2 and A10 Harston - report consultation results and seek approval to construct' from 1<sup>st</sup> September E&E Committee
- The Section 106 Allocations report for September would be the follow up from the report which went to the June Committee meeting, as discussions are continuing with Hunts District Council to agree a revised list of schemes

As there were no reports scheduled for the August Committee, the Committee was invited to cancel the 8<sup>th</sup> August Committee meeting.

Issues raised included:

- The Vice Chairman, making reference to recent incidents on the Guided Busway, suggested that it would be appropriate for Members to receive an update at the next E and E spokes meeting. The proposal was supported.
- With the Chairman now being the Council's appointee to the City Deal Executive Board, one Member suggested that to help keep the Committee updated, there should be a standing, information item on future agendas to orally update the Committee regarding decisions made at the Greater City Deal Executive Board. In discussion this suggestion was not supported by some other members of the Committee. Points raised in the ensuing discussion included;

- that the Chairman could not be expected to elaborate in detail on the complexities of all of the decisions taken,
- the minutes and reports were already available on the public website,
- that providing a discussion item was not appropriate, as it could confuse members of the public of who made decisions on the City Deal, which had already been delegated by the full Council to the City Deal Executive Board. In addition, it could lead to members of the public wrongly lobbying this Committee with petitions for which it has no powers to review City Deal Board decisions.
- With the Chairman absent, it was more appropriate to raise it as an item at the next Spokes meeting, which would be the more appropriate forum for such updates.

In respect of an E and E Committee outside body appointment concerning Anglian Central Region Flood and Coastal Committee, as Councillor Mason, one of the two Committee appointments (the other being the Chairman) was unable to attend due to his recent operation, he had asked Democratic Services if any other member would wish to attend as his substitute. The next meeting was to be held on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July which was an all-day meeting at their headquarters in Bedfordshire. As there was no named substitute, sending a substitute for Cllr Mason required the Committee's approval. In discussion no Members felt able to volunteer.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the agenda plan as set out, subject to the changes orally reported.
- b) To ask Spokes at their next meeting to receive an item for discussion regarding the most appropriate way for Committee Members to be informed on the programme and decisions made by the Greater City Deal Executive Board.
- c) That a brief explanatory report be prepared for the next Spokes meeting on the recent busway incidents.
- d) That the Minute Action Log Update which had not been possible to finalise for the current Committee meeting should be circulated in due course following the meeting.
- e) To agree to cancel the reserve August Committee meeting date due to the lack of any business requiring a time critical decision from the Committee.

Chairman  
1<sup>st</sup> September 2016