

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 14th July 2015

Time: 10.00a.m. to 12.20 a.m.

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

Also present: None.

Apologies: Councillors: A Lay, M Shuter and M Williams

137. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

138. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st April 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

It was unanimously resolved:

To note the updates on the Minutes Action Log.

139. PETITIONS

None were received.

140. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2 – SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS

This report sought the Committee's endorsement to the requirements included in the draft Section 106 Heads of terms package presenting the proposed requirements for the s106 Agreement for Northstowe Phase 2.

Detailed negotiations on the s106 requirements had now taken place, informed by the advice of the Local Authorities' viability cost consultant. Appendix 1 of the report set out the anticipated delivery of new homes and community infrastructure for the next ten years. Appendix 2 provided the list of items and triggers proposed for the s106 Agreement for Northstowe Phase 2 with Appendix 3 providing the draft brief for the health centre, library and community hub for Northstowe Phase 2. An education campus including primary, secondary, sixth form and special school provision, and community sports facilities was also proposed.

On 24 June 2015, the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee (NJDCC) resolved to grant consent subject to draft conditions for Northstowe Phase 2 as set out in the report.

Tabled at the meeting was a briefing note (attached as appendix 1 to these minutes) highlighting the differences in Section 106 contributions sought for items in the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee Report (June 2015) which totalled approximately £86m compared to the Committee report on the agenda which totalled over £75.5m, with those in green being the County Council's areas of responsibility. It highlighted reductions of nearly £7m for contingency items which may not be required to the full cost currently identified and councils were seeking, an arrangement similar to that on Phase 1, whereby any savings from such items could be recycled back to the Phase 2 Development. Some of the NJDCC items had been moved to from funding through S106 to the infrastructure list and would be funded by directly by the HCA. Also highlighted was that just over £450K could now be removed from the S106 as the household waste recycling centre contribution, following the decision of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 7th July, was no longer required.

It was highlighted that The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA's) costings and assumptions for Northstowe Phase 2 had been tested and accepted by HM Treasury. On this basis, the HCA proposed £73m funding towards the costs of community infrastructure, and 20% affordable housing. Following negotiations, the following position was being recommended:

- (a) Various items will be provided as part of the site infrastructure and therefore not secured through s106 payments,
- (b) Clear identification of contingency items, such as provision for maintenance of on-site Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) and transport mitigation measures which might be needed in the local area.
- (c) £73m funding towards the s106 package with the additional funding to be provided as detailed.
- (d) A continued review of viability including a review mechanism to assess whether the level of affordable housing might be increased, to take place part way through the build-out of Phase 2.

The report illustrated how a funding allocation might provide for the essential requirements for the scheme to be acceptable in planning terms, and also how the town would develop over phases 1 and 2. The list of items and triggers were to be presented to NJDCC on 29 July and, subject to its decision, would form the basis of the Heads of Terms of the s106 Agreement that would be secured during the detailed drafting stage.

In presenting the report officers highlighted that in terms of County Council Section 106 requirements for adults, libraries, schools and transport the funding was nearly fully secured and was considered to be an excellent outcome.

Issues raised by Members included:

- One Member was of the opinion that the current report did not recognise the future requirements for affordable housing and would have wished to have seen details of the viability calculation undertaken by HCA to justify their figure of 20% affordable housing, which he stated would not deliver Cambridgeshire's future needs, being 20% below the District Council's recommended target figure. In response, officers

indicated that the 20% affordable housing figure had been included in the HCA planning application and the Council's own viability exercise confirmed that it was not financially viable to build more than the 20% proposed, due to the building costs of infrastructure to be included in phase 2 and was in accordance with Government guidelines. Other Members suggested that as the viability calculation had already been agreed with Government, this was the best that would be obtained for the current phase, and while still aspiring to 40% affordable housing in other phases, officers should be commended in obtaining this level as being better than no affordable housing being achieved. The latter having sometimes been the experience of other authorities. It was also not considered appropriate to object to this in terms of being seen as a deal-breaker, as a challenge of this nature would not be upheld by an inspector at any later planning inquiry. The members who took this latter view supported the Section 106 proposals as being realistic and the best that could be negotiated.

- One Member highlighted not only the need to ensure the acronym for the Joint Committee meeting was spelt out in documentation, but that the correct title was being used by all officers in the two councils, as some reports referred to the Committee as the Joint Committee for Northstowe. Democratic Services were asked to review documentation. **Action.**
- One Member in expressing his disappointment with the proposals submitted by HCA, questioned whether the community hub and performance space was big enough for the demand that would result from further phases population increases, highlighting the possibility of another 5,000 houses and potential population of possibly up to 30,000 additional people. He suggested the proposals were being rushed through in a time period of not much more than two months, when other section 106 agreements were negotiated over a period of up to two years. In response, the officers indicated that they were seeking to future proof the proposals and in relation to the civic hub, it was suggested that consideration could be given to building a modular structure that could be added too later.
- The same Member suggested that the experience of other developments had shown that developers could challenge anything set out in the agreement conditions. In response the point was made that as the County Council was getting all the services it required, practically fully funded, it was not in a position to challenge other aspects of the agreement.
- There was a query on whether a swimming pool was planned for the schools. It was indicated that land had been identified and HCA agreed that a swimming pool was desirable, but this would be in phase 3, as swimming pools were expensive to run if there was not sufficient critical mass of pupils / population.
- In response to a question on whether the schools would be academies, this was confirmed as being the case, but unlike in the past, the land would be granted on a leasehold rather than on a freehold basis, so that the asset remained with the local authority.

Councillor Jenkins seconded by Councillor Cearns proposed an amendment of an

additional recommendation proposing “that the Committee is invited to note that the affordable level of housing delivery is inadequate to deal with the affordable housing deficit in Cambridgeshire”. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

On being put to the vote the main motion as set out to the recommendations were agreed by a clear majority and

It was resolved to:

- a) Endorse the draft Section 106 Heads of terms package as set out in Section 2 and appendix 2 of the report;
- b) Note the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee (NJDCC) would be taking the decision on the package on 29th July;
- c) Delegate to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make changes to the Section 106 agreements prior to signing.

141. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTYWIDE FLOOD AND WATER SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Committee was asked to review and approve the draft Countywide Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in order that it could be the subject of a public consultation exercise. In drafting the SPD a number of supporting documents have been produced, as detailed in the report.

The SPD has been produced to ensure that Cambridgeshire has a consistent, locally appropriate approach to flood risk and water management and had been produced by Cambridgeshire County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Fenland District Council, Huntingdonshire District Council, the Environment Agency, and the Internal Drainage Boards (including the Middle Level Commissioners). The draft SPD had been developed to support the implementation of flooding and water related policies in each local planning authority's respective adopted or emerging LDF or Local Plan.

The main purposes of the SPD would be to:

- 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).

Following the proposed public consultation on the draft SPD, the County Council, in conjunction with the local planning authorities, would consider the representations received and any relevant changes required. These would then be the subject of a further report to this Committee seeking agreement to adopt the SPD.

In discussion issues raised by Members included;

- Unanimous support for what was considered to be an excellent document.
- Pointing out an error in the reproduction of the document that had resulted in headings on pages 85 and 86 onwards not matching the plans which required to be rectified in the final version.
- Councillor Henson sought clarification on how many square miles of Cambridgeshire was below Sea Level. As this could not be answered at the meeting, the officers would research the question and respond outside of the meeting, **Action**
- The point was made that the Environment Agency would wish to rezone the Country as they did not consider that the zones currently reflected a true representation of flood risk.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Consider and approve the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD);
- b) 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 changes to the draft SPD prior to publication for public consultation and;
- c) Request officers bring the final SPD back to a future meeting of the Committee for approval with a recommendation to the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities to adopt the SPD.

142. PARK AND RIDE CHARGE IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

At its meeting in February this Committee had expressed concern about the reduction in patronage and the difficulties some users had experienced with the ticketing system and requested a further report be brought to this meeting.

This follow up report set out the effects on Park and Ride usage and the parking income achieved. It also advised of the changes that had been made / were to be made to improve the operation of the ticketing system.

The Committee was reminded that the car parking charges were introduced on 21 July 2014 with consultants predicting that the number of passenger journeys would fall by 5 % and would take 4 years to return to the level prior to the introduction of the charge. This was on the assumption of a 1% background growth in jobs in Cambridge City. The actual current reduction in passenger numbers following the introduction of the charge had, apart from minor fluctuations, been consistently showing a reduction of passenger journeys of around 14% despite various improvements made to the ticketing system and the marketing and promotional activities undertaken, as detailed in the report. It was considered that the continued impact on patronage was either the result of a greater than forecast effect of the charge, or the ongoing adverse publicity in the media surrounding the charges, which was discouraging use. Considering all of the improvements that had been made to address concerns about the ticket machines, the bus fare price freeze and the promotions that had been run, officers concluded that the original estimates on the likely drop in passenger numbers had been overly optimistic.

Efforts would continue to be made to improve and promote the Service and this, together with continued and growing economic activity, possibly assisted by measures being considered by the City Deal Board to restrain traffic in Cambridge, was expected to lead to an increase in Park and Ride usage and in due course, a return to previous levels. In order to better understand how people used the ticketing system and to see if further improvements could be made, a brief had been agreed for a specialist wayfinding consultancy to undertake a review. The objective of the review would be to audit and understand the process undertaken by first time users, tourists and concession users in using the ticket machines and parking procedures at the Park and Ride.

Members' comments included:

- One Member expressing his concern on his understanding that the departure charge for Stagecoach had not increased for between 10 and 15 years queried why the Council was not charging more to an operator who was in a monopoly position. As a response it was indicated the departure charge was linked to fare increases. The report highlighted that Stagecoach had increased their ordinary bus fares in April 2015, but agreement had been reached for them not to increase fares on Park and Ride until April 2016. This agreement was made in exchange for continuing the suspension of the departure charge but using a sliding scale of reductions.
- In a discussion on the principles around whether a parking charge should have been introduced, one Member who had been on Cabinet explained that the decision had been taken to help raise income to offset the costs of the administration of the park and ride sites. Cabinet had been of the view that a £1 parking charge was not an unreasonable sum to be able to park for 18 hours, as opposed to the cost of the operation being subsidised by all County residents. It was highlighted that Oxford park and ride sites were charging £2.
- Several Member queried the further use of consultants, finding it hard to believe there was not the necessary expertise within local government and highlighting that it had been consultants who had badly underestimated the impact of introducing a parking charge.

- While a number of Members agreed that the introduction of the charge had been badly handled in terms of its justification, coupled with the technical problems around the purchase of a ticket, the Vice Chairman highlighted that if the charge was discontinued, the Economy and Environment Committee would need to find an additional £800k from other areas of its budget which would affect vulnerable people.
- One Member asked if details were available of the breakdown of the users at park and ride sites in terms of whether they were local people or tourists, as his suspicion was that local people were more likely to stop using the sites to come and shop in Cambridge and would go to other centres such as Newmarket / Bury St Edmunds. In reply it was clarified that the statistics available only provided for footfall at the sites and did not differentiate on where people originated from. Such information would only be possible from undertaking surveys which could only be on a small scale, due to resource implications.
- Members supported undertaking more marketing to highlight the benefits of the service. One Member suggested that consideration should be given to undertaking targeted marketing / market research at large scale events such as the Duxford airshows and the Big Weekend, both of which led to an increased uptake of the park and ride sites. In response, it was indicated that the County Council already worked closely with the Duxford Imperial War Museum to try to encourage more people to become regular customers and officers would look at other large, local events as a further marketing opportunity.

It was resolved unanimously:

To note the impact of the parking charges, the effects of the changes made to the charging system and the ongoing need to market and promote Park and Ride.

143. RING FORT PATH - TO REPORT CONSULTATION AND SET OUT NEXT STEPS

This report set out the details of four options to provide direct access for pedestrians and cyclists between Histon and Impington, and the new development of Orchard Park, lying north of Kings Hedges Road in Cambridge. The lack of such a route had led to the creation of an informal path down a steep bank, linking the two communities.

Following an initial feasibility report which considered a number of possible options, two options were taken forward to public consultation, including reference to constructing steps if the ramp options proved too expensive to deliver or too risky on geotechnical grounds. The consultation results and main comments were provided in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of the report.

Option One was a continuous ramp which would provide a direct route to Ring Fort Road without having to negotiate a bend. A significant number of trees would need to be removed and there was a risk that cyclists travelling down the ramp would build up excessive speed which could be dangerous for pedestrians. This option was estimated

to cost £350,000. The Wildlife Trust had expressed concern regarding the loss of trees and the impact on habitats of this option.

Option Two was a ramp with one turn (switch back) in it. This would link into Orchard Park close to the sports facilities and Skate Park. Fewer trees would need to be removed than for Option One. The turn would mean the speed of descending cyclists was kept down. The option was also estimated to cost £365,000. Some cyclists had expressed concern about the 'dog leg' in Option Two which could bring cyclists into conflict with pedestrians.

The report explained that in December 2014 Economy and Environment Spokes, having discussed the project, consultation results and the relatively high costs for both of the options had asked officers to develop further options that might provide better value.

As a result the following additional options were produced:

Option Three this had a ramp starting 80 metres south of the roundabout, along Cambridge Road, with the ramp continuing behind the skate park through the wildlife area to Ring Fort Road. A large number of trees would need to be felled in this option, and the path would extend through the wildlife area behind the skate park. This option had an estimated cost of £245,000.

Option Four had the same start location as Option Three and had the shortest ramp length. This Option was favoured by Orchard Park Community Council, as it did not impact on the wildlife area behind the skate park. This option was estimated to cost £200,000.

Both Options Three and Four were more cost effective than options One and Two due to the ramp height reduction and while both took users a little way off the natural desire line, it was suggested that with careful design, conflict between pedestrians and cyclists could be minimised. Further discussions with the Orchard Park Community Council, local members and the Wildlife Trust had taken place with good support expressed to proceed with Option Four. Given the lower cost of Option Four, any remaining budget could be directed at designing a set of steps in addition to the ramp itself, as a facility to keep pedestrians on their desire line and was strongly supported by local member, Councillor Jenkins.

Roxanne De Beaux the Cycling Campaign Officer spoke on behalf of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign supporting Option 1 as it did not have the 180 degree bends of Options 3 and 4, which the Campaign believed should be avoided. The Campaign was opposed to Option 4 as it did not follow desire lines and went through the sports centre and would bring cyclists in conflict with pedestrians. In summing up, she indicated that if Option 1 was no longer under serious consideration, the Campaign would prefer Option 3 to Option 4.

Members raised issues including:

- A request for more detail of the risks associated with the project. It was explained that the key risk identified was the maintenance problems associated with the embankment, and that building the new path could be a potential maintenance

liability for the County Council. Initial geotechnical survey work had revealed that the embankment appeared to be in good condition, but to progress the project further, a more detailed comprehensive survey would be required once a favoured option has been approved. If the detailed study showed that the embankment was suitably strong, then detailed design and negotiations to secure access across the land would be finalised.

- Following on from the above, a question was raised regarding what the Plan B was if fundamental weaknesses in the bank were identified from the survey. In reply it was explained that if the study showed that extensive strengthening of the embankment was required, or that there was a real risk of future failure of the embankment, then the provision of steps would be the only feasible option. It was indicated that the bank had failed in the past and it was therefore a high risk project. This fall back approach had some support from local communities, but was an option that excluded wheelchair users and pram pushers, as well as making it very difficult to use for cyclists, even with wheeling channels added. If steps emerged as the only option, then there will be further discussions with local Members, Histon and Impington Parish Council and Orchard Park Community Council before progressing into detailed design and scheme delivery.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the consultation responses and the current project risks.
- b) Approve the development and delivery of Option Four,
- c) Approve continuing negotiations with landowners.

144. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN 2014-15

The report attached as Appendix A, provided details of the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Directorate Finance and Performance report for 2014-15.

The report highlighted that ETE had underspent on revenue by £1,375,000 in 2014-15, with the cost centres under the stewardship of the Economy and Environment (E&E) Committee underspending by £450,000.

With regard to the budgets under the stewardship of this Committee, there were three significant outturn variances by value (over £100,000) reported as follows:

- An overspend of £245,000 on Park and Ride, resulting from usage of the sites being lower than the anticipated level since the introduction of the parking fee;
- Passenger Transport other, £464,000 underspend, where the decision to roll forward funding for Community Transport to future years, to support the existing schemes for a longer period, will result in a technical underspend at yearend; and
- Transport & Infrastructure Policy and Funding, £117,000 underspend, mainly as a result of staff vacancies during the year.

ETE had underspent on capital by £43.487 million. The following were the six significant areas of forecast underspend for which this Committee had responsibility:

- the Science Park Station,
- the Connecting Cambridgeshire project,
- the Guided Busway,
- the Huntingdon West of Town link road,
- Cycling Schemes, and
- Chesterton Busway.

In relation to the performance of the 11 indicators E&E Committee had responsibility for at yearend, the expectation was that two of the indicators would be red in relation to County matter planning applications determined within thirteen weeks and the percentage of complaints responded to within ten days, with three amber, and six green.

At the end of 2014-15, there was £3.369 million in the ETE Service carry forward account with the following being proposed to fund projects in 2015/16:

Operational saving requirement	Area of Service	£'000	Description
Carry forward of earmarked funding			
Carry forward of Flood Risk grant funding for Kings Hedges Flood Risk management project.	Growth & Economy	42	Government provided grant funding for a flood risk management project in Kings Hedges. As this is a complex project, it will be completed and this grant spent in 2015/16 and 2016/17. Not spending it would mean we lose the opportunity to improve flood protection for homes in Kings Hedges and the County Council may be expected to repay the grant.
Carry forward of Community Transport residual (balance of £500k) that was allocated at Full Council in February 2014	Passenger Transport	346	The Business Plan assumes reductions in CFT funding of £583k in 2015/16 and 2016/17. This funding will temporarily offset these cuts.
Cambridgeshire Future Transport (CFT) - carry forward of	Passenger Transport	216	The Business Plan assumes reductions in CFT funding of £583k in 2015/16 and 2016/17. This funding will temporarily offset these cuts.

underspend			
Local Sustainable Transport Fund - carry forward of underspend 12/13 & 13/14	Transport Infrastructure Policy & Funding	178	LSTF bids included an allowance for overheads on each project. In consequence the projects have been delivered leaving an underspend. This funding will be used to support the delivery of sustainable transport access to Cambridge North Station where there have been unavoidable cost pressures.
Committed costs			
Carry forward of Investment for annual updates to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Economic Assessment.	Growth & Economy	15	£8k required for 2015/16 and £7k for 2016/17, for Cambridgeshire County Council contribution. The Economic Assessment is an important part of the evidence based used for bids for Government and EU funding. If we do not keep it up to date, it will be more difficult to get these funding streams and to understand how we achieve the County Council's key aim of Developing the Economy to the benefit of all. Updates are Jointly funded by the Local Enterprise Partnership and Joint Strategic Planning Unit.
Legal advice to help establish charging across Growth & Economy	Growth & Economy	5	£5k is needed for Counsel's advice on fees following a challenge from Hanson's against CCC charges. This is necessary to meet Business Plan income targets.
Core funding for the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise partnership for 2015-16.	Growth & Economy	50	This money has already been paid. We are required to provide a match funding contribution for the LEP for it to get central government funding.
Cambridgeshire County Council contribution to the Joint Strategic Planning Unit for Cambridgeshire.	Growth & Economy	25	Need £10,150 for 2015/16 funding commitment (already paid). The balance of £14,850 is needed to fund the County Council's contribution to the JSPU in future years. This delivers joint work on infrastructure and other strategic planning for the County Council and 5

			district councils.
Countywide Infrastructure Plan	Transport Infrastructure Policy & Funding	25	Development of countywide infrastructure and Investment plan with JSPU.
A14 Inquiry	Transport Infrastructure Policy & Funding	150	This funding is necessary to fund the ongoing work on the A14 inquiry and thus to allow the Council to secure its key objectives from the scheme.
Investment to ensure delivery of ETE savings in the Business Plan	Policy & Business Development	150	To cover the costs of two posts for two years, i.e. £75k per financial year to lead on transformation of key areas of ETE to deliver Business Plan savings. Two officers are already in post.
Contingency funding			
Contingency for costs of prosecuting serious minerals and waste planning breaches e.g. large deposits of waste wood that breach planning conditions or lack planning permission.	Growth & Economy	30	To fund Waste & Mineral planning breach enforcement costs if needed - this would mean that we can prosecute where it is in the public interest to do so, but we cannot be totally confident we will win or that if we win, our costs will be awarded. Being able to prosecute breaches where we have a good case is important as it should reduce potentially costly breaches, which damage public amenity and can present fire risks.
Park and Ride charges	Passenger Transport	200	Contingency for one more year on shortfall of Park & Ride income. The charges are anticipated to secure at least £850k in 15/16, but this is less than budgeted in the Business Plan.
Investments to Save			
Shared Planning services	Growth & Economy	50	Development of a shared planning service with district councils and/or other Authorities. Business plan assumes of £100k savings per year.
New options			
Transport Strategy Modelling, Analysis & Development	Transport Infrastructure Policy & Funding	120	Transport Modelling, analysis, strategy development plus consultation to support development of district wide Strategies and local plans for Huntingdonshire and East Cambs

Funding not allocated		134	

The Committee was asked to approve the proposals within its remit so they could be forwarded to the Chief Finance Officer for agreement. ETE would further declare that £134,000 of its carry forward reserve was no longer required and this will be returned to the Corporate Reserve.

Comments included:

- Seeking clarification In relation to the carry-forward titled 'Local Sustainable Transport Fund' and the reference to the funding to be used to support the delivery of sustainable transport access to Cambridge North Station where there had been unavoidable cost pressures. It was explained that this had involved the busway extension and the need to move BT cables.
- A query was raised regarding why the carry forward of the Community Transport residual had not been spent and what was the intention for it? In response it was indicated it would be used to support CCT projects in 2015/16 and 2016/17 to offset cuts, rather than used for new initiatives. Regarding a question on the progress on historic funding and how this would be allocated to districts, this was still the subject of discussions with district councils and other partners to agree a joined up approach and might involve other Committees. No recommendations had yet been made. It was suggested that the Health Committee should also be involved.
- The point was also made by the Vice-Chairman that decisions should not be taken in the next 12 months which would stop something more sustainable being developed in the longer term and that in some areas, such as Children and Families, they should be asked to provide a contribution / make savings. On this latter point, the Executive Director cautioned that CFA had even greater levels of savings to make, which would make it difficult to ask them to find even greater savings.
- In relation to page 20 and the performance indicator on 'County matter planning applications' whereby 44% had been determined on time, compared to a 60% target, a question was raised on whether, like Cambridge City Council, the County Council would benefit from pre-application planning performance agreements and being able to recharge for officer time. In addition, a question was raised on whether vacancies were impacting on performance. In reply it was explained that the report referred to the previous year's target which had now been amended going forward. As the target was in relation to County Council planning applications, other internal departments were not re-charged the same way as outside applicants. The Planning Team and Schools Planning teams were working closely together, but this did not stop residents asking questions that required further consultation. In relation to vacancies, there was currently a recognised issue in recruiting and retaining planning staff.
- In relation to the Performance Indicator for 'Complaints responded to within 10

days', there was a query from one Member regarding the figures of the numbers of complaints received appearing to be low, and queried whether this included all the complaints received in relation to street lighting. In reply it was indicated that the number of queries that councillors received directly would be far higher, but the system only recorded those that were formal complaints received by the directorate. Currently the complaints did not break down into categories, but the Executive Director undertook to seek to provide a breakdown to show street-lighting separately. **Action**

- The same Member also questioned whether as the above target continued to always be in the red, consideration needed to be given to agreeing a lower target, especially if it was not possible to even provide a holding response within the 10 day timeframe. Officers explained that while previously the performance levels had been unacceptable, part of the issue had been problems in the interface between the ETE system and the Corporate system. This issue had now been improved. The most recent performance figures indicated that the target was being achieved, and that in terms of performance, a high 90-95% target was still seen as appropriate.

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

To approve the use of ETE Service carry-forward reserve on projects in 2015/16 and future years as detailed in Section 3.2 of the report and as reproduced in these minutes.

145. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MAY 2015

This report provided the Committee with an opportunity to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position as at the end of May 2015.

It was highlighted that at the end of May ETE was forecasting a year-end overspend on revenue of £405,000. The cost centres under the stewardship of the E&E Committee were forecasting a year-end overspend of £260,000.

In relation to the budgets under the stewardship of the Committee, there was one significant forecast variance reported in respect of Park and Ride parking fee income, where an overspend of £260,000 was being forecast as a result of reduced income levels as a consequence of usage of the sites being lower than the projected level, following the introduction of a parking fee.

It was highlighted that General Purposes Committee, at its meeting on the 28th July, would be asked to approve the removal of the budget for the Science Park Station from the ETE Capital Programme as officers were content that this scheme would progress without any further direct funding from the Council.

It was highlighted that E&E Committee would receive details of twelve performance indicators during 2015-16, although at the early stage of the year, data was only available for nine of these. Of these, two are currently red, none amber and seven green. The two indicators that were currently red were the number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area and the percentage of complaints

responded to within ten days. At year end, the current forecast was that none of these indicators would be red, six would be amber and three green.

Arising from the report:

- There was a query regarding on the position of receiving a refund for the sunk costs incurred by the County Council in respect of the Science Park Station. Officers stated that discussions were still ongoing with Government. The question was also raised regarding the status of the name for the station previously agreed by the Committee. In reply it was indicated that the Committee had only been asked to provide a steer on the name, as the decision was not the County Council's, but Network Rail's. The Committee's choice for the new Cambridge rail station had been 'Cambridge North' and in reply to a question on why this name was not being used in the report, it was explained that as it had been called Science Park Station in the Business Plan, the normal process was to use this wording during the year to ensure that the figures could be reconciled. There was a request that the agreed name by the Committee should be included in all future reports to the Committee. **Action.**
- There was a request from the Vice Chairman to ensure going forward, that all new budget approvals should be taken as part of the new joined up approach to budget making to ensure, where practicable, a budget cut in one area would not have a detrimental effect on another Service's budget delivery.

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

note the report.

146. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

At the meeting of the Council held on 24 March 2015, it was agreed that each service committee should consider and approve its own training plan at every meeting. The Plan included as an appendix to the report had been prepared in response to the new requirement

The Plan provided both details of the training already undertaken for Economy and Environment Committee Members and further training areas suggested by ETE officers to be provided in the coming year. If agreed, these new proposals would be progressed with dates and venues agreed and Members notified.

Following a request for Members to suggest any further areas that were not currently included, but which were considered relevant to the work of the Committee, one suggestion was that under the title 'New Communities' entry on page 3 and 4 of the Plan, that this should also provide information on how the viability of Section 106 / CIL agreements were secured/ calculated. **Action**

The Vice-Chairman made the point that he had raised at the Chairman's briefing the need to ensure that as part of each training session, explanation should be provided of the specific equality and diversity implications.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Agree the Training Plan that had been developed as set out as Appendix 1 to the Report with amendments reported at the meeting.
- b) To contact Rob Sanderson, Democratic Services with any further suggestions outside of the meeting.

147. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS AND THE HEALTH AND WELL BEING CHAMPION

The Committee was reminded that the General Purposes Committee delegated some of its annual appointments to Service Committees. The Appendix to the report set out the appointments to be made. Where there were vacancies / issues that had arisen / new appointments to be considered, more detail was provided in section 2 of the report.

Following an exercise by Democratic Services to check if current appointees were happy to be re-appointed, the majority of appointments unless indicated otherwise as agreed at this Committee's meeting in May 2014 were recommended to be re-appointed.

In respect of the Transport and Health Champion, Councillor Schumann was the previous appointment made by this Committee following a request from the Health Committee for an ETE appointment. At the time he served on both the Health Committee and Economy and Environment Committee. As Councillor Schumann was no longer on the Health Committee, the latter Committee at their meeting held on 28th May proposed the appointment of Councillor David Jenkins, who at that time was the only Councillor currently serving on both Committees. The Committee papers sought the Committee's endorsement to the appointment. However since the report had been written, Councillor Jenkins orally updated the meeting that as a result of changes to the proportionality of the Council, going forward he was no longer to be a member of the Economy and Environment Committee. As a way forward, Councillor Schumann suggested that he should work alongside Councillor Jenkins and make the Health Champion a dual appointment, with one representing the Health Committee and the other representing both of the ETE Committees. This proposal received the full support of the Committee.

It was unanimously resolved to agree:

- a) the appointments of Members to serve on the bodies as set out in the attached appendix 2 to these minutes including the additional changes below.
- b) to appoint Councillor Orgee as the observer in respect of the Great Fen Steering Committee.
- c) To appoint Councillor Harford to the substitute vacancy highlighted in paragraph 2.5 to the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Committee.

- d) Not to appoint to the vacancy highlighted in paragraph 2.6 to the Needingworth Quarry Liaison Group as the current three representatives were considered sufficient.
- e) To appoint Councillor Shuter to be a director on the 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond Destination Management Company (DMO) - Board of Directors as detailed in section 3 of the report.
- f) To appoint Councillor Bates with Councillor Shuter as his substitute on the Eastern Agri-Tech Programme Delivery Board as detailed in section 4 of the report.
- g) To endorse the appointment of Councillor Jenkins for the ETE Health and Transport Champion role, as part of a joint appointment with Councillor Schumann the existing Economy and Environment Committee appointment.

148. SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

This report sought approval to the forward agenda subject to changes made since publication of the Plan on the current agenda.

One member raised the issue of the delay in producing the report on 'Congestion Issues in Cambridge' which he noted was not now coming forward until the November meeting and requested an explanation. In response, it was indicated that the issue had been discussed at a recent E and E spokes meeting where it had been highlighted that congestion had been one of the delegations for decision agreed by Full Council to go to the City Deal Executive Board. The timescale had been amended to correspond to their timetable, which now included setting up a workshop. This was to be discussed further at the next City Deal Assembly Board on 22nd July and the expectation was that this Committee would be included in one of the discussion forums, feeding into the Board's final considerations. To have a separate debate in two places was considered to be confusing and as the City Board were pushing to come up with solutions quickly, Members should not have concerns that the process would be unduly delayed.

It was resolved to agree the agenda plan as with the following updates;

- Cambridgeshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015 -2019 moved back from the 6th October meeting to the 8th September Committee Meeting
- Cancellation of the Business Planning Member only workshop on 11th August and from the proposals for a revised joint workshop date with Highways and Community Infrastructure (H&CI) Committee) with this Committee favouring the morning of Thursday 3rd September.
- Addition to 17th November meeting - Abbey - Chesterton Bridge – key decision
- 8th December Reserve Date – agreeing to try to keep this date free, as this was now confirmed as the date of the Kings College Carol Service.

149. ADULT LEARNING AND SKILLS REVIEW PROPOSAL

This Committee had reviewed the Adult Learning and Skills self-assessment report at its meeting on the 10th March and agreed to undertake a follow up review of the Service and to set up a working group to review the work of Adult Learning and Skills and consider how to improve equity and the Countywide offer. The current report suggested terms of reference and the possible membership of the Group.

It was highlighted that the review would need to be completed by November 2015 so that the results could be included in the 2014-15 Self-Assessment Report.

It was resolved:

- a) To endorse the review.
- b) To approve the terms of reference as set out in the officer's report.
- c) To agree the membership of the Review Group to be two members (Cllrs Schumann and Lay) and one lead officer (Lyndsi Hayward-Smith)

150. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10AM 8TH SEPTEMBER 2015

Noted.

Chairman
8th September 2015