

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

Date: Tuesday 14 June 2016

Time: 10:00-10:35am

Present: Councillors Ashwood, Bates (substituting for Cllr Criswell), Butcher, Chapman, Connor, Frost (substituting for Cllr McGuire), Gillick, Hunt, Reeve (Vice-Chairman), Rouse, Scutt, Taylor and Williams

Apologies: Councillors Criswell (Cllr Bates substituting) and McGuire (Cllr Frost substituting)

**199. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**200. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Vice-Chairman.

The Action Log was noted.

There were a number of queries relating to the minutes and Action Log:

Local Highway Improvements (LHI) – a Member asked when the application packs were due to be distributed to Parish/Town Councils. Officers agreed to circulate this information to all Members of both H&CI and E&E Committees. **Action required.**

Archives Festival – Councillor Scutt commented that it was unrealistic for the proposed Archives Festival to be arranged by the Friends Group, as it was too big a project. Officers agreed to raise this issue with the Service lead and report back to Councillor Scutt. **Action required.**

Average cost of pothole repairs in County – it was suggested that it would be helpful to know how current costs compared to pothole repairs using the old system. It was agreed that Richard Lumley would contact Councillor Connor on this issue and the response would be circulated to all members of the Committee. **Action required.**

2015/16 LHI bids in East Cambridgeshire – a Member advised that he was aware that the shortlisted successful schemes had come in under budget, so some of the reserve schemes had been brought forward. Whilst applauding this, the Member asked for this information to be provided to Local Members. **Action required.**

Street lights – clarification was sought on the policy for charging for street lighting attachments. Officers confirmed that the contractor had erroneously been advised to proceed with this, but they had subsequently been instructed to stop, as any policy for charging for streetlight attachments would be the subject of a Committee decision

at a later date. Councillor Taylor commented that it would be helpful to have a clear statement from officers to this effect, and it was agreed to send this to her. **Action required.**

## **201. PETITIONS**

There were no petitions.

## **202. INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEMS – FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLY OF EQUIPMENT**

The Committee considered a report on the procurement of the Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) framework agreement. Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council currently maintain their ITS using a jointly appointed single contractor, and this arrangement had worked well. The proposal was to expand the ITS contract to include not only maintenance, but supply and installation too, and to extend the partnership arrangements to Luton Borough Council, Bedford Borough Council and Central Bedfordshire Council, as well as Peterborough City Council.

A Member asked what happened with obsolete equipment, specifically whether there was a policy or budget in place, outlining a particular issue that had arisen in his Division with a battery powered flashing sign. It was acknowledged that there had been difficulties with some of the Council's older assets, and wherever possible, efforts were made to maintain units. In reply, the Officer noted that whilst there is some revenue budget available for replacement of obsolete equipment, it is likely that capital funding will be required in future.

Members noted that Real Time Passenger Information was covered by a separate contract.

A Member asked for the names of the companies that had made the four submissions. Officers explained that for legal reasons they could not provide the detail without going into confidential session, but once the procurement process had been completed, this information would be freely available. The focus of the report under consideration was the evaluation processes which were being undertaken in terms of procurement. It was noted that the industry was very small, and the four companies involved were all known to officers. It was further noted that the award of this contract needed to be made by Members, but on the basis of rigorous procurement processes, and not on the basis of individual Members' experiences of particular companies.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

- a) Approve the award of the framework contract;
- b) Approve the award of the call-off contract.

## **203. ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT (ETE) RISK REGISTER UPDATE**

Members received an update on those parts of the for Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE) Risk Register monitored by the Highways & Community Infrastructure (H&CI) Committee. Other risks on the ETE Register had been considered separately by the Economy and Environment Committee.

The H&CI Risk Register showed that there were ten risks, one of which (CR30) was included on the Corporate Risk Register. No risks had been removed or added from the H&CI Risk Register since it was last presented in December 2015, but Appendix 1 to the report highlighted a number of changes.

Whilst acknowledging that it was not a risk for the Risk Register, a Member queried the rules on the grass cutting of verges, specifically how the reduction of number of cuts could impact adversely on safety, and whether cuts were carried out more frequently in 30mph zones. Officers advised that the grass cutting regimes were set out in the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan, and it was agreed that this information would be circulated, along with clarification about the 30mph zone issue. **Action required.**

With regard to CR29 (failure to deliver waste savings/opportunities and achieve a balanced budget), officers confirmed that the Waste PFI contractor was investigating a potential contract for use of the Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) produced by the Mechanical and Biological Treatment plant (MBT) at Waterbeach. Officers had been working with advisors from DEFRA, and had identified a new process to potentially produce a slightly better product. A potential 'off-taker' had also been identified, who would take the RDF and use it at an Energy from Waste (EFW) plant. This would be undertaken on a trial basis initially. If the trial was successful, it would have a financial advantage for the County Council, who were currently landfilling waste at a cost of £84.50 per tonne, and whilst the off-taker would still be paid, it would be less than the landfill rate.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the position in respect of the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Risk Register.

## **204. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN**

Members noted the Agenda Plan.

A Member asked if an item could be added to an agenda in the near future on the Cambridgeshire Collection, including information on the staffing arrangements, opening hours, and potential synergies with the new Archives centre in Ely. He felt that it was important that Members had the opportunity for a full and open discussion. Officers advised that Service Committees should only consider items for decision, not items for information. However, it was agreed that this could be pursued via some other vehicle e.g. through Spokes or a Member Seminar. **Action required.** In response to a question on when the decision had been taken on the Cambridgeshire Collection, it was confirmed that this decision had been made as part of the Business Planning process.

A Member observed that *Library Service Transformation & Community Hubs* had previously been identified as an item for the July meeting, but had subsequently been removed from the Agenda Plan. Officers confirmed that this item would be rescheduled for later in the year, but had changed in line with new arrangements for Business Planning.

A Member asked if the *On street parking charges review* would be written in the context of the Greater Cambridge City Deal congestion proposals. Officers advised that they would be cognisant of those proposals when drafting the report, but due to the timing of the report, they would be unable to make assumptions on what the City Deal Board would be doing. Members were further advised that at the Economy & Environment Committee on 9th June, Members were very clear that the various strands of activity needed to be unified, so there may be a further report at a later date if things changed.

Chairman