

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 6th December 2018

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 10.40 a.m.

Present: Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), R Fuller, D Giles, N Kavanagh, S Tierney, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman)

Apologies: Councillors D Connor

181. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

182. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th November 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

183. MINUTE ACTION LOG

As an update on Minute 163 titled 'Waterbeach New Town Spatial Framework and Infrastructure Delivery Plan Supplementary Planning Document Flood Zone Query' it was reported that officers were meeting with the Environment Agency that morning to clarify issues including confirmation of which Flood zone the site fell within.

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

184. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS / REQUESTS TO SPEAK

None received at the relevant deadlines.

185 INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK ALLOCATIONS – REPORT WITHDRAWN

As the report on this agenda was the same as the one received at Highways and Communities Infrastructure (H and CI) Committee, the Chairman had exercised his discretion that the report should be withdrawn in order that this Committee should receive the same updated version of the report at the January meeting as H and CI Committee.

186. TRANSPORT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

In 2018/19 a budget of £1 million was set aside for transport scheme development as part of the Capital Budget in the Council's Business Plan, with the intention of bringing schemes to the point where they can be submitted for funding and the development

costs reclaimed. This Committee on 8 February 2018, approved a list of transport schemes to be developed in 2018/19 as listed in the report and also approved a process for sifting and prioritising transport schemes from 2019/2020 onwards, to be developed and designed ready to be implemented when funding opportunities arose. The previously agreed criteria was shown in Appendix 1 to the report.

The report provided updates on the work to date on the St Ives junctions and the at the A10 / A142 and Lancaster Way roundabouts around Ely and the plans to dual the A10 between Ely and Cambridge, on a study looking at the stretch of the A142 between Newmarket and Chatteris.

Officers had also reviewed the sifting prioritisation criteria approved in February (shown in Appendix 1 of the report) which currently precluded schemes in Cambridge. The reason for this being that the Future Investment Strategy for Greater Cambridge of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) would provide funding for schemes in this area. South Cambridgeshire was not excluded on the grounds that there might be schemes, particularly further from Cambridge, that were close to / crossed geographic boundaries, and while not a priority for the GCP or meeting relevant GCP criteria, might be, when considered in a County-wide context.

Officers proposed to bring back a review report on the funding sifting criteria for the March Committee meeting while also suggesting that the current criteria should be amended immediately to incorporate safety objectives, in order for a wider range of schemes to be considered for future year development. Other sifting criteria such as scheme location, (to consider further the issue of Cambridge City), would be considered as part of the March review report.

The following comments from the local member for Ely South were read out at the meeting:

“Whilst I support the additional piece of work that has been commissioned on the roundabouts on the A142 and A10 at Ely, (and I thank Andy Preston for meeting with me about this and his attention to it since our meeting) I must express my frustration at the time it has taken for this piece of work to report back. Time is now absolutely of the essence with regard to providing a solution, even if short-term, to the problems of these two notorious roundabouts in Ely. Lancaster Way is absolutely critical to the future economic success of the area, and its growth plans are set to provide thousands of high quality jobs for people in the District. We cannot allow that to be stifled, delayed or damaged with any further delays to delivering a solution to the serious traffic flow issues in this location. Funding is at risk of being lost if decisions are not reached in the very near future and implementation begun”.

In discussion:

- One Member indicated that he was pleased that the sift process was to be further reviewed as he had objected at the time of the original report to the exclusion of Cambridge City and had afterwards written to the then Section 151 Officer raising his concerns regarding what he felt were inconsistencies in the decision made.
- One Member while supporting safety being included, queried whether the definition extended to poor air quality. This was an issue in growth areas and for settlements

near to major roads such as the A14 as a result of pollution from stationary / slow moving traffic. Also referenced was a recent report highlighting that 53% of air pollution in Cambridge City was from buses and coaches (49%) and Taxi cabs (4%). In reply to the question asked, it was explained that the safety criteria proposed was specifically about vehicle safety, but officers were happy to include poor air quality as part of the review. **Action: Karen Kitchener / Matthew Bowles**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the scheme development work undertaken to date for the St Ives junctions study and at the A10/A142, Ely.
- b) Note the existing expenditure for the St Ives study for 2018/19.
- c) Approve the recommended review and update the sifting criteria as set out in paragraph 2.8, to be reported back to this Committee in March 2019.

187. PROPOSED REVISED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

This report provided details of a review of the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) and Targets for Place and Economy (P&E) undertaken to ensure that they were fit for purpose.

A summary of the review of P&E KPIs for both Place and Economy Service committees and P and E Operational indicators was attached in Appendix A to the report with the proposals and rationale for new and deleted indicators. They had been developed to align with County Council objectives, outcomes and existing longer-term targets, as well as responding to suggestions made from Members.

In discussion:

- One Member asked whether as the Mayor of the Combined Authority (CA) now had responsibility for strategic transport, the new indicators aligned with the CA's own KPI's and believed if not, they should. The Executive Director Place and Economy responded that he was not currently aware that the CA had as yet developed their own KPI set.
- The same Member expressed his concern at the deletion of the specific indicator for the guided busway and also that there was no indicator for park and ride alighting passengers as these were of interest to many people. He highlighted that the number of passengers from the Trumpington Park and Ride site had fallen recently suggesting this was due to the difficulties of parking vehicles on site because contractors at the Biomedical Campus were parking there. He suggested that a separate figure for park and ride bus passengers would be appropriate and should not be lost. It was clarified that although the KPI aggregated all the information about different routes in the report to Committee, the specific route based information would still be collected and be available and therefore officers considered that it was valid to combine passenger statistics. It was highlighted that the Combined Authority was now responsible for subsidising

a small number of bus service routes (10%), with the remainder being commercially operated. In terms of Trumpington Park and Ride Site, there were plans to extend it creating extra parking to deal with the current issue highlighted.

- Regarding that many of the indicators were only produced annually, who decided on their frequency? It was explained that many were nationally set and were based on surveys that were resource intensive and therefore it was not practicable to produce the statistics on a more frequent basis.
- In reply to a follow up to the above regarding whether the data was collected by other authorities at the same or different times, it was confirmed that all authorities worked to the same timetable to ensure meaningful comparisons could be made.
- One Member enquired whether passengers failing to get on buses due to them being overcrowded were counted as passengers in surveys undertaken, suggesting this could be a flaw in the statistics leading to an under-representation of passenger demand and the need for more buses. The reply was there was an expectation that the vast majority of passengers would wait for the next available bus and therefore would be recorded. It was also highlighted as context that to purchase an additional bus cost in the region of £200k and the same again to run it. Therefore commercial bus companies only laid on additional permanent buses when there clearly enough demand to ensure spending this amount of money yielded a profitable return above the running costs.
- The Vice Chairman highlighted that for the Growth in Cycling from a 2004/05 average baseline he had requested to be reviewed at the last Committee meeting (as showing only percentages was meaningless), required revised information to make it understandable (*Note: this should be by not replacing the current percentages with figures as currently suggested in the report, but by showing the numbers and also the percentage changes from the original baseline*) **Action Tom Barden / Louisa Gostling.**

Having commented

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve the proposed revised Key Performance Indicators and targets for Place and Economy as set out in Appendix A (subject to the clarification on one indicator referenced above) and to agree that they should be implemented as soon as practicable within future Finance and Performance Reports.

188. COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS TO THE WISBECH ACCESS STRATEGY PROJECT BOARD

As part of the officer introduction apologies were given for the wrong electoral division details shown for two of the local members on the front page of the report which should have shown Wisbech East for Councillor Hoy and Wisbech West for Councillor Tierney.

Through the Governments Growth Deal, £11.5 million was allocated to the Wisbech Access Strategy by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to support the development of a package of measures to support growth and regeneration, improve accessibility and address congestion in and around the town of Wisbech. Government had also agreed to provide up to a further £10.5m for scheme delivery for the Wisbech Access Strategy on condition that the development work resulted in an acceptable and deliverable package of transport measures.

The report highlighted that work on the Wisbech Access Strategy Study had concluded. The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had been subsumed into the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the £10.5m of funding was now within the gift of the CPCA Business Board and the CPCA Board. Subject to the release of the monies, delivery of the short term package of measure would commence. *(Post meeting note: The £10.5m of Growth Deal funding was approved by the Combined Authority Business Board and Board on the 26th and 27th November. The funding is subject to the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial strategy (BEIS) future Growth Deal funds Ministerial approval. Following this, the funding should be available).*”

As the project was now moving toward the delivery phase, it was proposed to convert the existing Member Steering Group for the study into a Project Board with the same County Council member representation (Councillors Tierney and Hoy) in order to oversee the delivery of the short term package of measures. It was highlighted that while the Project Board would give general direction, all key decisions would be referred back to this Committee. Appendix 1 of the report set out the draft Terms of Reference to be considered at the first meeting of the Steering Group. Appendix 2 showed the overall governance structure within which the Wisbech Access Strategy Project Board would sit.

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve the conversion of the Wisbech Access Strategy Member Steering Group to the Wisbech Access Strategy Project Board with no changes to the current County Council membership.

189. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OCTOBER 2018

The Committee received the report in order to comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position as at the end of October 2018. It was explained that there had been little change since the previous month’s report with the same pressures as previously reported.

The main issues highlighted were:

Revenue: The Service has started the financial year with two significant pressures for Coroners Services and Waste (both which came under Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee). The P&E service was showing that it will make £356K savings by year-end to bring the budget back into balance, and this would either be through new underspends and additional income, or planned reductions in service if

required at the later stages of the year. As an oral update it was highlighted that the November figures were showing a further reduction in the overspend.

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

Issues raised included:

- Asking the reasons for the underspend in the Concessionary Fares Budget as detailed in the report. It was explained £110k had been an over-estimate in the 2017/18 accrued costs and the remainder was mainly due to the increase in pensionable age impacting on eligibility.
- One Member querying with regard to the Freedom of Information requests (FOI) showing that only 60.6% were responded to within the target timescale, whether this was due to:
 - a reduction in staff dedicated to enquiries;
 - an increase in the number of requests, or
 - the time spent on unnecessary requests for information made under this statutory procedure.

In response, the Executive Director explained that the Council was obliged to provide the information requested in an FOI and therefore there was no scope for judging whether it was an appropriate request or not. There was often great complexity in the information requests received taking many officer hours to investigate but clarified that there were no systemic issues and there had not been a reduction in the number of officers in the team dealing with such enquiries. Where possible a simple answer was provided including, where appropriate, directing enquirers towards readily available information on the Council website. He highlighted that the most recent performance on responding to FOI requests had generally been good.

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

note the report.

190. COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2019-20 TO 2023-24

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan revenue and capital proposals for the Council and also for services within the remit of Place and Economy.

In October, Committees received information about emerging draft proposals to respond to the budget challenges with at that point the Council having identified 44% of the savings required with the remaining budget gap for 2019/20 identified as being

£21.5m. Additional gaps also existed for the later years of the business plan. The report set out the work undertaken since October.

All of the proposals within the remit of the Committee, including those which are unaltered since October, are described in the business planning tables (Appendix 1) and business cases (Appendix 2). Section 5 of the report provided an overview of the savings and income proposals within the remit of the Committee added to the draft plan since the proposals were presented in October or where the business case had altered materially.

The Committee was asked to comment on the revised proposals, and endorse them to General Purposes Committee (GPC) in December for consideration as part of the Council's development of the Business Plan for the next five years, before GPC recommended the programme in January as part of the overarching Business Plan for Full Council to consider in February.

This Committee's proposals were in respect of the following with the detail of the business cases set out Appendix 2 of the report:

- B/R.6.103 Historic Environment (-10k in 2019-20) involving sharing services with Peterborough City Council to achieve modest savings.
- B/R.6.105 Transformation of the Infrastructure & Growth Service into a profit centre (-79k in 2019-20) – the delivery of major schemes was already almost self-funded from fees charged. The proposal was to remove the service from the revenue budget and expand the commercial activities delivered by the Service to maximise income opportunities through recharge and development related income.

It was highlighted as set out in paragraph 5.12 that – 'B/R 6.101 Passenger Transport – remove discretionary Concessions and Taxi-vouchers (-260k in 2019-20)' – had been removed from the savings proposals following the direction of both this Committee and H and CI Committee at the October cycle of meetings.

The Capital Programme was shown in full in Appendix 1 as part of the finance tables. Since the Capital Programme was presented in October there had been a number of updates to the following schemes as detailed in the report:

- King's Dyke
- Investment in Connecting Cambridgeshire

The following two schemes had been added since the October Committee:

- Replacement of Library Management System
- Libraries – Open access & touchdown facilities

Appendix 3a set out the Place and Economy statutory fees and charges and appendix 3b the proposed non-statutory fees and charges for 2019-20.

In discussion:

- One Member raised the issue of the size of the papers and whether it would have been more appropriate to only have detail of the Committee's own budgets. It was explained that the general budget information set out in sections 2 to 4 of the cover report had been provided for all Committees to provide the appropriate overview context. Section 4 onwards and the appendices set out the Place and Economy Directorate budget details.
- One Member questioned where the £260K savings would be made now that 'B/R 6.101 Passenger Transport – remove discretionary Concessions and Taxi-vouchers (-260k in 2019-20)' had been removed. The Executive Director explained that the savings would fall to the overall savings requirement and not necessarily this Committee as the Council no longer worked on a cash limit basis for individual services.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2019/20 to 2023/24 Business Plan revenue proposals for the Service, updated since the last report to the Committee in October.
- b) To endorse the draft revenue savings proposals that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Infrastructure Committee for 2019/20 to 2023/24, to the General Purposes Committee (GPC) as part of consideration for the Council's overall Business Plan.
- c) To note the changes to the capital programme that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee and endorse them to the General Purposes Committee (GPC) as part of consideration for the Council's overall Business Plan.
- d) To note the fees and charges proposed for 2019-20.

191. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

The report invited the Committee to review its training plan.

The Committee was reminded that the Member Seminar the next day, 7th December, included the combined item on the agreement and distribution of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) And Section 106 Funding requested at previous meetings of the Committee.

The Training Plan was noted.

192. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

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

Additions to the January Committee meeting:

- Revised report on Transport Block Allocations
- Joint Procurement of Professional Service Contract

Addition to March meeting agreed earlier in Meeting:

Transport Scheme Development Programme Sifting Process

193. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 10TH JANUARY 2019

**Chairman:
10th January 2019**