

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 5th March 2020

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 11.50 a.m.

Present: Councillors: H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, M Goldsack (substituting for Councillor Ambrose Smith), D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, T Sanderson, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman)

Apologies: Councillor D Ambrose Smith

307. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

308. MINUTES

With the addition of Councillor Tierney to the list of apologies, the minutes of the meeting held on 16th January 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

309. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

310. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

a) Petition to widen and provide overhead lighting for the DNA Cycleway

One Petition was received by the Constitution deadline presented by Mark Troll requesting that the DNA Cycle Path running from Shelford to Addenbrooke's Hospital be provided with overhead lighting. A slide presentation was used to help illustrate the points made and has been included as appendix 1 to the minutes.

He explained that the DNA path was quite dangerous at night with many cyclists avoiding it and referencing an accident which had caused serious injury along the cycleway a few months ago between two cyclists, as a result of one cyclist not having any lights. He suggested that the number of cycling accidents was underrepresented as most were not reported. He highlighted that the present path had been built to a narrower standard to the minimum national standard and that the guide lights currently provided on the path funnelled cyclists to the centre of the path but did not provide sufficient light to be able to see cyclists not using lights or wearing high visibility clothing. Since his original petition he had been informed that the current path would be removed and relocated. If this was the case, it would not now make sense to widen the existing pathway one of the two requests in the original petition, but that installing Solar-powered overhead lights presented an immediate solution to the hazard. These could be installed quickly and relatively inexpensively and could be relocated to any new

replacement path. His presentation gave an example of one company's product as a guide to potential costs.

It was resolved:

That as there was no relevant report on the agenda, officers were asked prepare a full, written response to the petition presenter on the issues raised to be sent no later than 10 working following this meeting.

b) Public questions Fendon Road roundabout

Two public questions were received from local residents regarding Fendon Road roundabout.

1) Speaker Sam Davies presented the following question:

"In November 2016, this committee approved the project to redesign Fendon Road roundabout and cycle provision on Queen Edith's Way at a cost of £1.425m. Subsequent documents indicate that £800k was allocated to the roundabout works. In February 2020, six months after the roundabout works had commenced, the County Council announced that the cost of the roundabout works alone had increased by 125% to £1.8m. Could the Committee please explain at what point members were made aware of the increased costs, and what the approvals process is for the excess, including decisions about which other S106 schemes will be scaled down or postponed?"

2) Doctor Barnali Ghosh had submitted the following question which was read out as she was unable to attend:

"Recent communication indicated that this project is delayed by three months. As an engineer myself, I am interested to know the cost over-run and how this will be procured. I am also interested to see the schedule of services planned and how the principal contractor is performing against the contract."

It was resolved:

That as there was no report on the agenda on the project, a written response would be provided to both questions no later than 10 working days from the date of the meeting.

311. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROPOSALS

This report provided details of the proposed allocation of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding for 2020-21. The Committee was reminded that since its establishment, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) passported the LTP capital grant funding to the County Council. The Committee report had been prepared on the basis that this arrangement would continue for 2020/21.

It was highlighted that in September 2013 the County Council Cabinet had agreed a

contribution of £25m over a maximum period of 25 years towards the A14 Improvement Scheme to be paid from a top slice of the ITB capital grant. At that time the ITB funding was much higher at around £10m per year. Currently its value had reduced to £3.19m per year. The first £1m contribution to the A14 was expected in 2020/21. Given that the ITB funding had reduced in recent years and taking it from here would reduce the ITB by a third, the report proposed to ask General Purposes Committee (GPC) to approve that it should be funded from Prudential Borrowing. The report also made the assumption that the full ITB funding would be available to allocate to schemes as before. If the prudential borrowing was not agreed by GPC, it would need to be funded from the ITB budget and as this would reduce the funding available for schemes in the programme, a decision on revised allocations would require a further report to the Committee.

Based on previous allocations, the ITB for 2020/21 was recommended to be allocated as follows:

Budget Category and Proposed 2020/21 allocation	
Air Quality Monitoring	£23K
Major Scheme Development	£200K
Strategy Development and Integrated Transport Schemes	£345k
Local Highway Improvement (LHI)	£607k
Other Local Infrastructure Improvements for accessibility and Rights of Way	£75k
Road Safety Schemes	£594k
Delivering Transport Strategy Aims	£1,346k
Total	£3,190k

In terms of progress on 2019-20 schemes, it was highlighted that there had been delays to some of the schemes approved for 2019/20 delivery. Funding for the delayed schemes from the 2019/20 budget would be carried forward as continued spend and would therefore not affect the allocation of the 2020/21 budget. Paragraph 3.3 of the report listed those schemes with committed funding for 2020/21

The report highlighted that a 2019/20 scheme to provide a cycling link between Rampton to Willingham had been found not be feasible within the budget allocated due to its proposed length and therefore it was proposed to reallocate the £100k funding as detailed in paragraph 3.4 of the report. The two parish councils were in further discussions regarding other options for the cycleway route.

Attention was drawn as part of the ongoing discussion to paragraph 3.5 providing the

details of the prioritisation methodology used to identify eligible schemes. Schemes with the highest Total Score were proposed for allocation up to the limit of available 2020/21 funding, as shown in Appendix 1 to the report with Scheme 897 Godmanchester to Hinchingsbrooke Park subject to match funding. If this scheme was not able to go ahead it was proposed to delegate to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to decide on a replacement scheme from the prioritised list to receive funding. Schemes scores were listed from highest to lowest in Appendix 3 of the report. Eligible schemes assessed, but not proposed for funding allocation in 2020/21, would remain in the Transport Investment Plan to be considered for other appropriate funding sources or for the next round of ITB funding.

One member of the public, Doctor Philip Trathan, the Chairman of the Storey's Way Residents Association had requested to speak in support of TIP scheme 894 'Review and re-design of traffic control measures in Storey's Way to improve the cycling route to link to the Ridgeway and Eddington Development ' designed to help improve the safety of cyclists. He had also for background information, provided a Residents Association report previously sent to their local Councillor, Councillor Claire Richards in November which had also been circulated to members of the Committee in advance of the meeting and is included as Appendix 2 to these Minutes. His full presentation was provided to Democratic Services and is included as Appendix 3 to these Minutes. He also tabled a map of the relevant roads for reference purposes. Councillor Richards who had also requested to speak as the local member, also spoke in support of the scheme.

Questions / issues raised on the report included:

- With reference to the allocation to the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) scheme a question was raised on how this compared to the previous year. In reply it was explained that it was at the same level as the previous year. The Chairman indicated that full Council, when recently agreeing the Budget, had allocated an additional £200k towards this budget.
- A similar query was raised on the allocation (£75K) to the 'Other Local Infrastructure Improvements for accessibility and Rights of Way' category which one member saw as rather low. It was explained that this budget was only for top up funding for measures that were already going to happen, and was not the main source of the funding.
- Concerns were raised by members and the Chairman regarding the length of time panels were expected to meet to make decisions, citing a panel meeting of over 11 hours which was not seen as being efficient. There was a request that this should be reviewed and improvements suggested. **Action: Richard Lumley**
- In terms of recommendation d) to request GPC to agree prudential borrowing for payment of the A14, one member could not agree to this and indicated he would be voting against the recommendation as the payment was foreseeable and should have been included in Council contingency budgets. In total a £100m had been collected from other districts and county councils as far away as Northamptonshire as they all recognised the importance of the A14 as a strategic route.
- With reference to Appendix 1, two members of the Committee representing Fenland electoral divisions highlighted the vast disparity of funds and schemes allocated between different districts in the County, noting that Fenland schemes

only totalled £8,800 while other areas of the County were receiving sums in excess of £300k to £500k. It was explained that the schemes were allocated according to the scoring system set out in section 3 of the report previously agreed by the Committee. There had been a number of Fenland schemes put forward but on scoring against the criteria had received low scores. Officers were asked to look into how a more equitable distribution of funding across the region could be achieved in the future. Officers agreed they would look further into what schemes had been included in the Cambridgeshire Transport Investment Plan (TIP), as inclusion in the latter, was fundamental. Further to this, the Committee requested that officers review the current criteria for ways to improve its equitability and come back initially to the Chairman and Vice Chairman with any proposed amendments. **Action: Elsa Evans / Andy Preston**

- There was broad agreement across the Committee that the A14 contribution should not be taken from the ITB, but some Members were opposed to it being financed from prudential borrowing.
- One Member asked about the appropriate route to obtain funding from the County Council for an improved road safety scheme for Sixteen Foot Bank on the B1098 having obtained funding from other partners. In reply it was explained that as a road safety scheme, this was within the remit of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee who were due to discuss road safety schemes at their meeting on 10th March.

Following separate votes on each of the recommendations:

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Support the allocation to the ITB budget categories as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report.
- b) Support the prioritised projects in Appendix 1 for allocation of ITB Delivering Transport Strategy Aims category funding in 2020/21, subject to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority passporting the funding to the County Council; and,
- c) Delegate authority to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to decide on amendments as described in paragraph 3.9.

While voting in favour of the above recommendations, Councillors Connor and Tierney requested that their dissatisfaction with the inequity in the current allocation of funding by region be placed on record.

It was resolved:

- d) To recommend to General Purposes Committee that the £1m A14 contribution for 2020/2021 is funded from Prudential Borrowing.

312. BIKEABILITY CONTRACT

This report sought approval to let a contract for Bikeability cycle training and agree to the funding allocation methodology.

It was highlighted that in 2009 the County Council had moved from volunteer-led cycle training (cycling proficiency), to Bikeability training, delivered in accordance with national standards, and managed by the Cycling Projects Team. Bikeability being offered free to all schools in the County with the provision of training funded entirely through a Department for Transport (DfT) grant.

The current contract for the training concluded at the end of March 2020. Due to the uncertainty of year on year funding from DfT, the report proposed to let a one year contract, with the option to add up to three additional years, which was both in line with procurement rules, but also gave enough flexibility to react to any change of funding. Details of the procurement process was set out in section 2 of the report.

In terms of continued DfT funding it had been confirmed that they would provide Cambridgeshire County Council with an additional £56,000 required to meet the additional demand for Level 2 Bikeability training in the current 2019/20 financial year.

Questions raised in discussion included:

- Whether the one year funding would cover the school calendar year. It was confirmed that was the case.
- The likelihood of Government funding being extended beyond the year to allow forward planning. In reply it was explained that the Government was aware that Bikeability demand was growing year on year nationally. In recognition of this, the Government had announced on the 7th February 2020 that all children in England would be taught the skills for a lifetime of cycling. The commitment would see an additional 400,000 training places offered on the Bikeability scheme each year, although what this implied for Cambridgeshire had yet to be confirmed. It was hoped that the current £213k funding allocation would be increased to at least match the annual demand for training across the County. However as this could not be confirmed, this was why there was flexibility built into the new contract.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree to let a one year contract for delivery of Bikeability training let a one year contract, with the option to add up to three additional years and the allocation of annual Department for Transport funding proportionally by district area.
- b) Delegate authority to award the contract to the Executive Director – Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

313. KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE – PROPOSED PROJECT GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

This Committee decided at its meeting held in Whittlesey on 15th August 2019, to invite tenders from the open market to construct the scheme, following the removal of the previous contractor from the project. This report updated the Committee on the project risks and requested approval of the introduction of revised project governance arrangements to safeguard the timetable as set out in the detail of the report.

A total of nine submissions were received from Contractors to the initial contract opportunity and evaluation of these resulted in six tenderers successfully passing the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) stage. Two had since opted out, leaving four remaining tenderers bidding for the construction contract.

Invitation to Tender (ITT) returns were due shortly and would be evaluated based on a 60% price, 40% quality split. Upon completion of tender evaluation and moderation, the results would be reported to the Committee seeking a decision to award the Contract and to make any further recommendation to General Purposes Committee, should additional funding be required. The report set out the statutory process that was to be followed.

In terms of project governance it was proposed that the Governance framework should consist of an officer Project Board to report to E&E Committee and a Member Advisory Group which would receive information from, and gives recommendations to, both the Committee and the Project Board with the proposed project governance and Terms of Reference were set in Appendix A of the report, detailing the nature of the Project Board's responsibilities and its general relationship with the Member Advisory Group.

The risk register for the project was contained in Appendix B. This was to be reviewed by the Project Board at each of its meetings and exceptions would be periodically reported to this Committee for awareness and a steer. Sections 2.16 to 2.17 set out details of the finance and funding.

The following issues were raised as part of the discussion:

- Officers were reminded by one Fenland Member that this project had been promised 10 years and three leaders ago.
- The Lead member for the Liberal Democrat Group suggested that the lessons from the Ely bypass project had not been learnt as there was no opposition party representation on the Member Advisory Group to provide critical friend input and so could not support the proposed governance arrangements. Other members highlighted that the councillors listed to be appointed included members representing Fenland divisions and they would ensure that there was robust challenge.

Having been put to the vote with seven members voting in favour, none against and three abstentions,

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the proposed project governance arrangements and membership of the Member Advisory Group and its Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix A of the report.
- b) to note the key project risks and full risk register in Appendix B of the report.

314. MARCH AREA TRANSPORT STRATEGY

This report provided details of the progress on the March Area Transport Study. The Study had examined a wide range of options developed from officer led workshops which had then been reviewed by the Member Steering Group (MSG) set up by this Committee in July 2018, The options were assessed using bespoke transport models at a higher strategic and more detailed operational level, with Appendix A of the report providing the executive summary of the Options Assessment Report.

At the outset of the study and after discussions with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the MSG, the study was extended to cover all transport modes and the consideration of small, medium and large interventions relating to those junctions initially identified. MATS has identified various packages of interventions, some of which have been progressed to feasibility design with the further objective of ensuring these schemes would be ready for further development if, and when, any funding opportunities arise. None of the schemes assessed prejudiced options for reinstating the March – Wisbech rail line, which was a separate CPCA funded project.

A variety of smaller scale Quick Win (QW) schemes were identified early and had been progressed separately from the main study. These comprised measures such as signal improvements at junctions, better lighting and improvements for pedestrians and cyclists through new and upgraded crossings and pavements. A full list of the Quick Win measures was included at Appendix B to the report.

The report highlighted that in parallel to the MATS project, Fenland District Council had submitted a bid to the Future High Street Fund (FHSF) to fundamentally change the way in which March functioned as a Town Centre. This included improvements in Broad Street to improve pedestrian flow and footfall, changes to densification in use to support a 24-hour economy and support resilience, and public realm improvements which would open up underused and derelict areas for commercial development. There has been regular dialogue between the two projects to ensure that any proposals were consistent with the FHSF aspirations.

The report detailed the three stages of assessing schemes used to reach the findings of the MATS Options Assessment Report including assumptions made regarding the five main junctions and the options considered. Three March town centre package options were tested focussed on the area around the Broad St / Station Rd junction in the centre of town. The packaging assessment took the best performing schemes from the strategic and operational assessments and combined them into packages based on varying levels of intervention in March town centre, considering scenarios with and without the March Northern Industrial Link Road (NILR). High level construction costs were calculated and economic appraisals were run on the packages to produce benefit

to cost ratios (BCR) for each. Table 1 of the report listed the component schemes for each package and Table 2 summarised the respective benefit to cost ratios.

Public Consultation detailing options assessed in the study and seeking public opinion on the individual schemes was planned for a 6 week period commencing 28th March 2020 and would include four public drop-in events after 20 April to avoid the school Easter holidays. The Next steps for MATS were as follows:

- March 2020 – report study outcomes to CPCA Transport and Infrastructure (T&I) committee, FDC Cabinet and March Town Council (MTC)
- March to April 2020 – public consultation on individual schemes
- Summer 2020 – report consultation outcome to CCC Economy and Environment Committee, CPCA Transport and Infrastructure Committee, Fenland District Council (FDC) Cabinet and March Town Council, and seek support for the recommended next phase of work
- Apply for funding for the next phase of work and Quick Win schemes.

Issues raised / answers provided in the subsequent discussion included:

- The funding for the feasibility study provided by the CPCA included £1m in March 2018 with further funding to be made available in the region of £220k for quick wins. The Chairman highlighted that there was an item on the next day's Combined Authority agenda on the subject.
- Questions were raised regarding how the proposed strategy schemes integrated with district council market town strategies as they needed to complement each other, avoid duplication and ensure between them issues were not missed and needed to also be linked to economic growth plans e.g. business parks. It was explained that the study in the report was looking at congestion issues and had taken into account existing market town strategies. The master plan would be fully integrated in terms of proposed transport plans with officers from the County Council working closely with their colleagues in the Combined Authority and District Councils.

Having commented,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the emerging outcomes of the March Area Transport Study.
- b) Approve the study outcomes for consultation with the public.

315. GRANTS TO COMMUNITY PROVIDERS

Cambridgeshire County Council provides grant awards following procurement exercises to community transport operators to contribute to the cost of the provision of dial-a-ride services. The Council's Audit and Accounts Committee had asked for a report on the performance of the grant funded schemes to be presented to E&E Committee.

There were currently five grants awarded to operators covering the areas of Fenland (£40,265), Huntingdonshire (£12,095), Cambridge City (£27,280) villages in East Cambridgeshire around Newmarket (£18,071) and villages in East Cambridgeshire around Ely (£50,000). The current community transport operators in receipt of the grants were Fenland Association for Community Transport (Fenland), Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (Huntingdonshire), Cambridge Dial-a-ride (Cambridge), The Voluntary Network (Newmarket area) and Ely and Soham Association for Community Transport (Ely area).

Figure 1 of the report showed the number of passenger journeys per annum, the annual grant amounts and the resultant cost per passenger journey for each scheme, enabling a comparison between the schemes. It was highlighted that the cost per passenger varied between £0.95 and £10.38, with an average across all schemes of £2.21. As a comparison, the figures for traditional local bus services ranged from £0.49 to £42.27, with an average of £4.15. Overall the five schemes enabled 66,837 journeys to be made that might not otherwise have been possible. The current grant agreements ran until the end of April 2021 with the timescale giving the opportunity to review the current funding arrangement and consider whether there was an alternative method of allocating the funding available.

Issues raised / replies provided included:

- A member of the Committee who was also a South Cambridgeshire Councillor explained that South Cambridgeshire were not included as the district council funded its own Community Transport Provision
- In answer to a question on the funding arrangements, it was clarified that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CA) passed back the money that the County Council received as part of the core funding from central government and delegated its allocation functions to the County Council. If in the future the CA took over the allocation function, the County Council would still receive the core funding monies and then pass it over.
- The high cost of Ely and Soham Community Transport at £10.38 cost per passenger was seen as a concern to which the officers replied that was why the second report recommendation was suggesting that at the November Committee meeting there might be proposals to look at certain services in a different way. Councillor Goldsack indicated that he had not seen anything of this Service and asked what publicity measures were being undertaken to inform residents of the service's availability. As the Member for Soham North and Isleham he knew that residents were absolutely crying out for bus services to link Ely to the Soham area. **Action: Paul Nelson to investigate further the current publicity arrangements and consider how they might be improved.**

Having commented:

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the report; and

- b) To agree to consider proposals for allocating funding for 2021/22 at Committee in November 2020.

316. PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT – QUARTER 3 2019-20

The performance report provided information on the status of performance indicators the Committee has selected to monitor to understand performance of services overseen by the Committee. As previously requested by the Committee Indicator 32 – ‘Growth in Cycling from a 2004/05 average baseline’ now showed the increase in cycling journeys by both a percentage increase and the number of cycle journeys.

Current performance of indicators monitored by the Committee were as follows:

Status	Number of indicators	Percentage of total indicators with target
Red	2	29%
Amber	1	14%
Green	3	43%
Blue	1	14%
No target	5	

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the Performance Report.

317. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – JANUARY 2020

The Committee received a report outlining the Finance Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place & Economy Services as at the end of January 2020. The Strategic Finance Manager informed the Committee that a bottom line underspend of £2.9m was forecasted, £0.2m up from the previous report provided to the January Committee. The main areas of overspend / underspend were:-

- Bus Lane Enforcement and Parking Enforcement: forecasting of additional income in excess of budget had increased to £961K
- Winter Maintenance: a projected overspend of £239K reflecting the reduced number of runs due to the mild winter to date.
- Waste Management: The forecast underspend was now £2.3m due to the Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility (MBT) breaking down and the contractor being responsible for the landfill costs.

The revised capital budget for 2019/20 reflected the carry-forwards of funding from 2018/19 and the agreed re-phasing of schemes. Wisbech Town access Study was now reported as a new capital line as it had previously been reported under Combined Authority Schemes.

The Local Member for Queen Edith’s had requested to speak regarding issues that were affecting her electoral division and highlighted on page 138 under the heading

‘Operating the network” - Signals C233 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge (At Queen Edith’s Way / Robin Hood junction) – which stated that the work on the scheme had been delayed as a nearby cycle scheme had been pushed back. She made reference to delays to schemes in the Cherry Hinton / Queen Edith’s Way area including the severe delays to the Fendon Road roundabout due to cabling issues which had greatly increased the cost and was also having a knock on effect on the commencement of other local schemes in the area. She stated that what was needed was a report back to Committee to set out:

- How was the original cost estimated on the Fendon Road Roundabout / Robin Hood junction schemes
- How the Council could improve project estimating to avoid enormous variations
- How would money be re-allocated to the two other delayed cycling improvement schemes as a result of the Fendon Road Roundabout overspend.

The Chairman asked officers to provide a response to the issues raised. The Assistant Director Infrastructure and Growth explained where funding had been obtained for the area, including a £3m allocation from Section 106 monies and a £450k grant from the Department of Transport. The first delayed scheme would start once the Fendon Road Roundabout had been completed. There had been challenges with the scheme in respect of the utility providers and where their equipment was located which had led to the delays, A report would be coming back to Committee on the challenges faced on the construction of the Fendon Road Roundabout which could pick up on the other issues raised by the local member. In reply to a question it was indicated that it would be programmed to come to the May Committee meeting.

in discussion:

- The local member for Fulbourn highlighted that the knock on effect from the delay in constructing the Fendon Road roundabout was also delaying schemes in his division as there was currently a half finished cycleway and all the east side of Cambridge was being affected by the massive traffic congestion caused by blocking off parts of the main road during the construction period, not forgetting the disruption to local people in the area. He suggested that local members had not been informed regarding the construction delay and that he had obtained his information from Stagecoach. In reply the officer indicated that as soon as officers were certain of the delay, electoral division members were informed. The Local Member clarified that she had not been made aware of the overspend at the roundabout until about January.
- Linked to this a Member of the Committee raised the issue of how often it seemed that the Committee was being notified of capital project with overspends, while the Committee never saw details of projects that had come in below the original project estimate. In response the Officer explained that at the project development stage costs did often change, as more clarification was gained on potential problems. In reply to this, the same Member while accepting that it was difficult to judge the total cost of large scale projects, suggested that if officers were continually underestimating the total cost, the risk estimate balance was not right. As further clarification, the Strategic Finance Officer highlighted that there was now a Capital Project Board which met monthly chaired by the Chief Finance Officer which

provided robust challenge on all capital schemes and required a revised business case to reflect any cost increases. She also highlighted that some schemes came in over the original budget but that others came in under the original budget. The Service Director of Highways and Transport further clarified that most County Council projects did come in on budget as could be seen in the Finance Monitoring reports. Design cost estimates were undertaken on an Optimism Bias Factor basis but that sometimes this was not sufficient to take account of all the issues that could arise once construction begun.

- A Member stated that if there were capital over or under estimates in local projects, this would also be good for local members to be aware of. He suggested that the minutes of the Board should be made available so they were aware of the status of capital schemes in their electoral division in terms of overspending / underspending, in much the same way local members were provided with details of road repairs. The Chairman asked officers to raise with the Chief Finance Officer the question of the Minutes / notes of the Officer Capital Board being made available to all members of the Council. **Action Sarah Heywood / Graham Hughes**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the Finance Report.
- b) To receive progress a report at the May Committee meeting including a cost and financing update on the programme of works in the south of Cambridge in relation to Fendon Road, the Robin Hood roundabout and Queen Edith's Way.

318. AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) To note the agenda plan with the addition of a report at the May meeting on the on the progress and update on the cost of the programme of works in the south of Cambridge in relation to Fendon Road, the Robin Hood roundabout and Queen Edith's Way.
- b) To appoint the new local member for Duxford Councillor Peter McDonald to the following vacancies on E and E Committee outside bodies previously allocated to Cllr Topping as the local member:
 - Barrington Cement Works and Quarry Liaison Group
 - Barrington Light Railway Sub Group
 - Duxford Neighbours Forum

319. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 23rd APRIL 2020

**Chairman:
23RD April 2020**