

## **HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Time: 10:00a.m – 13:05 p.m.

Present: Councillors D Connor (substituting for Councillor Gardener), J French (substituting for Councillor King), M Goldsack, L Harford, B Hunt (Vice-Chairman), I Manning, T Sanderson, J Scutt, M Shuter (Chairman) and G Wilson.

Apologies: Councillors I Gardener and S King

### **158. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were noted as recorded above.

Councillor Matthew Shuter declared a non-pecuniary disclosable interest in relation to Minute 165, as a co-opted member on the Cambridge BID Board representing Cambridgeshire County Council.

### **159. MINUTES – 21<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **160. HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE ACTION LOG**

The Action Log was noted and the following points were raised:

- Minute 144b – The Member who had raised the issue clarified that he was requesting that the Highways Fault Reporting Tool be replaced, possibly with 'FixMyStreet', and not integrated. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that procurement for a new system would commence shortly. The procurement process could result in a change from the current Symology Insight system and therefore the reporting tool would also change. He explained that this process would take around 12 months to complete. Therefore, in the interim period until the new system was installed, any data submitted would be logged on the current system. It was noted that the usability of the reporting tool would be addressed during the wider procurement process.
- Minute 151b – Clarified that this meeting had been postponed due to a Member being unable to attend the meeting originally scheduled on the 18<sup>th</sup> February 2020.
- Minute 146c – Queried the progress that had been made regarding officers addressing the anomalies found within the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) bid process. The Chairman confirmed that this was being investigated and a report would be presented to the Committee at a future meeting. He suggested the need to gather feedback from all Members in regards to this. **(Action required)**

## 161. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairman announced that four public questions had been received. These would be addressed during Item 10 – Residents' Parking Delivery Review.

## 162. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – JANUARY 2020

The Committee was presented with the January 2020 Finance and Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place and Economy (P&E) Services. The Strategic Finance Manager stated that P&E Services were forecasting a bottom line underspend of £2.9m, which included an increase in underspend of £179k for Bus Lane Enforcement and Parking Enforcement, a reduction in overspend of £224k for Winter Maintenance and a £0.4m increase in underspend for Waste Management.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- queried whether the bus gates in Cambridge were being advertised effectively, as there had been a number of road users repeatedly fined for driving through them illegally. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that a large amount of work had been undertaken to advertise the bus gates and help educate the public so they didn't receive fines. There was more signage than the Department for Transport (DfT) required at the bus gate sites. Officers had also produced short video clips which were published on the Council's website and on Social Media explaining how the bus gates operated. He acknowledged the difficulty of addressing the issue of drivers repeatedly using them illegally, as these road users did not appear to be deterred by the fine.
- asked whether there was any evidence that the road users repeatedly being fined for using the bus gates illegally were causing delays to the bus services. The Assistant Director, Highways suggested that he was not aware that this was the case. He stated that the bus gates on Silver Street and Station Road were the most frequently being used illegally. He highlighted that the timings for the bus gate on Silver Street were more complicated compared to the one on Station Road, but that the sites were regularly monitored and improvements made where possible. The Chairman commented that from the 12th March 2020 there would be an additional bus gate on Worts Causeway.
- queried whether any further legislative measures could be taken to target the road users who were repeatedly using the bus gates illegally. The Assistant Director, Highways agreed to investigate. **(Action required)**
- asked whether officers had written to the road users repeatedly being fined. The Service Director, Highways and Transport suggested that this could be a General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) issue. He commented that he would take this away and inform the Committee of the additional measures that could be implemented. **(Action required)**
- asked whether officers could send a different form of notification to the road users who were repeatedly being fined. The Assistant Director, Highways stated that he would take this away. **(Action required)**

- stated that it was important for officers to remind the Committee and residents how the additional money collected from bus lane enforcement was being used. The Service Director, Highways and Transport clarified that the Council did not run these schemes to generate income. He explained that if a surplus was made, then the Council would put the money back into the transport system from the area in which it had been collected. He confirmed that the money was not used to bolster the Council's general finances and all surplus income was spent on transport.
- asked whether officers had the ability to allocate the savings gained from Winter Maintenance into a reserve, to prepare for the next severe winter. The Strategic Finance Manager explained that the Council did not operate their finances in this way. This was a demand led budget which could fluctuate and it was not possible to ring-fence the money.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review, note and comment upon the report

### **163. PERFORMANCE REPORT – QUARTER 3 2019/20**

The Committee considered a report providing performance monitoring information on selected performance indicators. The Senior Business Intelligence Analyst stated that following the discussion held at the last meeting, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman had agreed that indicator 40 would be split into three: Indicator 40a – Classified A road condition, Indicator 40b – Classified B road condition, and Indicator 40c – Classified C road condition. It was highlighted that there were two red indicators, Indicator 43 – Killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties and Indicator 180 – Percentage of Freedom of Information requests answered within 20 days.

A number of Members raised concerns regarding the condition of B and C class roads in Fenland compared to the rest of the County. They stated that the current amount of money allocated to improving road conditions in this area was not adequate. They requested that more money should be invested into Fenland. The Chairman commented that officers would continue to look at innovative methods to improve the road conditions the District.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- requested clarification regarding the commentary found on Indicator 40c. The Chairman suggested that the conditions of C class roads in Fenland were similar in character and usage to unclassified roads in other parts of the County. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that the criteria of C class roads in Fenland varied considerably, and were therefore not completely comparable to C class roads located in other parts of the County.
- sought more information regarding how the data for Indicator 46 was collected. The Assistant Director, Highways clarified that the data was supplied by Balfour Beatty.
- asked whether officers were able to evaluate the data supplied by Balfour

Beatty using an independent data set collected by the Council. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that the Indicator was part of a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract agreed between the Council and Balfour Beatty. He commented that officers were unable to fully evaluate the data as the Council did not have any base line data to compare it to. The Chairman stated that officers received feedback from Parish Councils on the performance of street lights, which the Council would investigate if an issue occurred. He reported that it was beneficial to continue to monitor this.

- sought more information regarding the use of recycled plastic for road surfaces in Fenland. The Chairman explained that an experiment with recycled plastic road surfaces had taken place in Peterborough. He commented that the surface only consisted of around 3% plastic and was effective in disposing of unrecyclable plastics. However, he suggested that this method was not particularly effective for improving the condition of Fenland roads and would have to be analysed further. He stated that in the last financial year, the Council had allocated £16m to improving roads in Fenland. With this funding, officers were only able to improve around four miles of road. He explained that improving the roads in Fenland was a substantial task.
- believed that individuals were more likely to purchase heavier 4x4 vehicles if road conditions were poor, which would have further negative implications on road conditions and the environment.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note and comment on performance information and agree remedial action as necessary.

#### **164. ROAD SAFETY SCHEMES 2020-21**

The Committee considered a report outlining the road safety schemes to be delivered in 2020/21. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager drew the Committee's attention to the report and appendix A.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- requested more information regarding the funding allocated to other County wide cluster sites. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that if any fatal or serious collisions occurred, the Council had a duty to investigate it in collaboration with the Police. If immediate remedial action could be taken, the £50k budget line presented in the report would be used to implement safety interventions.
- asked whether the Road Safety Annual Review report being presented to the Committee in June 2020 would review the effectiveness of road safety schemes completed in previous years. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that the report in June would present the cluster site list containing the latest data for the last 3 years. This information would be considered when allocating funding to the design of future schemes. He stated that an officer was reviewing a number of schemes completed in the last decade to establish which schemes were the most

effective and achieved best value for money. However, this data would not be included within the report presented in June.

- raised concerns regarding the road conditions on the A47 between Guyhirn and Thorney. It was stated that there had been a number of incidents on this road and it was hoped that the report in June would highlight the details of these incidents further.
- thanked the Council for the work they had completed on the junction between Manea Road and the A141. It was noted that there had been a number of fatal collisions at this location. It was acknowledged that the traffic lights installed over two years ago had improved the level of safety considerably.
- highlighted one road safety scheme that was estimated to cost around £500k out of the total £594k budget. One Member requested more information regarding the other 52 locations investigated. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that some of the 52 schemes would cost millions of pounds, whereas others could be completed with a smaller budget. He suggested that over time the number of smaller schemes would be reduced, leaving only the larger schemes.
- suggested that the link between road safety and Local Highways Improvement (LHI) schemes could be investigated further. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that road safety was one criteria used when scoring the LHI bids. He suggested that road safety was analysed at the LHI feasibility stage with officers from the Road Safety team.
- the Chairman stated that the Swaffham Bulbeck crossroads was a dangerous location but he was pleased that remedial work would be undertaken to improve road safety. He suggested it was important that the Council access Government funding to implement road safety interventions. He commented that it was also important to establish whether the road safety schemes being completed were achieving the desired outcomes. He thanked officers for all their work.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Approve the capital programme of safety schemes for 2020/21 outlined in Appendix A.

## **165. LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT (LHI) SCHEMES 2020-21**

The Committee considered a report providing information on the outcome of the prioritisation of LHI applications for delivery in 2020/21 by the Member Panels in each District area. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager drew the Committee's attention to the information found within the report and the appendices. He stated that following Full Council on the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2020, the approved budget to facilitate a programme of LHIs had increased by £200k to £807k. In reference to Appendix A, he explained that the schemes above the red dashed line in each District list were being funded and would be included in the budget for the next financial year. He stated that there was a proposal to bring forward the application window for LHI schemes to be delivered in the 2021/22

financial year by 2 months, opening on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 and closing on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- noted that the number of LHI schemes carried over from previous years had been reduced. The Chairman hoped that these proposals would facilitate further improvement.
- expressed disappointment regarding a LHI scheme that had been submitted a number of years ago for Fenland. One Member explained that the scheme should have been completed this financial year. However, they had been told recently that the cost to complete the scheme had doubled. She stated that this issue should have been identified earlier and asked officers if the costing of the scheme had been estimated accurately.
- sought clarification regarding the Lode Road and Clay Street schemes in East Cambridgeshire which had an identical overall score. Lode Road was being funded, whereas Clay Street was not. It was queried whether this was due to one applicant being able to provide a higher percentage of funding for the scheme. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that the schemes were ordered using an Excel spreadsheet formula. He confirmed that if the applicant's contribution was higher, then this would increase the score for the scheme. The Chairman stated that in the event of an underspend being achieved for LHI schemes in East Cambridgeshire, the Clay Street scheme would get priority as it was the first scheme under the red dashed line.
- queried whether the Council were prioritising LHI bids made by smaller Parish Councils who were providing a large percentage of the costs. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager confirmed that they were and this was reflected in the 'added value' scoring criteria.
- raised concerns regarding Fenland being allocated the second lowest amount of funding from the LHI budget in 2019/20. It was requested that officers should review this. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that the funding formula was based on the number of divisions in each District. He commented that the number of LHI applications in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire were lower, as they had a lower number of Parish Councils. He stated that this was reflected in Appendix A as the number of schemes below the red dashed line in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire were lower compared to other Districts.
- suggested that it was important to manage public expectations surrounding the submission of LHI bids.
- sought more information on how the Council communicated with Parish Councils regarding the LHI process. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager confirmed that if the LHI schemes were approved at this meeting, officers would contact all Parish Councils who had submitted an LHI bid.
- sought clarification regarding whether the equity of approved LHI bids in

each District was considered. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained the process of an LHI bid being scored by Members at an LHI Panel meeting. The Chairman suggested that the Local Member should be encouraging and supporting their Parish Councils to submit a LHI bid. He commented that some Parish Councils were less engaged with the process and were therefore not submitting any LHI bids. He stated that it was important to ensure that the LHI process was as equitable as possible.

- reiterated the need to ensure equity throughout the LHI process. It was noted that historically, some Parish Councils had repeatedly submitted unsuccessful bids. It was noted that officers could provide support to these Parish Councils to assist them in producing bids that had a higher chance of being approved.
- acknowledged that in some areas of Cambridgeshire, Parish Councils and residents were more engaged in the LHI process. It was acknowledged that it was important for Local Members to support bids in their divisions.
- suggested that a number of the smaller LHI schemes were not successful as they were not proposing effective measures to achieve their objective. It was suggested the LHI review should identify why certain smaller schemes were unsuccessful.
- noted that a LHI bid in Chesterton had been submitted. The bid was initially unsuccessful, but after negotiations with officers, the bid was changed and was subsequently approved. The Vice-Chairman agreed and stated that a similar process had occurred with a scheme in Wilburton.
- raised concerns regarding the proposal to bring the LHI application window forward by 2 months. It was reported that this would mean that part of the application window would occur during Cambridge City Council's pre-election period. One Member asked whether this had been considered by officers. The Highway Projects & Road Safety Manager explained that this had not been factored in. He confirmed that he would investigate in consultation with the Monitoring Officer. **(Action required)**.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the prioritised list of schemes for each District area, included in Appendix A of this report.
- b) Approve the proposal outlined in section 3 of the report to change the application timescales for the next round of LHIs.

## 166. HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSET MANAGEMENT

The Committee considered a report outlining the County Council's Highway Asset Management Policy, Strategy and Highway Operational Standards (HOS) documents. The Highways Asset Manager drew the Committee's attention to the information found within the report and the appendices.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- stated that if developers were damaging footpaths when work was being undertaken, the Council should ensure that they were responsible for repairing them. One Member commented that the Council did not have an unlimited budget and therefore should not be responsible for these repairs. She suggested that this should be reviewed as it would save the Council money and benefit residents. The Highways Asset Manager explained that the Highways Development Management team worked with developers to manage and monitor the conditions of the Council's assets. He acknowledged that the Council should not be responsible for these repairs.
- suggested that it was important to photograph any work being undertaken by developers, this would allow officers to compare the condition of the site before and after the work had been completed. One Member commented that this could be used as evidence if any damage had incurred. Another Member suggested it was important to monitor the work performed by contractors.
- sought more information regarding drainage grips. The Highways Asset Manager clarified that the frequency of grip cutting was set out in the Cyclic Maintenance Standards section of the Highways Operating Standards (HOS) document. The Chairman asked whether a programme of grip cutting had been reintroduced. The Assistant Director, Highways confirmed that it had. The Chairman commented that given the issue of global warming, the frequency of floods would only increase.
- stated that cutting grips was vital for the maintenance of roads in rural areas. Using the example of Isleham, one Member stated that the cutting of grips had reduced the frequency of flooding on the roads. The Highways Asset Manager agreed and suggested it was important to maintain drainage on roads.
- queried when grip cutting would take place in Fenland. The Assistant Director, Highways stated that he would investigate and circulate a grip programme to the Committee. The Highways Asset Manager clarified that grip cutting was targeted on a risk based approach. Therefore he suggested that it may be difficult to provide an exact programme. The Chairman asked whether Local Members should therefore contact their Local Highway Officer if roads in their division were flooding. The Highways Asset Manager confirmed that this would be a good idea.
- requested more information regarding the reduction in the amount of maintenance for public footpaths. The Highways Asset Manager stated that there was a right of way improvement plan which set out the principles

for maintaining public footpaths. He commented that this was a separate document, which could be accessed online.

- sought clarification regarding the fee charged to assess the suitability of lamp posts for Mobile Vehicle-Activated Signs (MVAS). The Highways Asset Manager confirmed that the Council only charged commercial organisations for these inspections so Parish Councils or community organisations would not be charged.
- highlighted the high number of highway related insurance claims received from South Cambridgeshire. The Chairman suggested this should be analysed further. **(Action required)**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Policy, Appendix 1
- b) Approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Strategy, Appendix 2
- c) Approve the Highway Operational Standards (HOS), Appendix 3
- d) Agree that the Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee, can make minor amendments to Appendix R of the Highways Operational Standards, in accordance with the approved asset management principles.
- e) Agree that Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee, can make minor amendments to the budgetary apportionments derived from Appendix Q of the Highways Operational Standards.

## 167. RESIDENTS' PARKING DELIVERY REVIEW

The Committee considered a report reviewing the delivery of Residents' Parking Schemes (RPS) and determining future delivery across Cambridge City. The Traffic Manager drew the Committee's attention to the contents of the report and the appendices. The three proposed options presented to the Committee were, Option 1 – Continue with implementation as per the existing RPS policy and associated delivery extension plan. Option 2 – Pause all work on the development and implementation of all RPS for 12 months. Option 3 – Proceed with the implementation of only those schemes listed in section 2 of the report where some local consultation had been undertaken, but do not undertake any work on any other schemes for a 12 month period.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that four public questions had been received and two Local Members had requested to speak. He announced that written statements had been received from: Ian Sandison, Councillor Richard Robertson and Councillor Amanda Taylor. A further statement had been provided by Councillor Aiden Van de Weyer, on behalf of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Executive Board. Copies of these statements had been circulated to the Committee at the meeting.

A public question was presented by Graeme Hodgson. The question asked the Committee to investigate the possibility of the introduction of an RPS where the parking permit was only required during a certain time period each day. (The full question can be found in the Public Question Time document attached as appendix 1 to these minutes).

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the question:

- sought more information regarding the opinion of the residents of Romsey. Graeme stated that he had spoken to a large number of residents in Romsey, and the majority of these people were in favor of option 1.
- asked whether this question had been presented to the local county Councillor. Graeme confirmed that it had not.
- sought more information regarding houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and the effects they had on the availability of parking spaces. Graeme suggested that HMOs were having a negative impact on parking availability as residents were not able to park near their house. He stated that Romsey residents had also raised concerns regarding the lack of development of alternative transport methods. He suggested that residents would not use their cars if there were other efficient forms of public transport to use.
- stated that the Council needed to put pressure on the bus companies to provide an efficient service. Graeme stated that this reflected the view of the residents of Romsey.

A public question was presented by Jim Chisholm. The question was supporting the approval of option 1. (The full question can be found in the Public Question Time document attached as appendix 1 to these minutes).

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the question:

- suggested that if option 2 was approved, there would be no incentive for commuters to travel into Cambridge by bus. The Member suggested that if bus usage declined, bus companies would reduce the number of routes provided. Jim agreed and stated that they needed to encourage bus companies to run more bus routes from rural villages into Cambridge.
- stated that it was important for parking availability in Cambridge to be balanced between Cambridge residents and commuters. Jim commented that if car traffic in Cambridge was reduced by around 10%, it would vastly improve the efficiency of buses. He acknowledged that some commuters would not be able to travel into Cambridge by bus. However, the commuters nearer a bus route needed to be encouraged to use the bus.

A public question was presented by Caroline Brettell. The question was supporting the approval of option 1 or 3. (The full question can be found in the Public Question Time document attached as appendix 1 to these minutes).

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the question:

- suggested that the De Freville RPS had put additional parking pressures on the Elizabeth zone.
- asked what the outcome would have been if Elizabeth, Hurst Park and Ascham had remained as one RPS and not divided into three zones. Caroline believed that if this was the case, the issues raised today would not exist.

A public question was presented by Michael Page. The question was supporting the approval of option 1 or 3. (The full question can be found in the Public Question Time document attached as appendix 1 to these minutes).

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the question:

- queried the dialogue that had taken place between the Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association and residents in Elizabeth. Michael stated that since the Elizabeth zone had been divided into three, there had been active dialogue. He suggested that a possible solution for easing congestion in the area was to include Hurst Park and Elizabeth into an expanded Ascham RPS. This would increase flexibility as the Hurst Park zone could facilitate more permit parking.
- suggested that even if new RPSs were introduced, there would still be areas in Cambridge where commuters could park.
- suggested that there needed to be a more holistic approach when introducing RPSs. He commented that proposals for RPS needed to be more conscious of the effects it would have on parking availability in the surrounding area due to displacement. Michael agreed and stated that residents needed to be provided with a greater understanding the nature of a RPS and its effects on them. He suggested that residents in Hurst Park did understand that some commuters needed to park their cars in Cambridge.

- asked whether agreeing option 2 would be beneficial as it would allow Officers and residents to re-examine how RPSs were introduced and their effect on neighboring zones. Michael suggested that residents would be frustrated if this was the case.

The Chairman invited Councillor Noel Kavanagh as the Local Member for Romsey to speak on the item. Councillor Kavanagh expressed his support for Option 1 and raised the following points; the Council should be listening to the residents in Romsey West who would like a RPS introduced. He suggested that residents in Romsey West were frustrated as they believed that the proposed RPS scheme for their area had been postponed due to arbitrary reasons. He stated that RPSs were effective in reducing congestion and pollution in residential areas.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the points raised by Councillor Kavanagh:

- sought more information regarding the points raised. Councillor Kavanagh stated that the GCP were working hard to address the congestion issues in Cambridge and the effects this had on the efficiency of public transport. He stated that Cambridgeshire residents should be encouraged to use alternative forms of transport to travel into and around Cambridge, such as the Park and Ride and cycling.
- raised concerns regarding the time it would take for some rural commuters to drive to a Park and Ride site and then catch a bus into Cambridge.
- commented that commuters who were unable to catch a bus into Cambridge needed to be able to drive in and find a car parking space.
- stated that Cambridge residents did not own the parking space outside of their house. Councillor Kavanagh agreed and stated that residents could often not find a parking space on their street due to commuters.

The Chairman invited Councillor Linda Jones as the Local Member for Petersfield to speak on the item. Councillor Jones expressed her support for Option 1 and highlighted the benefits of a RPS. She stated that before the Staffordshire RPS was introduced, residents in that area were unable to park their cars near their home as all the available parking spaces were being used by non-residents. She also highlighted the work being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and the GCP to reduce congestion and pollution in Cambridge and improve the efficiency of public transport.

The Chairman invited the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Director of Transport to speak on this item. The Director of Transport drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 1.6 and 5.1 in the report. In reference to paragraph 1.6, he clarified that the development and implementation of the GCP's initiatives were running on schedule. In reference to paragraph 5.1, clarified that the GCP had given CCC around £500k over the last few years to help implement the 26 proposed RPSs. He explained that there would be a significant cost incurred if the Committee agreed to delay the implementation of the schemes.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the points raised by the Director of Transport:

- suggested that the introduction of RPSs was a key element of the GCPs wider strategy to encourage commuters to use public transport to travel into Cambridge. The Member queried the impact Option 2 would have on this strategy, if agreed. The Director of Transport stated that this was a complex issue. He explained that RPSs made up part of an interconnected strategy to reduce congestion and pollution within Cambridge. Therefore, if option 2 was chosen, the desired outcomes of the wider strategy would become more challenging to achieve. He also explained that the GCP's Executive Board were planning to work with Stagecoach to achieve an 18 hour, 7 day a week bus service across the Greater Cambridge area by the end of the year.
- asked whether the GCP were willing to find a middle ground between option 1 and 2. The Member also asked whether the GCP would be willing to commit resources to help the Committee perform a review of the RPSs and their relationship to the GCPs wider strategy. The Director of Transport stated that the GCP were committed to working collaboratively with all their partners.
- understood that CCC had not communicated with the GCP whilst writing this report. The Member commented that that CCC and the GCP should be working collaboratively. The Director of Transport commented that GCP were always ready to offer support to CCC.
- raised concerns suggesting that Cambridge City was given preferential treatment compared to the rest of the County. The Member queried whether the purpose of introducing RPSs was to benefit the residents of Cambridge and disadvantage residents living elsewhere in the County. The Director of Transport clarified that the GCP did not solely focus on the population of the Greater Cambridge area. He stated that the GCP needed to be working with all communities within Cambridgeshire.
- queried the number of GCP consultation events that had been held across the County. The Director of Transport stated that in the last 18 months consultation events had been held in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland. He highlight that the recent GCP Citizens' Assembly contained a representative sample of residents from the Greater Cambridgeshire area and other districts across the County. The Vice-Chairman stated that he was not aware of the consultation events held in Ely. The Director of Transport confirmed that the consultation event had been advertised. He explained that the Citizens' Assembly was managed by consultants from Government and the participants had been randomly selected.
- commented that currently there were no substantial developments in place to enable residents from rural areas to commute into Cambridge. The Director of Transport highlighted the various schemes the GCP were working on in collaboration with their partners. He stated that over time the size of the schemes being implemented would increase.

- suggested that due to the growing severity of the Coronavirus, the usage of public of transport would decrease. He stated that this seemed an appropriate time to choose Option 2.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- commented that the limitations of RPSs needed to be communicated with residents. The Member also highlighted the process of an RPS being implemented.
- agreed that this was a complex issue as the introduction of RPSs involved this Committee, Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) and the GCP.
- proposed that the decision be deferred. She commented that it was important for CCC to be given time to communicate with the GCP.
- suggested that lowering the congestion and pollution levels in Cambridge would benefit residents and commuters.
- suggested that the introduction of more RPSs would encourage more commuters to travel in to Cambridge by bus.
- reiterated the fact that that there were areas outside of the RPS zones in Cambridge where anybody could park.
- queried whether the Council could be subject to judicial review (JR) if all the RPSs were postponed. The Service Director, Highways and Transport commented that it was not unusual for a Council's policy to change, resulting in the cancellation of a scheme whilst it was being developed. He suggested that in his view, the Council would not be subject to judicial review but stated that he would take this away. **(Action required)**
- stated that commuters coming into Cambridge from rural areas by car could not be penalised until efficient alternative transport systems were introduced. The Vice-Chairman expressed his support for Option 2.
- raised concerns regarding Option 2. He stated that the Committee had been provided with assurance that the bus services in Cambridge would improve in the future. The Member stated that the implementation of RPS should continue.
- acknowledged the frustration felt by Cambridge residents. She suggested that rural residents were also frustrated as they had not seen substantial development in alternative transport methods.

Councillor Manning proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Sanderson to change the wording of paragraph 3.14 to read:

Option 3 - Proceed with the implementation of those schemes listed in section 2 of this report. For further schemes an urgent review will be done with GCP and lead members in order to ensure the place in the overall GCP schedule, including the availability of alternative transport options and streamlining the process. This should report back to the next Highways and Infrastructure Committee meeting.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

Councillor Scutt proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Wilson to change the wording of paragraph 3.14 to read:

Option 3 – Proceed with the implementation of those schemes listed in section 2 of this report where some local consultation had been undertaken (Hurst Park, Elizabeth, Romsey West) and consult with the Grater Cambridge Partnership as to the future of the schemes as a whole with a report back to the Highways and Infrastructure Committee at the earliest opportunity.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

It was resolved to:

Approve Option 2 – Pause all work on the development and implementation of all RPS for 12 months.

**168. HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Chairman confirmed that the LHI Review report would be brought to the September Committee meeting. **(Action required)**

It was unanimously resolved to:

Note the Committee Agenda Plan

Chairman