

ECONOMY AND  
ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE

Minutes - Action Log



This is the updated action log as at 28th October 2016 and captures the actions arising from the most recent Economy and Environment Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

MINUTES OF THE 15 <sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015 COMMITTEE					
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
140.	<b>NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2 – SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS</b> – resolution b) Delegation on making any minor changes	Juliet Richardson	A delegation was agreed giving the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make changes to the Section 106 agreements prior to signing.	An update at 27 <sup>th</sup> October indicated that the S106 was close to being signed off. South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) were still awaiting information on starter homes. The intention was to return to SCDC committee in December with sign off hopefully early in 2017.	<b>ACTION ONGOING</b>

## MINUTES OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2016 COMMITTEE

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
186.	<b>CHERRY HINTON HIGH STREET – APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT – POLICY GUIDANCE TREE REPLACEMENT</b>	Richard Lumley	Concern was expressed regarding proposals to plant trees near the highway and there was a request for details on the relevant Policy governing tree planting on / near highways.	Subject to further comments, the timetable now is for the policy approval to be wrapped up as part of the annual HIAMP review (along with a number of other operational policies). This review is scheduled for 14 February 2017 Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee and will therefore come to December Spokes (currently scheduled for 6 <sup>th</sup> December 2016).	
189.	<b>FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER 2015</b>  <b>a) land acquisition and licence agreements to allow construction to commence on Yaxley to Farcet cycleway / walkway.</b>	Bob Menzies /  Ian Wilson Strategy and Estates	It was agreed an update on the current position would be sought from Legal and a written response provided outside of the meeting to the Norman Cross local Councillors (Councillors McGuire and Henson).  At the April Committee meeting it was agreed that Cllrs Henson and McGuire and the Chairman (Cllr Bates) and Vice-Chairman (Cllr Cearns) should receive fortnightly updates on progress.	The latest update at 18 <sup>th</sup> October from Ian Wilson indicated that both the landlord and tenant had agreed to the additional amounts of compensation that had been offered for the land being taken. Therefore, the legal team were currently documenting everything and it was at the above date almost completed.	<b>ACTION ONGOING</b>

## MINUTES OF THE 24<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2016 COMMITTEE

Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	status
224.	<b>ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN</b>  B) Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill	Bob Menzies / Rob Sanderson / Dawn Cave	There was a suggestion that Members required a briefing on the new Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill announced in the Queen's Speech on 18 <sup>th</sup> May and the potential impact this could have on the work of the Council and its district partner, as well as a progress update on the Total Transport Project". In discussion it was suggested that both these would be more appropriate as topics at future Member seminars.	Due to the number of priority topics taking precedence it had not yet been possible to arrange a slot with the October and November member seminars had been ruled out as being too early and priority being given to Budget planning items.  A slot for The Total Transport has been added to the March 2017 seminar.	<b>ACTION ONGOING</b>

## MINUTES OF THE 9<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016 COMMITTEE

<u>Minute No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Action to be taken by</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Comments</u>	Status
247	<b>SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2017-18 CAPITAL PROGRAMME - MEMBER REVIEW ANALYSING COMPLETED CYCLE SCHEMES</b>	G Hughes / Bob Menzies	The issue raised was whether there was the need for Member Review in respect of analysing completed cycle schemes, including the use of floating bus stops and the crossings created for them, to ensure they represented value for money and to give confidence to the public	This was discussed at the 9th September spokes meeting and Member nominations sought. So far the following nominations had been received;  Councillor Henson (UKIP) Councillor Cearns (Liberal Democrat) Councillor Jenkins (Liberal Democrat) Cllr Manning (Liberal Democrat) Cllr Taylor (Liberal Democrat)	<b>ACTION ONGOING</b>

			that best practice was being adopted.	<p>Proposed Liberal Democrat Substitutes Cllrs Leeke and Cllr Van de Ven</p> <p>The terms of reference and approval of the members to be on the Review will require this Committee's approval.</p>	
<b>249.</b>	<b>ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN</b>	Bob Menzies /Rob Sanders -on	The need for a training session to explain to Members the legal complications and potential timescale issues that could arise on proposed developments that required the acquisition of additional land. A proviso was that any presentation from Legal should be provided in simple, non-legal lay person's language.	<p>This was still ongoing. As there was nothing to report on the Training Plan, it had not been included on the current agenda.</p> <p>Due to the proximity of the local elections in 2017 this training, once arranged, was likely to be the last training session organised for the Committee.</p>	<b>ACTION ONGOING</b>
<b>251.</b>	<b>AGENDA PLAN - GARDEN VILLAGES</b>	Action: Graham Hughes	An issue was raised in respect of the Department for Communities and Local Government inviting developers and local authorities to submit expressions of interest for proposals for garden villages. It was agreed that this would be discussed at Spokes as there was a report due on Wisbech Garden Village.	A discussion item titled "Garden Villages & Wisbech Garden Town" was included on the Economy and Environment Spokes meeting on 1 <sup>st</sup> November.	<b>ACTION COMPLETE</b>

## MINUTES OF 13<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2016

253.	<b>MINUTES ACTION LOG UPDATE</b>  <b>Minute 247c) Floating Bus Stops –</b>	<b>Action Mike Davies</b>	<p>Members were sent the report on 5<sup>th</sup> September</p> <p>As a follow on action it was suggested that the report should be added to the public website and given publicity so that Members of the public could access it.</p>	<p>The review of floating bus stops has been published on the County Council's website and can be accessed at this address:</p> <p><a href="https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/huntingdon-road">https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/huntingdon-road</a></p>	<b>ACTION COMPLETE</b>
	<b>Minute 251b) Garden Villages – Action</b>	<b>G Hughes</b>	<p>Councillor McGuire asked if a submission had been received from Huntingdonshire District Council and the developer regarding a proposal for a garden village and whether any action had been taken to counter the false impression being created that the County Council supported the proposal. <b>The Executive Director undertook to write to Huntingdonshire District Council as the planning authority to highlight the issues that required clarification.</b></p>	<p>A letter was sent out from the Executive Director on 28th October to Nigel McCurdy, Corporate Director, Huntingdonshire District Council emphasising that in respect of the Sibson Garden Town proposal, the County Council has not been engaged in any detailed discussions on the proposals and at this stage does not support them, as the Council has not undertaken any assessment.</p>	<b>ACTION COMPLETE</b>

254.	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION - WENDY BLYTHE, CHAIR OF THE FEDERATION OF CAMBRIDGE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS – CYCLING SCHEMES REVIEW</b>	<b>M Davies</b>	<p>Asking why a review had not yet been undertaken. She highlighted that residents were well-informed about the issues and were keen to help support the process in a constructive way through participation in a working party.</p> <p>In response it was highlighted that the membership of the Member-Led Review had been discussed at the Committee's Spokes meeting and that nominations were currently still being sought from Councillors. <b>A written response to the issues she had raised would be sent no later than 10 working days after the meeting.</b></p>	<p>A response was sent on 25<sup>th</sup> October with members forwarded the response on 27<sup>th</sup> October. The response is included at Appendix A.</p>	<b>ACTION COMPLETE</b>
256.	<b>FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - AUGUST 2016</b> <p><b>a) Guided Busway Response to Councillor Mason</b></p>	<b>Graham Hughes / Bob Menzies</b>	<p>Councillor Mason made reference to an e-mail he had sent to the Chairman for which he was still awaiting a response regarding whether the Revenue Budget included provision for the repair of the Guided Busway.</p>	<p>Post meeting note: The reply on behalf of the Chairman had in fact been sent to Councillor Mason the day before the Committee meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> October. It was re-sent to Cllr Mason on 18<sup>th</sup> October with confirmation requested that he had received them, which was confirmed. The Committee was also sent the responses in an e-mail on 27<sup>th</sup> October to be able to see the detail of the response that has been provided. Unless there is a different issue this is seen as a definitive response.</p>	<b>ACTION COMPLETE</b>

	<b>b) Guided Busway Performance Indicator</b>	<b>G Hughes</b>	Councillor Mason queried whether the Guided Busway Performance Indicator statistics were valid and whether they represented travel along the whole of the Guideway, or included those passengers who hopped on and off for local journeys around Huntingdon.	An e-mail response was sent to the Committee on 21 <sup>st</sup> October indicating that Graham Amis the lead officer has confirmed that the figures for Busway passenger journeys are for journeys on any part of the Busway route - not just the guided section. All journeys are counted, regardless of the length of journey.	<b>ACTION COMPLETED.</b>
	<b>C) Review of 'Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area'. Action</b>	<b>Graham Amis to feed into SMT Review.</b>	It was suggested that other performance indicators should also be reviewed for relevance including 'Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area'. This was noted and would be actioned at the time of the next SMT Review.	Graham Amis has been contacted and asked to progress the action.	<b>ACTION ONGOING.</b>

**Appendix A**

**WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE PETITION SUBMITTED TO THE OCTOBER ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Extract from the draft minutes of the Economy and Environment Committee meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> October 2016 (shown in Italics):

#### **254. PETITIONS / PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

*One Member of the public Wendy Blythe, Chair of the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations was invited to speak having registered a request in advance under the Council Constitution public speaking rights arrangements.*

*It was stated that the Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations (FeCRA) welcomed the action point logged in the last minutes of the Economy & Environment Committee 1<sup>st</sup> September Committee meeting namely c) reading “To agree to spokes discussing setting up a Member Led Review to assess the success of recent cycleway schemes / floating bus stops and crossings”.*

*As part of her presentation the FeCRA Chair highlighted that the budgets for the Hills Road and Huntingdon Road Cycleway Schemes together had been £1.8m and, to date, had overspent by £1.4m. Phase 1 of Hills Road cycleway which had begun on 5th January 2015 had been scheduled to end 'by end of summer 2015 was still not complete, and as a result, was causing major disruption for residents and road users. She highlighted local concerns about safety, consultation and the quality of the work undertaken, as well as environmental concerns.*

**Officer Response:** Appendix 1 gives more information about costs and programme associated with these projects.

*As further cycle schemes were being planned under the City Deal and Cycling Cities initiatives, she highlighted that residents across Cambridge were becoming alarmed about the impact on their own areas, and questioned whether they represented value for money. To help inform future schemes she suggested that the Committee should, without delay, undertake a review of recent cycleway schemes, including the first phase of the Hills Road Scheme. She suggested that the review would not be a glossy document but should aim to cover budget, timetable, consultation, safety, design and environmental and maintenance issues. The document should undertake a straightforward assessment and offered to provide a template form which her organisation had prepared.*

*She highlighted that at the 27th May 2014 Economy and Environment Committee Meeting which approved cycleway schemes for Hills and Huntingdon Roads, Mark Lloyd, the former Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire County Council had recommended a review of the schemes which had been filmed and her question was why had this not been done? She highlighted that residents were well-informed about the issues and were keen to help support the process in a constructive way through participation in a working party.*

**OFFICER RESPONSE:** The minutes of the meeting of May 2014 stated that a review would be undertaken within a year of completion of the projects. Some work is still ongoing in Hills Road, so a review will be undertaken some time before November 2017 in accordance with the minutes.

**A review of floating bus stops has already been published on the County Council’s website at this address:**



<https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/huntingdon-road>

*The Chairman invited the Committee Members to ask any questions of clarification. In response a question was raised on whether the review she was envisaging was to be greater than Cambridge City, making the point and in referring back to a comment that the Chairman had made earlier in the meeting, that not all cycle schemes were undertaken by the County Council Cycling Projects Team with projects outside of the City being delivered by local cycle teams. Another question was whether any suggestions were being made in relation to other proposed cycle way schemes. Wendy Blythe responded that they were suggesting reviewing the Hills Road scheme to learn lessons from, as it was a major route into Cambridge. She made further reference to the template which they had produced which had been passed to the Committee's Chairman and the Vice Chairman and the Leader of Cambridge City Council. She hoped to ensure the highlighted issues would be sufficiently covered in future projects and to this end resident representatives hoped to engage in a constructive way with the County Council on the working group.*

*The Chairman thanked Wendy Blythe for her questions, highlighting that the membership had been discussed at the Committee's Spokes meeting and that nominations were currently still being sought from Councillors. **A written response to the issues she had raised would be sent no later than 10 working days after the meeting. Action: M Davies***

#### **Officer Response Member led review**

**Councillors have been asked to volunteer to take part in this cross party, member led review. An initial meeting of interested members will take place at which the Terms of Reference will be discussed and agreed, as well as appointing a Chair.**

**The review will be countywide, potentially to include any cycling projects, and as such membership of the review could include District Councillors, possibly one from each District. The review group will decide whether it is appropriate to invite interest groups to present information and views as part of the review. The group will also need to consider how it will gather and record information, including the consideration of the form provided by Wendy Blythe.**

**The first step will be to confirm which members have volunteered to take part in the review.**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **HUNTINGDON ROAD AND HILLS ROAD**

#### **1. COSTS**

- 1.1 The current cost for Huntingdon Road is £1.528m, the original estimate was £625,000. The current cost for Hills Road is £1.732m, the original estimate was £1.2m.
- 1.2 The original application for Cycle City Ambition funds from the Department for Transport had to be made in a very tight timescale, in July 2013. Costs were estimated for the seven schemes in the programme with no ground investigation work undertaken, no information on statutory undertakers plant, no consultation or preliminary design work. Segregated cycleways had not previously been delivered in Cambridgeshire (and indeed in few places in the UK at that time), and other features such as the 'Cambridge' kerb, sedum and floating bus stops had never been used in schemes.
- 1.3 At the time of the application very early concepts for segregated cycleways were being developed by the County Council with ideas developing.
- 1.4 The overall successful programme bid was for £4.075m from the Department for Transport. Additional S106 developer funding and residual capital funding have increased the specific budgets for Hills Road and Huntingdon Road, and for the Cycle City Ambition programme generally.
- 1.5 The schemes were discussed by the Economy and Environment Committee in May 2014 and July 2014, and in the report it referred to the fact that there was flexibility within the programme around funding between individual schemes.
- 1.6 Work commenced on the schemes in the programme in 2014, and the first four schemes (A1307, A505, Swavesey and Foxton) were completed below their original estimates.
- 1.7 Due to the following factors, Hills Road and Huntingdon Road have exceeded the original estimates:
  - The need to undertake carriageway repairs.
  - Additional traffic surveys and monitoring.
  - Additional consultation.
  - Decision to undertake footway resurfacing as part of the schemes.

- Increased staff and consultant time due to resolving extensive localised issues including attending meetings, report writing, formal complaints and FOIs.
- Design and consultation work undertaken for Phase 2 of each of the schemes.
- Delays to the programme as set out in 2.2 and 2.5 below.
- Issues associated with bus shelters and real time information displays.
- Use of a non standard 'Cambridge kerb' for which moulds had to be created.

## **2. PROGRAMME**

- 2.1 Works on Huntingdon Road commenced on site on 5 January 2015. The contractor's programme showed completion by the end of Summer 2015.
- 2.2 Additional works were instructed in the section between Storeys Way and Oxford Road, as well as extensive footway resurfacing. Delays to the programme were also caused by clash of working space with Cambridge North West junction works, the need for co ordination with statutory undertakers diversions, and street lighting, as well as issues with bus shelters and real time information equipment.
- 2.3 Due to the 'Christmas Embargo' no works were undertaken in December 2015 and early January 2016. Works were substantially complete by April 2016.
- 2.4 Works on Hills Road commenced on site on 26 January 2015. The contractor's programme showed completion by Summer 2015, though additional works were instructed to repair failed sections of carriageway.
- 2.5 Delays to the programme were also caused by accommodating the laying of new broadband cables, co ordination with street lighting works carried out at the same time, issues with bus shelters and real time information equipment, weekend events that restricted when surfacing works could be programmed in, and works by utility companies.
- 2.6 Due to the 'Christmas Embargo' and concerns about traffic delays and impacts on bus journey times, no works were undertaken from late October 2015 until mid January 2016. Works were substantially complete by September 2016.
- 2.7 In both cases the mobilisation period to commence works was relatively short and this meant sub contractors were appointed late and did not input into the programming. Given the lack of sub contractor input, and the fact that this was the first time that this design of cycleway had been built in Cambridgeshire, it was quickly apparent that a very unrealistic programme had been put together by the main contractor.

- 2.8 Although it was always the case that working time would be restricted to 9.30 to 15.30 hours, it was somewhat underestimated how inefficient such a working window is as often it proves impractical to commence certain activities near the end of the daily construction window.

### **3. CONCLUSION AND REFLECTIONS**

- 3.1 A very tight window to apply for funding, with schemes barely at concept stage, made it difficult to give an accurate estimate of costs for each scheme. Estimates for the rural schemes were more accurate as these types of schemes had been delivered previously.
- 3.2 In terms of programme, the schemes were not delivered in timely fashion, but with a longer lead in time and more involvement from sub contractors, statutory undertakers and others working in the area (street lighting contractors and broadband installers) a more efficient and realistic programme could have been developed.
- 3.3 Lessons learnt will be taken forward to future projects, and shared with other local authorities. The County Council works closely with other Cycle City Ambition cities as well as Transport for London, as part of a professional network.
- 3.4 Further Cycle City Ambition funding was provided in early 2015 and the programme was expanded. Works are on track to substantially complete all of the schemes in the programme by April 2018, and to spend all of the funding allocated, thus in programme-wide terms the overall programme is on track to be delivered on time and to budget, in common with the majority of other cycling infrastructure schemes delivered by the County Council in recent years.