

HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 21st January 2020

Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.

Present: Councillors: I Gardener, M Goldsack, L Harford, B Hunt (Vice-Chairman), S King, I Manning, J Scutt and M Shuter (Chairman).

Apologies: Councillors T Sanderson and G Wilson

150. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were noted as recorded above.

Councillor Ian Manning declared a non-pecuniary disclosable interest as he was employed by Cambridge Assessment, whose office was located on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, in relation to agenda item 3 - Petitions and Public Questions.

Councillor Matthew Shuter (Chairman) declared a non-pecuniary disclosable interest as he was a Director at Visit Cambridge and Beyond Ltd, in relation to agenda item 3 – Petitions and Public Questions.

Councillor Mark Goldsack declared a non-pecuniary disclosable interest as he had an interest in a property repair company which dealt with insurance companies, in relation to agenda item 6 – Resident's Parking Permit Charge Review.

151. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on the 4th December 2019 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

In noting the action log some Members highlighted concerns raised by their constituents regarding the quality of work undertaken by the Council's Highways Contactor. After a detailed discussion on the performance of the Highways Contractor and the way the contract was managed, Members highlighted the need to review the measures in place to monitor the performance of the contract. It was agreed that the Committee should receive a quarterly report on the Highways Contract. The Assistant Director, Highways also offered to meet with Members to explain how the performance of the Highways Contract was managed. **(Actions Required)**

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the action log:

- Minute 144 a. – Asked at which meeting on the 17th December 2019 was a review of the current set of Performance Indicators (PIs) discussed, as there had not been a Highways and Infrastructure (H&I) Committee meeting on that date. The Service Director, Highways and Transport clarified that this discussion had taken place at the H&I Chairs and Vice Chairs meeting. At this meeting, Officers had a conversation with Members and agreed that the current set of PIs would remain the same at this point in time, but would be reviewed periodically.
- requested a report be presented to the Committee providing a review of the current set of PIs before the start of the next financial year. The Service Director, Highways and Transport confirmed that the regular Performance Report was scheduled to be presented to the Committee at a future meeting.
- Minute 146 b. –Requested clarity regarding whether bulk ordering had taken place. The Chairman stated that this would be discussed further at a future H&I Chairs and Vice-Chairs meeting.
- Minute 146 h. – Requested an update on the proposal to add information into the Finance Monitoring Report outlining the change in the number of true vacancies in Place and Economy each month starting at the beginning of the 2019/20 Council year. The Service Director, Highways and Transport confirmed that this information would be included in the next report presented to the Committee.
- Minute 146 i. – Requested an update on the review of Business Support vacancy data found in the Finance Monitoring Report. The Service Director, Highways and Transport confirmed that Personal Assistants (PAs) and Business Support Assistants posts had been removed during a restructure. He commented that the action should have been marked as complete.

152. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A petition was received with over 50 signatures organised by Julia Sang. The Petition asked that the Council consider changing their temporary street closures application form to encourage local residents to apply. Members of the Committee expressed their support for the petition.

Individuals Members raised the follow points in relation to the Petition:

- queried the benefits of allowing communities to ‘Play Out’. Julia Sang suggested that Playing Out events mitigated the feeling of isolation as they promoted a sense of solidarity amongst communities.

- queried whether the petition would promote a greater sense of community resilience. Julia Sang advised that the events would enable communities to take responsibility for and address issues found in their local area, which were not being addressed by the Council.
- sought more information regarding whether there were any formal groups or organisations within Cambridgeshire or nationally who were already organising Playing Out events. She suggested that it would be beneficial if the Council could learn from other Councils or communities as to the best way to manage Playing Out Events. Julia Sang explained that Playing Out was a national organisation based in Bristol, who supported communities and Councils with organising Playing Out events. She stated that the organisation had a website which could be used as a resource to learn more about how to organise and manage Playing Out events. The Member suggested that it would be useful to liaise with Playing Out.
- suggested that the contents of the petition could link with the Council's Innovate and Cultivate Fund.
- requested more information regarding the change in the number of street parties organised in England. Julia Sang informed Members that there were over 1000 play streets in England but none of them were located in Cambridgeshire. She had spoken to residents who wished to apply for a street closure and they explained that they had been deterred by the application form due to its length and complexity.
- commented that Street Events could also take place in towns and villages and not just in Cities. He suggested that the petition linked to Think Communities which was being looked at by the Communities and Partnership Committee. He stated that this could be taken away and reviewed.

The Chairman thanked Julia Sang for presenting the petition and stated that Officers would provide her with a written response to her petition within ten working days. **(Action Required)**

A public question was presented by Alexander Nix. The question asked the Committee to consider adopting policy to allow motorcycles and powered two wheeler access to bus lanes in Cambridgeshire.

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

- requested clarity regarding whether restrictions would be put in place on motorcycles using the bus lanes depending on the size of their engines. Alexander Nix suggested that he did not believe any form of restriction should be put in place as all motorcycle users should be abiding by the speed limit of the roads.
- queried whether motorcycles had caused delays to buses in areas where the Local Authority (LA) had approved this policy. Alexander Nix stated that he was not aware this issue. He commented that the Motorcycle Action Group may be able to provide more information on this.
- asked whether there had been time restrictions implemented for motorcycles to use bus lanes in areas where this policy had been approved. Alexander Nix suggested that other LAs had imposed time restrictions.
- requested more information regarding the concerns raised that motorcycles increased the risk posed to cyclists. Alexander Nix explained that if motorcycle road accident statistics were analysed, urban areas had lower number of serious collisions compared to more rural areas. He acknowledged the vulnerability of cyclists on highways but did not think motorcycles would pose a safety concern to them.
- suggested that he could see the benefits this policy would have on reducing congestion, but only if road users transitioned from using a car to a motorcycle as their primary mode of transport. He commented that he would like to approach the other LAs who had adopted this policy to see if this transition occurred. Alexander Nix stated that there was evidence that suggested when 10% of road users swapped from using a car to a motorcycle, there had been a 40% reduction in congestion.
- raised concerns at the fact that buses, taxis and cyclists already used the bus lanes and queried the effects motorcycles would have on congestion in bus lanes if the LA did adopt this policy.
- suggested that he was sceptical regarding whether motorcycles produced less emissions than cars per mile. Alexander Nix suggested that there was not a substantial difference in the amount of emissions produced by a car and motorcycle whilst driving at 60mph. However, in urban areas with lots of traffic, motorcycles were not idling for as long as cars and therefore he suggested that they were more environmentally friendly.

- queried whether a motorcycle user planning on travelling into Cambridge would consider using the Cambridge Park and Ride (P&R) instead. Alexander Nix stated that he would not feel the need as there was free parking in Cambridge city centre for motorcycles.

The Chairman stated that he was interested in finding out more information regarding the proposed differences in the amount of emissions produced by a motorcycle compared to a car.

The Chairman thanked Alexander Nix for asking his question and stated that Officers would provide him with a written response to his question within ten working days. **(Action Required)**

A public question was presented by Matthew Danish. The question was in relation to the recently installed barriers on the Guided Busway pathway near Addenbrooke's Hospital.

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

- asked whether more safety measures needed to be installed at the site and queried whether this could be achieved by installing bollards rather than barriers. Matthew Danish stated that previously there had been bollards installed at the site to stop cars driving onto the cycle way. He welcomed the idea of this bollard being reinstalled.
- asked Matthew whether he thought there needed to be a wider safety review of the junction. Matthew Danish confirmed that there should be and stated that the path and junction were now used much more as the infrastructure around that area had developed significantly.
- asked whether there was an organisation who had been campaigning for the barriers to be removed. Matthew Danish informed the Committee that Cam Cycle had raised concerns over the installation of the barriers. A petition had also been created by a local Councillor which was estimated to have around 1,500 signatures.
- queried whether a consultation process had taken place before the barriers were installed. Matthew Danish explained that he had been informed through private emails that a consultation had taken place between the Biomedical Campus, Countryside Property and possibly the Busway Team. The Member commented that it would be beneficial if the Council reviewed their consultation requirements.
- stated that Officers needed to establish whether the barriers were an issue for both individuals who walked and cycled along the busway.
- stated that a review needed to take place to establish how and why the barriers had been installed.

- asked whether the barriers had been installed in that location to try and reduce the speed of cyclists approaching the junction. Matthew Danish suggested that this seemed to be the intent, but they had not solved the overarching issue which was the safety of the junction design.

The Chairman thanked Matthew Danish for asking his question and stated that Officers would provide him with a written response to his question within ten working days. **(Action Required)**

A public question was presented by Councillor Katie Thornburrow regarding the same issue discussed by Matthew Danish previously.

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

- sought more information regarding the junction both Councillor Thornburrow and Matthew Danish mentioned previously. Councillor Thornburrow stated that the junction prioritised cars and buses and not pedestrians. She also suggested that the junction needed to be reviewed.
- queried why Councillor Thornburrow wanted the barriers removed. Councillor Thornburrow believed that the relevant safety checks had not been carried out and therefore the barriers should be removed until the correct procedure had been completed. She commented that the barriers caused significant issues for cargo bikes and disabled bike users.
- commented that the barriers could not be seen at night as they were not well lit.
- stated that this area had seen significant development which had led to greater usage of the highways and cycleways.
- the Chairman queried who owned the land where the barriers had been installed. Councillor Thornburrow believed that Liberty Property Developments Ltd had installed the barriers on their own land. The Chairman suggested this had considerable relevance.
- stated if the Council did own the land, then Officers should request that the barriers be removed.
- believed that there were plans to remove the barriers.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Thornburrow for asking her question and stated that Officers would provide her with a written response to her question within ten working days. **(Action Required)**

A public question was presented by Penny Heath. The question was in relation to the progress that had been made between Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council in introducing a coach parking permit scheme in Cambridge.

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

- suggested that this was a significant issue as buses had been parking in a number of locations in Cambridge. She supported the proposition of making Park and Ride sites more attractive for coach tours and suggested that Penny also raise this at her meeting with Councillor Lewis Herbert and Councillor Ian Bates.
- queried whether the coach companies operating in Cambridge had been consulted. Penny Heath stated that she had not directly but understood that there was a working group consisting of City and County Council Officers who had been consulting with Coach Companies. She suggested it was important to consult with coach companies in order to find a practical solution to this issue.
- stated that the tourists brought into Cambridge by the coach companies provided a substantial contribution to the Cambridge economy. Penny Heath acknowledged that tourism did have benefits, but also had drawbacks. She suggested that the financial benefits to the City Council were limited and reiterated that this issue needed addressing.
- the Chairman advised that it could be beneficial for Penny to consult with Visit Cambridge and Beyond Ltd. Penny Heath believed that they were part of the working group and would support the introduction of coach parking permits. The Chairman suggested that coaches in Cambridge was an historic issue.

The Chairman thanked Penny Heath for asking her question and stated that Officers would provide her with a written response to her question within ten working days. **(Action Required)**

153. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – NOVEMBER 2019

The Committee considered a report presenting the November 2019 Finance Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place and Economy (P&E) Services. The Strategic Finance Manager stated that Place and Economy services were forecasting a bottom line underspend of £2.7m. There had been a few changes since the last report relating to Bus Lane Enforcement and Parking Enforcement, Community Transport & Concessionary Fares and Waste Management, but nothing material. On the Capital side, there had been a £500k slippage on the delivery of Transport Strategy Aims – Cycling Schemes. She commented that as the report had been generated before December's Committee meeting, the direction of travel for vacancy data was

not included, but confirmed that it would be in next month's report.

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

- highlighted the £368k underspend on Highways and queried why he had been told by Officers that there was not sufficient resources to repair a certain highway in his division. The Assistant Director, Highways confirmed that there was an underspend on Highways, and he agreed to take this away and talk to the relevant team to find out more information. He commented that if the Council were able to perform the repair this financial year then Officers would programme it in. The Strategic Finance Manager noted that the reason for the apparent underspend was that income from certain activities had exceeded budget, and not that the main highways activities were underspending. (**Action Required**).
- requested an update on the status of the Waste Management Contract. The Service Director, Highways and Transport explained that contract negotiations with AMEY had taken more time than expected, but a conclusion had been reached. The Deed of Variation for the contract was now being prepared and would be sent to the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the funders at AMEY. The current contract meant that the Council was paying a varying amount of money depending on the performance of the Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plant and the In-Vessel Composter (IVC). A key element of the new proposed contract was that the MBT plant and the IVC would have a fixed level of performance, irrespective of how the plants operated. This would cap expenditure and provide the Council with greater financial certainty.
- believed that concerns had been raised previously regarding recycled waste being put into landfill and asked whether this was still happening. The Service Director, Highways and Transport suggested that there had been an issue in relation to the District Council's recycling bins. However, this was a separate contract which was managed by District Councils and processed by AMEY. He believed that this issue was no longer occurring as a solution had been agreed by District Councils and AMEY.
- sought more information regarding the costs incurred by the Council for District Councils putting recycled waste into landfill. The Service Director, Highways and Transport suggested that this was a complex process and explained that the County Council had secured a rebate, as the waste collected by District Councils was put into landfill rather than recycled. The Council were currently in the process of recovering this money and confirmed that this issue had not penalised the Council financially.
- queried whether Officers had investigated the financial impact to the Council if changes were made to the Concessionary Fares to extend its

use to before 9:30am for individuals with disabilities in addition to sight disabilities and who were in paid employment. The Service Director, Highways and Transport explained that the national concessionary fares scheme did not provide provision for any of these changes. When the County Council took over responsibility, it was agreed that certain additions to the concessions would be granted. He stated that the budget for Passenger Transport was volatile and that there was a requirement for the Council to balance this budget. He suggested that there were no plans to increase the amount of money allocated to Passenger Transport as this service was a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) function which was levied back onto the County Council. It was suggested that the Chairman and Councillor Bates (Member of the CA Transport and Infrastructure Committee) could write to the Mayor regarding this proposal. The Service Director, reiterated that this was a CPCA function delegated back to the County Council and therefore this proposal could be implemented through this Committee and General Purposes Committee (GPC). A Member highlighted the fact that she was the Chair of the CA Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committee and another Member sat on the O&S Committee.

- asked whether it would be beneficial for Officers to consider contracting local suppliers to deliver certain Local Highways Improvement (LHI) schemes. This would mean that they could avoid going through Skanska's processes in order to deliver the LHI schemes more effectively. He also suggested that local suppliers could offer a much more competitive price to complete the work. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that Skanska's supply chain consisted of local businesses, but if other local businesses were keen to deliver LHI schemes then Officers could look at adding them to the supply chain. He commented that that this was difficult situation as the Council had a Highway Contract that was procured on the basis that a certain proportion of work would go through it. He agreed that the Council should be focused on getting the best value for money. The Service Director, Highways and Transport reminded the Committee that most Councils had a service contract as they did not have the resources to manage multiple procurements/contracts and that if there were a large number of individual suppliers, the Council would need more internal resource to manage this. There was also an issue of ensuring quality and adherence to standards and safety regimes.
- suggested that they should be making their constituents feel confident that their LHI bids would be delivered. The Chairman confirmed that Members would look closely at their LHI delivery performance during the process of reviewing the LHI process. The Service Director, Highways and Transport acknowledged the concerns raised and commented that the delivery of LHI schemes must be spread over the financial year as the Council and the supply chain only had a certain resource capacity. He commented that it was inevitable that some LHI schemes approved at the start of the year would be delivered nearer

the end of the financial year. He acknowledged that Parish Council's would be frustrated if an LHI scheme was approved with no indication of a completion date. Going forward, he believed that Parish Councils should be provided with an estimated completion date and stated that the aim is to get all schemes delivered within the year for which they were approved.

- suggested it would be beneficial if Local Members could communicate with Officers to ensure that effective Local Contractors in their constituencies were considered to be added to Skanska's supply chain. The Chairman and the Service Director, Highways and Transport agreed that this was a good idea.
- requested more information regarding the cost of the winter gritting service. The Assistant Director, Highways explained that currently an audit on the Highways Contract was being carried out by LGSS. The Audit Team were looking at the first two years of the contract to scrutinise Skanska's accounts for every aspect of the highways service. This work had taken longer than expected but would hopefully be completed by the end of this financial year. He suggested that they were expecting a report to come from this audit that would be presented the Highways Board which would identify a number of issues and recommendations to resolve them.
- informed the Committee that she had received concerns from one of her Parish Councils regarding whether the implementation of the van and trailer e-permit schemes had increased the amount of fly tipping. She queried whether there had been any communication between the County Council and the District Councils to establish whether there had been an increase in fly tipping and if so how was it being addressed. The Chairman informed the Member that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) currently had an anti-fly tipping campaign running. He commented that County Officers was regularly in touch with RECAP to identify whether fly tipping rates had increased. If there was evidence of an increase there would need to be discussion to decide whether the e-permit policy needed reviewing.
- informed the Committee that on the East Work Programme list, the Witchford, Main Street work could now be marked as completed.
- raised concerns regarding the fact that only 159 trees had been planted since January 2017. The Chairman suggested that these were the trees planted on the Highways estate and not the total number planted in Cambridgeshire. The Member followed on from this by asking whether there was any data highlighting the total number of trees planted in Cambridgeshire. The Chairman stated that this data would be interesting and asked Officers whether they could collate this information. The Assistant Director Highways stated that he would take this away. **(Action Required)**

- informed the Committee that in Wisbech they had recently planted 20 trees with the permission of the County Council, but stated these trees had not been captured within the report. The Assistant Director, Highways confirmed that if this went through the Local Highways Officer (LHO) then Officers should be able to pick this up.
- the Vice-Chairman noted that in one division in Cambridgeshire, 96 additional trees had been agreed to be planted.
- informed the Committee that further remedial work had to be undertaken at Bellamy's Bridge in Wisbech St Mary as the original work had not been completed to a satisfactory standard.
- requested more information regarding an LHI scheme in St Neots that was proposed to be removed and queried whether a new scheme could take its place. The Assistant Director, Highways suggested that he didn't think that this would be the case. He commented that this was a valid point and highlighted the fact that if a scheme was removed at an early stage in the financial year then another one could be approved and take its place. The Member stated that this could not happen again as LHI schemes should be identified as not achievable at an earlier stage in the process. The Chairman stated that as they were nearing the end of the financial year, another scheme could not take its place. The Assistant Director, Highways commented that they carried forward a budget to complete schemes that were already ongoing, but could not do this for brand new scheme. He noted that the feasibility stage of the LHI process should identify whether schemes were achievable or not.
- informed the Committee that a Parish Council in his constituency had put an unsuccessful bid in for an LHI scheme. The Parish Council had informed him that they had not been successful, but the Member had not received any information from the LHO as to why the scheme was not successful. He requested whether in future the LHO could inform the County Councillor if a scheme was unsuccessful. The Chairman agreed and stated it was important to keep Local Members informed.
- sought more information regarding the number of vacancies found in the Highways Projects and Road Safety and Highways Maintenance Teams. The Assistant Director, Highways clarified that there was now only 1 vacancy in the Highways Maintenance Team, this information was not reflected within the report as the individuals had not started yet. In terms of Highways Projects and Road Safety, three out of the six vacant posts had been filled.
- requested clarity regarding the vacancies found within the Historic Environment team. The Interim Assistant Director, Environmental & Commercial Services explained that the two vacant posts that were focused on income generation in the team had now been filled.

However, due to this this gap in income generation, an income shortfall had occurred.

It was resolved unanimously to:

review, note and comment upon the report

154. REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER FOR PLACE AND ECONOMY

The Committee considered a report presenting the Risk Register for Place and Economy. The Service Director, Highways and Transport drew the Committee's attention to the contents of the report and highlighted that Officers were currently undertaking a fundamental review of the Risk Register as there had been a number of concerns raised over its effectiveness. He commented that the next time this report was brought to Committee it would change significantly.

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

- hoped that the new version of this report would provide more useful information to Members.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note and Comment on the Risk Register

155. RESIDENT'S PARKING PERMIT CHARGE REVIEW

The Committee considered a report seeking approval for the proposed Resident's Parking Permit changes. The Traffic Manager drew the Committee's attention to the contents and recommendation of the report.

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

- queried whether a £5k budget for the on-going maintenance of signs/lines across all schemes was sufficient. The Traffic Manager explained that there was flexibility in the budget, this figure was kept under review so it could be adjusted if necessary. The Parking Policy Manager suggested that the budget needed to be monitored further in order to ensure that essential maintenance work could be carried out if necessary.
- raised concerns that this £5k budget would not sufficiently cover the whole of Cambridgeshire. The Chairman confirmed that this budget was just for Cambridge City. The Member raised further concerns and suggested that not enough funding had been allocated to this. The Parking Policy Manager agreed that this would have to be reviewed moving forward. The Chairman suggested it would be beneficial if

Officers recorded the money spent so they could amend the budget accordingly.

- requested more information on the Tradespersons Permit and suggested that it was a common occurrence for multiple contractors to bring more than one vehicle into a zone. The Traffic Manager explained that one contractor can have two permits at a time, but could also use visitor permits and pay and display parking. If there were multiple contractors working on one site then they would all need to apply for tradesperson permits.
- explained that during a project, the Contractor may send multiple sub-contractors who could all apply for two tradespersons permits, this would lead to whole streets in Cambridge being blocked. He asked whether it would be more effective to charge contractors for vehicle access into Cambridge rather than reducing the number of permit they could purchase.
- queried whether residents parking only occurred in Cambridge City. The Parking Policy Manager stated that there was also resident parking in St Neots and Huntingdon, but the report only covered Cambridge City.
- suggested Contractors do not apply for a resident parking permit as the process was too time consuming, they would rather just try and park for free.
- expressed concerns regarding the fact that previously the Council had allowed a certain level of flexibility as the 'loophole' allowed two vehicle registration numbers (VRNs) to appear on one virtual permit. He suggested that the proposal presented in the report would penalise everyone who was applying for a Tradesperson Permit. He therefore proposed that the Committee did not make any changes to the current system, but when individuals try to apply for two VRNs on one permit, they would be charged for both applications. This would mean that the individuals exploiting the loophole would be penalised. The Traffic Manager confirmed that this would be difficult to implement as Officers did not have the information to identify who had been abusing the loophole.
- suggested that the consideration of the introduction of one VRN per Tradesperson Permit needed be brought back to a future Committee meeting so Officers could take the report away, review it and formulate alternative possibilities of resolving this issue. The Chairman, with the agreement of the Committee stated that there was a lack of clarity surrounding this proposal.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve leaving Residents' and Visitors' Permits fees unchanged
- b) Defer the consideration of the introduction of one vehicle registration number per Tradesperson Permit until a future Committee meeting.

156. PARKING CHARGES

The Committee considered a report proposing new on-street parking charges in Cambridge City which formed part of the Council's 2020/21 Business Plan. The Traffic Manger drew the Committee's attention to the information found within the report.

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

- the Chairman reminded the Committee that they had asked for this review to be brought to Committee regularly as the last time the parking charges were changed it had caused significant controversy.
- stated that he used the parking app Ringo when parking in Cambridge, he suggested this was a very simple system that created less of a burden on the Council as they did not need to handle physical money. He commented that the Council should be encouraging individuals to use this system.
- queried the difference in parking costs for certain streets in Cambridge. The Traffic Manager was unclear as to why this was and expected that it was based on the facilities that were in the locality of the street. She stated that work had been undertaken to analyse the usage of various parking machines, she suspected this had also influenced the proposed tariff changes.
- supported the proposed tariff changes and suggested that it could lead to less pollution and congestion in Cambridge as more people could decide to use the Cambridge P&R.
- asked Officers whether they were going to analyse the usage of parking machines in Cambridge if the new tariff proposals were implemented. The Chairman and Officers stated that this work was ongoing.

It was unanimously resolved to:

Approve the new charges

157. HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE FORWARD AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES.

Individual Members raised the following points in relation to the Agenda Plan:

- queried whether it would be updated following the decision to defer the consideration of the introduction of one vehicle registration number per Tradesperson Permit. The Chairman confirmed that it would be presented at a future Committee meeting. **(Action Required)**
- queried whether a report providing a review of the LHI process would be presented to the Committee. The Chairman explained that this would be discussed at the Chair's and Vice-Chair's meeting initially. He confirmed that this report had not yet been timetabled.
- Councillor Scutt informed the Committee that concerns had been raised by her constituents regarding the time frame to renew visitor parking permits. The Chairman stated that a review of this was taking place.
- queried whether Officers could put a report on the agenda regarding the installation of the anti-terrorism barriers on Kings Parade. The Chairman confirmed that Cambridge City Council were responsible for these barriers.

It was agreed to cancel the provisional Highways and Infrastructure Committee meeting on the 18th February 2020.

It was unanimously resolved to:

Note the Committee Agenda Plan

Chairman