

## **ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 10.21 a.m.

**Present:** Councillors: D Ambrose Smith, D Connor, H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), R Fuller, L Jones, T Sanderson S Tierney, J Williams, and T Wotherspoon (Vice-Chairman)

**Apologies:** Councillors: N Kavanagh (Substituted by Councillor L Jones)

### **287. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **288. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

### **289. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

There was a request that with regard to Minute 279 - 'Alconbury Weald Ermine Street Little Stukeley Outline Planning Application Consultation Response, - the missing information in the log regarding the date when the response was sent should be chased up and details provided outside of the meeting. **Action: Andy Preston / Rob Sanderson**

### **290. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions or petitions were received by the deadline.

### **291. PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 2**

This performance report covering the period up to the end of September 2019 provided information on the status of performance indicators the Committee had selected to monitor. The appendix to the report contained information on:

- Current and previous performance and projected linear trend
- Current and previous targets
- (Red / Amber / Green / Blue (RAG) status
- Direction for improvement
- Change in performance
- Statistical neighbour performance
- Indicator description
- Commentary on the indicator.

The following RAG statuses were used with the Red and Blue indicators to be reported to General Purposes Committee in a summary report:

- Red – current performance is 10% or more from target
- Amber – current performance is off target by less than 10%
- Green – current performance is on target or better by up to 4%
- Blue – current performance is better than target by 5% or more

Attention was drawn to the following changes to indicator 24: Percentage of premises in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough with access to at least superfast broadband.

- The targets and quarterly figures were now for both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- Quarterly targets had been calculated based on the interim target for end of 2019 and going forward would be based on the overall target to reach over 99% coverage countywide by the end of 2020.

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

- The substitute Member who was also on Health Committee queried why the green indicator criteria for Economy and Environment Committee being on target or better had a text percentage “up to 4%” when for Health Committee the green indicator had a percentage figure “up to 5%”. In discussion it was considered inappropriate that service committees should have different percentage performance measures for the same RAG rating. The lead officer was asked to look into this with colleagues, with the Committee recommendation being that they should ensure that for the future, all service committees should have the same RAG status criteria. **Action: Senior Business Intelligence Analyst - Matthew Tullett**
- There was a query regarding the revised Indicator 24 ‘Percentage of premises in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with access to at least superfast broadband’ and whether it would be more appropriate for there to be a Cambridgeshire only measure, so that the progress in Cambridgeshire could be tracked separately. It was explained that the rollout of the local Broadband since the beginning had always been a joint exercise involving both authorities.
- Page 24 Indicator 31 – ‘The percentage of County Matter Planning applications determined within 13 weeks etc..’. The Member who was also the Chairman of Planning wished to place on record his congratulations to the Planning Team for their sterling work, as apart from one dip in performance as shown on the performance chart, they had consistently hit the 100% target.
- Page 25 Indicator 32 – ‘Growth in cycling from a 2004/5 average baseline’ Asking for an explanation of why after the Committee had requested in November 2018 that the information should be included as actual numbers, the information was still being shown as percentages on the graph. The Lead officer explained that as the target was a percentage this was reflected in the graph data further highlighting that the commentary text below the graph included the relevant figures. The Committee asked Officers to review whether the target should have been changed to the number of cycle journeys rather than as a percentage figure / th reason why it was

not changed. **Action: Matthew Tullett to review and discuss with the Vice Chairman.**

It was unanimously resolved to:

Note the Performance report.

## **292. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – OCTOBER 2019**

The Committee received a report outlining the Finance Monitoring Report (FMR) for Place & Economy Services as at the end of October 2019. The Strategic Finance Manager informed the Committee that a bottom line underspend of £2.9m was forecasted, £1m more since the last report. The main areas of overspend / underspend were:-

- Bus Lane Enforcement and Parking Enforcement: forecasting a £650K underspend
- Winter Maintenance: a projected overspend of £463K
- Community Transport & Concessionary Fares: An underspend of £313K is forecast for Community Transport
- Waste Management: The forecast underspend had increased from a £1.0m underspend to a £2.1m underspend for the reasons set out in the report.

The revised capital budget for 2019/20 reflected the carry-forwards of funding from 2018/19 and the agreed re-phasing of schemes. There had been no significant changes to any capital schemes since the previous report. The vacancy, tree and Local Highway Initiative (LHI) activity data was detailed in the appendix to the report.

In discussion issues raised included:

- page 41 paragraph 2.1 -regarding the underspend of £313K forecast for Community Transport which on was highlighted as being an 11% underspend against the budget querying why this was so high and asking whether it was as a result of less bus contracts being tendered out by the Combined Authority. In reply it was explained that although the Service is funded by the Combined Authority the Service is currently managed and provided by the County Council. In the re-tendering exercise some routes had come in lower than the value of the previous contract price with others higher. The Member who had raised the question indicated that he had not been able to deduce this from the summary text in paragraph 2.1.
- In a discussion on Concessionary Fares it was clarified that this Service was also being provided on behalf of the Combined Authority and had been initially forecasting an underspend due to the change in eligibility linked to the increased pensionable age and the reduction in the number of bus routes. However, over the previous two months there had been an increase in spend due to increased usage of the Busway and services from the Park & Ride sites, leading to an overspend against the budget. This, however was balanced against the reduction in spend on Community Transport.

- Further to the above discussion there was a request for a more detailed breakdown of the make-up of the Community Transport underspend of -313.k to be sent to the Committee outside of the meeting. **Action Sarah Heywood / Paul Nelson**

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the report.

### **293. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2020-21 TO 2024-25**

The Committee received a report providing an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for the Council as a whole, in response to the combination of cost increases and continuing resource pressures following a decade of sustained reductions in Government funding. To balance the Budget whilst still delivering for communities required the Council to find savings or identify additional income of £21.4m for 2020-21 and a total of £68.5m across the full five years of the Business Plan. Section five onwards starting on page 75 set out the specific to Place and Economy (P&E) budget proposals. It was noted that there were no business planning proposals coming forward within Committee's remit with the two going forward both being the responsibility of the Highways and Infrastructure Committee.

As the Liberal Democrat and Labour Groups would be presenting their own alternate budget proposals and as there were no questions on the contents,

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) note the overview and context provided for the 2020/21 to 2024/25 Business Plan revenue proposals for the Service, updated since the last report to the Committee in October.
- b) Note the draft budget and savings proposals that are within the remit of the Economy & Environment Committee for the 2020/21 to 2024/25, and endorse them to the General Purposes Committee as part of consideration for the Council's overall Business Plan.
- c) Note the changes to the capital programme that were within the remit of the Economy & Environment Committee and endorse them to the General Purposes Committee (GPC) as part of consideration for the Council's overall Business Plan.

### **294. AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

It was resolved unanimously to;

- a) Note the agenda plan with one change: namely that the ITB Funding Allocation report currently included for January was required to move to March.
- b) Note that under the delegated authority granted to agree urgent appointments between meetings, the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and

Vice Chairman had agreed that Councillor Wotherspoon would replace Councillor Topping on the North Uttlesford Garden Community Delivery Board.

**295. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING THURSDAY 16<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2020**

**Chairman:  
16<sup>th</sup> January 2020**