

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 14th September 2017

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 11.25 p.m.

Present: Councillors: D Adey, D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), R Fuller, N Kavanagh, L Harford (substitute for S Tierney), J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman).

Apologies: Councillors D Connor, D Giles and S Tierney.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Harford declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of the Planning and Joint Development Control Committees and left the room before the discussions on minutes 39 and 40 as these were issues that were likely to go forward to the aforementioned committees.

In advance of consideration of the report on the Trumpington Park and Ride Report Councillors Kavanagh and Williams highlighted for the record that they were on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Assembly with Councillor Bates and Wotherspoon stating that they were Members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board which was included on their declarations of interest forms.

35. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th July 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

36. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minute Action Log update was noted. Councillor Kavanagh highlighted the response to action 3 on the Bikeability Cycle Training Report identifying that seeking volunteers to undertake future cycle training would be more expensive than contributing to the current government scheme for the reasons highlighted.

37. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No petitions were received.

38. A10 ELY TO KING'S LYNN STUDY

The Committee received a report to consider the Technical Report on the A10 corridor between Ely and King's Lynn which followed on from the Motion agreed by Council on 10th May 2016 Instructing the Chief Executive to:

- Commission a further high level economic and route options study for the A10 north of Cambridge to complement the existing A10 study for use in future bidding exercises
- Work with Norfolk County Council to develop a case for whole route improvement from Cambridge to Kings Lynn
- Work with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships to develop funding bids for the development and delivery of a scheme of improvement on the A10 north of Cambridge
- Continue to lobby government for improvements to the whole of this vital route.

The Study was developed in four stages. Stages 1 and 2 forming the baseline study, analysing existing transport conditions, with Stage 3 analysing the impact that projected future housing and employment growth was likely to have on the network and Stage 4 to considering the economic case for investment.

The findings from Stages 1 and 2 were that:

- The A10 between the A134 roundabout north of Watlington and King's Lynn lying wholly within Norfolk was the worst performing section along the study corridor against the indicators assessed.
- The route as a whole was not nearing capacity, and could accommodate an increase in trips. However, if traffic flows continued to increase on the route, the Watlington to King's Lynn section might soon be at capacity.
- Localised queues and delays occurred at a number of junctions (e.g. the two A10 / A142 junctions at Ely, A1122 roundabout at Downham Market, and A134 roundabout as noted above).
- Travel demand and congestion levels were lower than in the Ely to Cambridge part of the A10(N) corridor.
- Accident risk analysis resulted in all the identified sections on the A10 being classified within the 'low' or 'low-medium' risk bands.

The findings from Stage 3 were that:

- Based on the projections, dualling of the whole route was unlikely to offer value for money as levels of congestion did not warrant it.
- that further work was undertaken focusing on improving link and junction capacity in Section 1 (Ely to Littleport) and Section 5 (around West Winch) of the A10.
- There might be benefit in considering localised junction capacity and safety improvements elsewhere on the corridor, together with the potential role of non-highway measures.
- Recommending that a programme of traffic surveys were carried out to complement and corroborate the results obtained to provide a robust basis for scheme and business case development.

While the analysis showed that the Ely-Kings Lynn route as a whole had accident ratings of 'low', the recommendations identified various safety improvements. As a result, the Stage 4 report recommended a series of interventions to form the basis of further detailed study work. These interventions were listed in paragraph 3.4 of the report. The report explained that a feasibility study had been commissioned to support emerging development in Ely, and design schemes which would mitigate the impact

such development would have on the local transport network, focussing on junction improvements to the A142/Lancaster Way, A142/A10 (Witchford Road) and A142/A10 (Angel Drove) roundabouts.

The report proposed:

- to extend the feasibility work to identify proposals over and above those needed to mitigate development impacts to deliver a more holistic solution for the short and medium term capacity issues. It was anticipated that longer term solutions on the A10 would be identified from the work being undertaken by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and also the Combined Authority.
- that all schemes which sit within the Cambridgeshire boundary should be considered for inclusion in the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire.

In reply to issues raised in advance of the meeting by local member for Ely South , it was confirmed that Recommendation D asking the Committee "to agree to expand the scope of the feasibility study at A10/A142 junctions to consider a wider range of solutions" was a reference to the Grovemere Lancaster Way study. Regarding her concerns of any additional delay in delivering the study, assurance had been given that subject to the Committee approval, officers would be working closely with Grovemere.

In discussion:

- One Member in highlighting both the amount of proposed new housing development around Littleport / Ely and local business expansion located near to the Ely roundabouts, sought assurance that their impact had been taken into account when assessing the improvement proposals for the A10. The Member also had concerns regarding the adequacy of the road into Littleport being able to deal with this future growth pressure. In addition as a separate point he highlighted the need to prioritise the provision of a cycleway between Littleport and Ely. This was supported by other Members of the Committee. **As an action it was agreed that a meeting should be arranged between officers and Councillor Ambrose-Smith (to include Mike Davies) on the issues he had raised above.**
- Related to the above point, the Council's Cycling Champion highlighted that feedback he had been receiving was for the need to be able to cycle safely alongside the A10 and for a cycleway to be completed to allow a direct route from Cambridge to Ely. He requested a joined up approach to the planning of future cycleways to help achieve these aims. In response it was explained that the Cambridge-Ely study was looking at all modes of travel with the Greater Cambridge Partnership making positive moves on funding but needed clarity on the Combined Authority's priorities.
- As an answer to a query regarding whether there would be co-ordination on major studies such as those Ely, Ely North, the A10 with the future work of the Combined Authority to ensure no false hopes were raised or wasted effort undertaken, assurance was provided that this would be the case and would include funding issues. **Action: In that the A10 was one of the priority areas for the Mayor of**

the Combined Authority, officers were asked to seek confirmation of the Combined Authority's future plans for it in writing outside of the meeting.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (a) note the report in response to the Full Council motion of 10 May 2016,
- (b) note the Combined Authority proposals for the A10 corridor,
- (c) consider the schemes identified in the report for development, and
- (d) agree to expand the scope of the feasibility study at the A10/A142 junctions to consider a wider range of solutions.

39. TRUMPINGTON PARK AND RIDE GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP PROPOSALS

The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) had been assessing issues and options around the western side of Cambridge as part of the Western Orbital project, including assessing demand and options for additional Park and Ride capacity. While the work had considered potential new Park and Ride sites, it also identified opportunities to provide additional capacity at Trumpington P&R site, as a more rapid way of achieving the goal.

As the site is owned and operated by Cambridgeshire County Council, approval from the Committee was sought to permit the GCP to develop, promote and ultimately implement their proposals for which a report was to be considered at their meeting on 20th September. Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.12 provided details around three options to expand capacity at the Trumpington site.

In discussion:

- Councillors who had been at the Assembly the previous day highlighted issues raised in respect of the need for effective landscaping for any of the proposals to avoid it being a sterile environment and the need to improve safety at the site, as it was not considered a safe environment for school children. One Member stated that both of these should feature as part of any future planning application.
- Concern was expressed regarding any proposal to reduce the size of the car spaces to increase parking density. The member in stating this, highlighted that the trend was for an increase in the size of vehicles. There was the real risk that such proposals, if implemented, would put some people off from using the facility if their comfort or vehicle safety was perceived to be unduly compromised. Comfort of usage was an important factor with there already being examples of the negative impact of restricted space from some of the existing Cambridge City car parks.
- A Member raised the issue of whether a study should be undertaken on the

additional pressures that would be caused by the proposal to roll out further residents parking schemes in Cambridge. In response officers indicated that assessments had already been made on the proposals in relation to all the park and ride sites and that some still had a spare capacity within their current site design. Details had not been provided in the current report as there was still no firm dates for the extension of residents parking in Cambridge which by their nature from past experience, took a long time to implement.

It was unanimously resolved to:

to agree that Greater Cambridge Partnership should develop and implement proposals for expansion of parking and other provision at Trumpington Park and Ride.

40. LAND NORTH OF CHERRY HINTON SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The emerging local plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire allocates land for residential development at Land North of Cherry Hinton (LNCH) in accordance with the adopted Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008). The proposed allocation comprised of approximately 47 hectares of agricultural land located between Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way and Cambridge Airport. LNCH is planned to deliver up to 1,200 new homes with supporting infrastructure, including a primary and secondary school, employment, leisure and community facilities. Access to and from the site will be from both Coldhams Lane and Cherry Hinton Road/Airport Way for vehicles, with other potential linkages for pedestrians and cyclists provided to the surrounding area. The report explained that the route of the spine road would require careful planning to ensure it did not encourage its use as a 'rat run' for motorists. A more detailed report on this issue was due to come forward to the November Committee meeting.

Following a series of workshops, the draft Supplementary Planning Document had been published for consultation with the deadline for comments being 2nd October. The report provided the proposed County Council response for approval and comment. It was highlighted that the delivery of both a primary and secondary school and sustainable transport options were the main priorities for the County Council. Appendix 1 to the report contained the full officer response with paragraphs 2.3 to 2.8 of the cover report providing the salient issues for consideration (including that the playing fields part of the secondary school site would be in the green belt and that the gas pipeline would need to be re-located from the site proposed for the primary school). They also detailed the reasons for specific objections.

The local member for Cherry Hinton highlighted paragraph 2.8 of the report reading: *"The SPD should highlight that the requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by the County Council and local authorities prior to submission of a planning application. The wording in the consultation version suggests that this will be decided through the planning application process, but the County Council require this to be decided prior to a planning application being submitted. Therefore, officers recommend an objection on this point until the wording is altered to "prior to submission of a planning application"* On this basis she had requested to speak on behalf of both concerned local residents and at the request of Cambridge City Councillor Mark Ashton

and Councillor Russ McPherson regarding concerns that the spine road might not be a through road. Their view was that the spine road must link up at both ends without any rising bollards or other obstructions which would result in the traffic diverting and causing even greater congestion in Cherry Hinton village, especially the High Street, than was already the case. Any new housing estate built on the site must take traffic away from the village and High Street, i.e. leading towards the by-pass and Airport Way and Coldham's Lane. She highlighted that residents of Rosemary Lane and Church End were also concerned with increased traffic and would prefer it not to be directed down these streets which already had "rat running" problems.

She also highlighted concerns that the secondary school was going to be a Free School, citing the various failures and closures of such schools in the past, including press reports highlighting issues related to the employment of unqualified, teachers and large class sizes.

Questions of clarification of the local member included:

- The suggestion being made that the local member was very strongly in favour of a spine road that was effectively a bypass away from the local church, and asked if her proposals were supported by any empirical survey results. In response she indicated that all recent works in Cherry Hinton had been in respect of reducing accidents by dealing with the long term problem of speeding vehicles, especially at Rosemary Road. The Chairman commented that he had recently walked the Cherry Hinton High Street Route and was of the view that the measures in place were a vast improvement to what there had been, with both speeding and cycling issues largely addressed.

In terms of free school provision, officers in response clarified that there was interest to open such a school around Teversham but not on the site itself, and that Marshall supported the Council's proposals for a secondary school. The Council had no control over such an application and that objections needed to be directed to the Department for Education. **As an action it was agreed that officers would provide contact details to Councillor Crawford on who objectors to a free school application should write to.**

In subsequent debate:

- Concerns were expressed by two members regarding what noise mitigation measures were to be put in place, as the site was right at the end of the runway especially in respect of shielding the worst effects of airport engine noise from children out playing. It was highlighted that the runway was used not only for light training aircraft but also commercial flights and was also used to test aircraft engines. One Member who had been at an earlier briefing on Marshall's plans for a new ground run pen explained that it would reduce noise by up to 95% when running test engines, but could not be used if the wind was in the wrong direction. The Member suggested that the development should not go ahead until the ground pen had been built. In response, officers confirmed that noise mitigation was an issue for education facilities and would need to be included as part of the environmental impact assessment.

- Another member sought details regarding whether there were any cycle route plans to enable children to cycle safely from their homes to the local schools. Another member echoed the need for sustainable transport links in the planning application, including designated separate, cycle routes. He suggested the need to also establish, initially from public monies, a new bus route to run from Teversham to the site, then on to Coldham's Lane and on to the City. This could become a commercial route later when the demand for the route increased.
- Other issues raised was the need to design the homes to be future proofed to take account of the demands of a rising elderly population, the need to look to builders installing solar panels and ensuring, for environmental reasons, appropriate landscaping to be undertaken including where practicable, a tree planting programme. Officers highlighted that the Council's policy is not to accept trees planted within the adopted highway, however there was not an issue with the principle of trees in private or non-adopted areas. **It was suggested that some of the issues raised should be considered as part of a training session for new developments to be added to the Committee training programme. Action: Bob Menzies to discuss with Tamar Oviatt-Ham.**
- The need to look to providing youth club provision. In response it was explained that this would be an issue for the City and South Cambridgeshire district councils as they were responsible for specifying the provision of community facilities.

Having considered the response, it was unanimously resolved to:

- a) approve the response as set out in Appendix 1 to the report; and
- b) delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and the Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

41. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2018-2019 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Capital Programme for Economy, Transport and Environment. It was part of the process set out in the Capital Strategy whereby the Council updates, alters and refines its capital planning over an extended planning period. New schemes are developed by Services and all existing schemes are reviewed and updated as required before being presented to the Capital Programme Board and subsequently Service Committees for further review and development.

The revised draft Capital Programme for Economy Transport and Environment (ETE) is as set out overleaf

Service Block	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000	2022-23 £'000	Later Yrs £'000
Economy, Transport and Environment	34,250	25,232	17,631	18,561	20,098	19,182

This is anticipated to be funded by the following resources:

Funding Source	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000	2022-23 £'000	Later Yrs £'000
Grants	18,730	16,108	16,686	17,668	16,664	21,662
Contributions	9,752	3,473	200	1,000	1,000	9,700
Borrowing	5,768	5,651	745	-107	2,434	-12,180
Total	34,250	25,232	17,631	18,561	20,098	19,182

The full list of ETE capital schemes was shown in the draft capital programme at Appendix 1 of the report with Table 4 listing the schemes with a description and with funding shown against years. Table 5 showed the breakdown of the total funding of the schemes.

In respect of Integrated Transport and Operating the Network it was explained that this was mainly funded by Local Transport Plan grant funding from the Department for Transport as well as schemes funded by developer contributions. The assumption being that funding that now went via the Combined Authority would now be passported across to Cambridgeshire.

The main changes to existing schemes for the Economy and Environment Committee were in respect of the following as detailed in paragraphs 5.8.1 -5.8.3 in the report:

- Ely Crossing and Kings Dyke
- Guided Busway
- Energy Efficiency Fund

In reply to a question regarding when the retention ran out on the Guided Busway it was explained that it was 10 years from completion, which was 2021. It was clarified that currently the Council were still withholding payments.

It was unanimously resolved:

- To note the overview and context provided for the 2018-19 Capital Programme for Economy Transport and Environment.
- To note the draft proposals for Economy Transport and Environment's 2018-19 Capital Programme and endorse their development.

42. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – JULY 2017

Economy and Environment Committee received the latest Finance and Performance Report for the period to the end of July 2017 to enable them to both note and comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position.

It was highlighted that:

Revenue: That at this stage of the year ETE was forecasting an overspend of £177K. There was an estimated £1m pressure on waste which came under Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee with underspends on the Concessionary Fares budget estimated at £400k which were being used to partially offset this pressure.

Capital; Pressures relating to land purchase for the Kings Dyke overpass and pressures on the Ely Southern Bypass Scheme were detailed in Appendix 6 of the report with the pressures being reviewed, and if possible, mitigated with any further residual pressure to be addressed.

Performance: on the revised suite of fourteen performance indicators, two were currently showing as red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area and the average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes) three were showing as amber, and nine green. At year-end the current forecast was that only one performance indicator would be red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area).

In discussion issues raised included:

- One Member expressed concern regarding the potential further delay to the Kings Dyke overpass and requested additional information regarding the pressures referred to in the report. In response it was explained that officers were working hard with the contractor and landowner to reduce the current £3m overspend on the budget which would need to be managed within the Capital Programme and assurance was given that this would not lead to a delay in undertaking the scheme.
- On page 90 under the heading 'County Planning Minerals and Waste' and the text reading "*Current underspend related to an increase in income due to an un-budgeted large planning application fee. The remainder of the underspend is due to a difficulty in filling a technical vacancy*" there was a request for additional information. Regarding the vacancy this was due to the current problems in recruiting planners as the Council could not compete with the pay offered by the private sector or some other authorities. **The Lead officer would investigate the detail of the fee and report back to the Vice Chairman outside of the meeting. Action: Bob Menzies.**
- As a follow up to the above another Member asked whether it was possible to utilise Planning Performance Agreement fees to ensure they recovered the full costs involved.

- There was a request for a future all member seminar to include districts and bus operators for a joined up overview to be scheduled in respect of the Bus Services Act 2017 - **Action Bob Menzies to discuss with Head of Passenger Transport and Democratic Services (Dawn Cave)**
- With reference to page 99 - Performance Indicator titled “Out of work benefit claimants – narrowing gap between the most deprived areas (top 10% and others) there was a request from one Member for officers to consider refining it further so that it measured the differential between the highest and lowest areas of the County, with the Member who had raised it commenting that the final target as an aggregation, did not reflect what was happening in the most deprived areas and that it would be better shown as a ratio rather than a set target. He highlighted that deprivation in areas such Cambridge were likely to be less than in other deprived areas of the County where unemployment as a percentage of the working population was higher and this could skew the final % figure thereby making it unrepresentative. **Action: Bob Menzies agreed to take the suggestion away for further consideration.**

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was resolved to:

note the report.

43. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FORWARD AGENDA PLAN

Having received the forward agenda plans as set out in the agenda:

It was resolved to note the agenda plan with the following additions / potential additions:

- Planning Obligations Strategy likely to move from October to November
- New addition to November - Land North of Cherry Hinton (Spine Road)
- Adult Learning Self-Assessment Report to be deleted from November as this Service has moved to be within the responsibility of Communities and Partnership Committee and will go to their Committee Meeting in December.
- December meeting likely to have the following additions:
 - St Neots Northern Foot and Cycle Bridge – Project Update
 - Wisbech Access strategy recommendation of schemes to access £10.5m Growth Deal Funding

44. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 12th OCTOBER 2017

Chairman: 12TH October 2017