

**ECONOMY AND
ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE**

Minutes-Action Log



This is the updated action log as at 6th December 2015 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 15th July 2015					
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
140.	NORTHSTOWE PHASE 2 – SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS 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.	The Section 106 Heads of terms were agreed on 29 th July 2015 by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, the body with the authority to make the final decision. An oral update provided at the December meeting indicated that the heads of terms were being drafted with lawyers and County schedules were due to be complete by January. Other schedules associated with the	Ongoing

				<p>district council (such as affordable housing and the civic hub) will continue to be drafted into the new year. Progress remained good and positive”.</p> <p>The current expectation was still for sign off during January.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

MINUTES OF THE 17TH NOVEMBER 2015

Minute No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
168.	SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2016/17 TO 2020/21	Bob Menzies	A question was raised by Councillor Mason (regarding his concerns of the potential cost of the repairs required to keep the Guided Busway running) was on who was responsible for the budget for ongoing work. This would be taken up by officers in consultation with him outside of the meeting.	Officers have contacted Councillor Mason and are awaiting a response.	ACTION ONGOING

MINUTES OF THE 3RD DECEMBER 2015

174.	PETITION- SAFER CYCLING AND WALKING TO AND FROM NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE	Richard Lumley	It was noted that in line with the Council Petitions Procedure that the petition spokesperson would receive a written response within 10 working days of the date of the meeting.	A response from the Chairman was sent to Dr Pearson the spokesperson on 17 th December with a copy of the text included as Appendix 1 to this Action Log. .	ACTION COMPLETED
------	---	-----------------------	---	--	-------------------------

175.	TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR EAST CAMBRIDGE-SHIRE DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION	Jack Eagle	<p>a) Venues for consultation with the public</p> <p>To facilitate the consultation in appropriate venues it was suggested that officers should contact local members. The Ellesmere Centre Stetchworth (CB8 9TS) was suggested by one member as a potential venue.</p>	<p>Officers have now looked at the Ellesmere Centre, Stetchworth as a potential venue and it will be considered further when planning the consultation.</p> <p>The Committee to note that as there is now a District Council Election in Bottisham following a Councillor resignation, the associated purdah period which started on the 30 December would continue until the 4 February, but might be extended to include the Sutton by-election following the death of Cllr Read. Originally officers were planning to hold the Consultation from the start of February 2016 for six weeks. With the Sutton and Bottisham By election. It is now possible that the consultation might clash with the purdah period. Once confirmation has been received, officers will look to update the consultation timescales and inform this Committee and Cllrs on the joint ECDC and CCC planning group.</p>	ACTION ONGOING
		Jack Eagle	<p>b) Littleport Station Car Park Provision</p> <p>The local member for Littleport had written in support of the provision of more car parking near Littleport Station. He highlighted that local residents were concerned that nothing had happened in the last 2 years, and that Littleport residents wanted to</p>	<p>The officer response was emailed to the Committee on 7th December and the text is reproduced at Appendix 2.</p>	ACTION COMPLETED

			know when something would be done, listing these in a series of questions for which a response had been provided in an e-mail dated 2 nd December. There was a request that this should be circulated to the whole Committee.		
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	STATUS
176.	CAMBRIDGE QUALITY BUS PARTNERSHIP RENEWAL	Bob Menzies	<p>a) Problems were highlighted regarding the audio announcement system on some buses with incorrect information being given on the stop had been reached. The Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery undertook to investigate</p> <p>b) The Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery to confirm date the above revised agreement had been signed and to report any feedback from the bus operators.</p>	These actions were still being progressed.	ACTION ONGOING
177.	PLANNING OBLIGATIONS STRATEGY	Colum Fitzsimons	It was suggested that reference should be made to District Regulations 1-2-3 schedules. In response it was indicated that to include full details of each District	Officers have since revised the document to make reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 lists. As only 2 districts (East Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire) have adopted CIL to date, a	ACTION COMPLETED

			Councils' CIL regime would be overcomplicated and confuse the objective of the Strategy. The officers undertook to review what could be included as part of the consultation exercise.	<p>link to their respective websites has been included.</p> <p>An e-mail was sent to Members of the Committee on 6th December which included the full revised consultation draft with this amendment.</p>	
Minute No.	Report Title	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	STATUS
178.	ECONOMY TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT (ETE)RISK REGISTER UPDATE	Celia Melville	a) Request that in future the print size could be made larger as even blown up to A3 it was difficult to read. It was agreed this would be taken back to the report authors. Action Rob Sanderson to take back to Report authors	Democratic Services had conveyed this request to the relevant ETE Officers.	ACTION ONGOING
		Action Bob Menzies	B) Councillor Mason asked how much was left of the £10m set aside to fund busway defect works. It was agreed that a written response would be provided outside of the meeting but highlighting that all it would be was a number.	A response was sent by e-mail on 24 th December indicating that at the end of November the balance in the account stood at £3,377,380.	ACTION COMPLETED

Appendix 1

Dear Dr Pearson,

Safer Cycling and Walking to and from North West Cambridge Petition

Thank you for taking the time to present the above petition at the County Council's Economy & Environment Committee, held 3 December 2015.

Whilst I understand fully the points outlined by the petition and appreciate the concerns of the signatories, the planning and design for the new school was intended to address the schools catchment, which is entirely on the south-western side of Huntingdon Road, therefore not requiring children to cross the road to reach it. That said, as part of the planning stage a degree of out of catchment movement was anticipated, but, as this would be relatively small, the infrastructure approved was considered appropriate to allow safe access.

As Highway Authority, the County Council has a duty to ensure the safe and efficient movement of traffic (including pedestrians and cyclists). Unfortunately the County Council is not able to ensure that any parent choosing to send their child to a particular school can do so without encountering traffic. The amount of additional infrastructure required for such an undertaking would be significant, disproportionate to the situation and indeed undeliverable in the current financial climate.

The planning system requires that significant adverse impact be addressed by developers. In the long term, upon completion of the scheme, a route from Girton Corner along the Ridgeway, or a route along Huntingdon Road to a crossing point south of the new junction will be provided. This crossing leads to a traffic free route and, whilst this route is longer, is not seen as unreasonably so. Whilst I acknowledge that it is difficult to cross Huntingdon Road (having crossed Cambridge Road, prior to Girton Corner), this provision is deemed reasonable for the number of people crossing at this location. It was therefore considered that this arrangement is adequate, and improvement at the developer's expense would be unreasonable and unwarranted.

With regard to the Eddington Road junction; the width of the highway at this location is wider than the existing highway and therefore a realignment of the kerb is required.

Whilst a change in alignment of the kerb was always present in the original design, when the developer was on site, a conflict was discovered between the setting out of the junction and their land ownership.

This was resolved by marginally moving the point at which the new kerb joins the old, to retain the width of footway. The road marking (crosshatching) in the middle of the road was reduced to retain the cycle lane width and general vehicular lane width. Unfortunately this has reduced

the amount of safe space for turning vehicles, albeit marginally. However it was not considered to be of such significance as to merit stopping the works for a more extensive redesign of the junction.

Whilst it would have been desirable to extend the junction widening further towards the Thornton Road junction, widening both the footway and cycle lane was not possible, due to neither the developer nor the County Council owning the relevant piece of land needed to carry out the widening. Again, in the planning process a judgement must be made as to whether the impact of the development required such a widening. The development was not anticipated to increase usage of that footway to such a degree (it being reasonable to expect that the number of crossing movements, such as they were, could be accommodated at the new Toucan crossing to the southeast) and it was considered unreasonable to require such improvement for the development to proceed.

As I am sure you will appreciate, work on the scheme is still taking place and the current layout is subject to regular, temporary changes whilst these works progress. At present the layout of this traffic management does not allow the provision of a marked cycleway, although I would like to reassure you that this will be provided in the future. The temporary traffic management itself influences driver behaviour and it would be premature to judge the final junction layout during this interim period. The final layout will be subject to an independent safety audit, once the works are completed and fully operational.

In previous correspondence regarding this development, the question was asked as to why a pedestrian crossing on Huntingdon Road was not incorporated within the approved layout. Wherever possible the Highway Authority would seek such provision where there is a need, and there is normally a need wherever the proposed junction lies within a built-up area.

However, when assessing this junction proposal it was found that to incorporate such a crossing would result in one of three impacts; firstly either the south-western kerb-line would be pushed further into the site, further accentuating the kink in the kerb.

Secondly either or both the right turn or left turn lanes would need to be omitted from the junction mainline. Removal of the right or left turn widening would increase delay significantly to vehicles at the junction. This junction will be under very significant pressure for capacity and lies on a primary radial road serving Cambridge.

Thirdly the cycle lanes would have to be removed to provide more space. Removal of the cycle lanes was not considered acceptable as they are extremely well used, and carry greater numbers of cycle movements than the anticipated demand for pedestrians crossing at this point (particularly given that there is to be a facility within a reasonable distance). In summary the accentuation of the kink, and enlargement of the islands would, in combination make the conflict with cyclists far worse.

Whilst capacity of a junction is not always an overriding influence on junction acceptability, in this case it is a significant one. Therefore given that there is a crossing facility to be provided within reasonable reach it was considered that a reasonable balance was struck in the final accepted design.

The Toucan is located between the two main parts of the junction system as this is where an orbital cycle way, strategically linking Cambridge North Station, the Science Park, Guided Busway, Darwin Green, North-West Cambridge and West Cambridge runs. This scheme is identified within the local plan and is intended to provide a major non-motorised link around that area of Cambridge. The movements on this route would, therefore, be anticipated to be much, much higher in number than those generated between the established residential areas of Girton and North-West Cambridge in this vicinity. This route would provide access to the school via a gate.

In summary the University has chosen to open the new school in advance of the trigger requiring them to do so under the terms of their planning permission. In doing so, the school is operating in advance of full infrastructure intended to serve it. Indeed whilst the main junction accessing the school continues to be subject to construction-related traffic management, unfortunately road users will experience some disruption and discomfort whilst travelling through this area.

I would like to reiterate that this situation is a temporary one whilst the additional infrastructure is built. However, regarding the final design, the Highway Authority considers that the planned provision is appropriate and reasonable for the volume of traffic and pedestrian likely to be generated between Girton and the new urban extension to Cambridge.

Whilst I understand that this response is not what you may have hoped for, I trust that it explains the situation thoroughly.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Ian Bates
Chairman of Economy & Environment Committee

Cc. Mr David Mackay

Appendix 2

Dear Economy and Environment Committee Members

As requested by Councillor Henson at last Thursday's Economy and Environment Committee meeting and having first checked with Councillor Divine that he was happy they were passed on, please find below the questions and the subsequent answers sent to Councillor Divine last Wednesday evening.

Rob Sanderson
Democratic Services Officer
Cambridgeshire County Council
Telephone 01223 699181
Email: rob.sanderson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Questions and responses on parking provision at Littleport Station

Why did the original deal announced by Steve Barclay in Sept 2013 break down?

Response: The land prices quoted at the time did not make acquisition viable.

- What alternative sites have been looked at and which of those are still viable?

Response: The 2 sites originally looked at were not viable. An East Cambridgeshire District Council project team is being re-established to look at alternative sites. The first meeting of this group is being held on 9th December 2015.

- Why 2 years on have we not found a solution to this problem yet?

Response: Because of a lack of affordable land available.

- How much has this delay cost the tax payer? how much has the working group/committee cost because of this delay? can I issue a FOI for this information if not freely given?

Response: No cost to delay.

- When will we have a clear and agreed solution and plan.

Response: The project team will look for alternative sites in the area, but a solution depends on availability of land and the cost of purchasing it so it is difficult to give timescales.

- if the above is unknown what are the problems causing the delays?

Response: The main issue causing delay is the lack of affordable land and the Council taking time to appraise the options available to move this forward.

- How can individuals help?

Response: No help is required from individuals. If the Council feels there is a case for individuals to become involved we will communicate this at the appropriate time.

- How can individuals be kept up to date on what is happening with this issue? how are updates reported?

Response: The project group will work up a communications strategy.

- Who can we contact for updates or progress?

Response: Tracey Harding 01353 665555 or email tracey.harding@eastcambs.gov.uk

- Can I issue a Freedom of Information (FOI) request for copies of all committee minutes or working group minutes for the last 2-3 years on this matter? if so what is the working group / committee called.

Response: All committee minutes are available online via www.eastcamb.gov.uk. The relevant committee is Asset Development Committee (also referred to as Asset Development Sub-Committee during the time referred to).

Jack Eagle

Lead Transport & Infrastructure Officer
Cambridgeshire County Council
Transport & Infrastructure, Policy & Funding,
Box SH1310, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP
Tel: 01223 703269