

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 27TH May 2014

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 12.55 p.m.

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman) R Butcher, B. Chapman, J Clark, E Cearns, (Vice-Chairman), D Divine, D Harty, R Henson, J Hipkin, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, A Lay, J Reynolds, J Schumann, M Shuter, A Walsh and J Williams

Also present: Councillors P Downes, I Manning and M Mason

1. CONFIRMATION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

The Committee noted that the Council had appointed Councillor Bates as the Chairman and Councillor Cearns as the Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2014-15.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared non-statutory disclosable interests in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members' Code of Conduct:

- Councillor Hipkin in item 5 'Hills Road and Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, Cycleways' as he lived close to Huntingdon Road.
- Councillor Kavanagh in the same item as a member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

3. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

4. A14 DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO) FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Members were asked to consider the draft proposals of the Highways Agency (HA) for the A14 from Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme which was to be the subject of formal consultation until 15th June and to also agree the County Council's response. Attention was drawn to the key issues set out in the report including:

- the governance roles and responsibilities and the simplified procedure being adopted under the Planning Act 2008,
- the Implementation Plan and timetable,
- the impacts on Cambridgeshire's residents and the environment,
- the Council liability in relation to de-trunked and new county roads, with the latter amounting to 12 kilometres of new road.

It was highlighted that there was also the need to rescind previous objections made by Cabinet which were still in place, relating to the now withdrawn 'A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme'. In relation to recommendation b) the officers highlighted that for clarity it should include the following additional wording added "as set out in Appendix 2". This change was supported by the Committee.

Speaking as the Local Member for Brampton, Councillor Downes welcomed the new element of the current proposed scheme relating to widening the A1 between Brampton and Alconbury, but highlighted the need to consult with Alconbury residents. He also raised local residents concerns regarding soundproofing along the alternative layout now proposed for the A1 and A14 junction adjacent to Brampton. In highlighting the text set out in 5b on page 11 of the Council's proposed submission, he supported the need to ensure adequate noise mitigation measures were installed.

In relation to the text in 5c on the same page referring to the demolition of the Huntingdon A14 Viaduct and the related changes to the local roads, he highlighted the need to ensure any new road layout would not have a detrimental impact on traffic flow, as he was concerned that otherwise this could lead to local gridlock, and asked that the officers be vigilant on points of detail. He tabled for information a map of the alternative route that residents had suggested to the Highways Agency which would have moved the road further away from Brampton, but which had been deemed to be too expensive. He also highlighted concerns regarding the safety of non-motorised traffic crossing the main route and suggested that this should be added to the Council's response as a concern, requiring appropriate mitigation.

During the debate the following issues were raised:

- Concerns regarding the potential noise and pollution which would be generated in Girton, Hilton and other areas, and the need for appropriate noise mitigation measures to be in place from the outset, to reflect the concerns of local residents over those of road users. This should include low noise road surfacing.
- That the standard on noise mitigation on the 'pinch-point' scheme for Girton should be the standard that would be provided for that location under the main Cambridge to Huntingdon Scheme.
- The need for 24 hour traffic flow data to be made available. *(Note the officer in response suggested the final traffic forecasts for the scheme would include these flow data and should be available after 20th June)*
- The need to future proof the Bar Hill junction to ensure it could handle the increased traffic that would be generated in the next 20 years from the Northstowe development.
- The need to ensure enhanced cycle / walking facilities were separated from the carriageway to ensure the safety of pedestrians / cyclists.
- The need in developing noise mitigation measures to include appropriate landscaping works / tree screening, and to work in partnership with district councils and local residents.

- The need to consider lower speed limits where there were complex road layouts which could also help reduce noise and air pollution.
- The need to ensure that side roads (local access roads) worked effectively and did not lead to blockages that might promote 'rat running'. *(In reply the lead officer indicated all side roads would be the subject of a safety scrutiny and would not be adopted unless they were considered safe and adequate)*
- In relation to undertaking maintenance works overnight, to ensure that long diversion routes were kept to a minimum as these could encourage rat running.
- The need to ensure the responsibility for appropriate refurbishment / de-trunking roads to be adopted, should be a cost to the Highways Agency and not the County Council.
- The need to ensure proper drainage was provided in the new layout on both the roads and on cycle-paths.
- In paragraph 7.2 'Helping people live healthy and independent lives' it was suggested that this should have made reference to reducing noise and pollution, as a way of improving healthy living conditions. Another Member made the point that the improvements the scheme was designed to provide (reducing congestion and ensuring free-flowing traffic) would in itself reduce air pollution.
- One Member suggested a future report provide more detail on the potential cost of the additional Council liabilities and the funding of these.
- Future reports to include a map to help illustrate the Scheme.
- Supporting sourcing materials for the construction works locally, where-ever possible.
- To receive a report back in the Autumn (September) to be able to comment on the Draft Highways Agency response before its submission by the 31st October deadline.

As there was a need to ensure that Members views had been taken into account in the final submission by the officers, it was agreed that recommendation b) should be amended to also include the Vice Chairman's involvement.

It was resolved to agree:

- a) To rescind eighteen listed objections agreed by the former Council Cabinet to the now withdrawn A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme at its meeting on 15th December 2009.
- b) The Director , Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman responding to the Highway's

Agency current Formal Consultation for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme, confirming the overall support for the Scheme, but reserving the position on matters of detail to be discussed and negotiated with the Highways Agency prior to its submission of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) as set out in Appendix 2, and raised by Councillors in the debate, and

- c) To receive a further report in the autumn on the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) following its preparation by the Highways Agency.

5. HILLS ROAD AND HUNTINGDON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CYCLEWAYS

This report provided the results of the consultation on proposed cycleways on Huntingdon Road, Girton and Hills Road, Cambridge and sought the implementation of segregated cycleways in these areas as recommended in the report.

It was indicated that as a result of responses from a number of key stakeholders there was the intention to modify the bus stops to take account of identified requirements, as set out in paragraph 7.4 of the report. It was confirmed in reply to a question, that the Police had not responded to the consultation.

Martin Lucas-Smith speaking as the Chair of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign had provided comments in advance which were tabled for Members of the Committee at the meeting. In his oral presentation he indicated that the Campaign strongly supported the principles of changes to Hills Road and Huntingdon Road for safety reasons, as the move to a segregated cycleway would reduce both bus and cycle conflict, as well as that between pedestrians and cyclists. They believed such measures would help encourage more people to switch from cars to riding bicycles to reach work and thereby help reduce congestion in Cambridge and prevent gridlock during the rush hour periods. His proposed change to the standard priority arrangement would involve a ramped up crossing. He did highlight that the junctions remained problematic and the Council needed to undertake to improve these in the near future. He did however consider the proposals to be a win, win for everybody.

Mr Christopher McDoualla member of the public who had requested to speak explained that he used Huntingdon Road every day and while supporting the principle of that scheme, highlighted that 40% of respondents did not support options 1-3.

He highlighted that in his view, one part of Option 3 was in fact dangerous to cyclists. He explained that the majority of Huntingdon Road would not have a cycleway segregated by kerbs. As a result, when cars parked at the side of the road, broke down or when there were roadworks, cyclists had to manoeuvre around them. He explained that while going down a higher section of cycleway onto the road was less dangerous, trying to then re-enter the raised cycleway at the height of 25mm being suggested, in some cases caused a front wheel to be deflected and the cyclist to then fall off into the road. He explained that this had already happened to his wife at another location. He suggested there was a need for an independent cycling expert to review the whole idea of raised kerbs. In response to this last point it was indicated that a safety audit had been carried out, which confirmed that the proposals were safe.

Councillor Tom Bygott District Councillor for Girton was also invited to speak. He expressed his concerns regarding the predicament of the elderly trying to cross where cyclists were given priority. He highlighted the added danger of cars queuing up behind buses, as well as some cyclists moving too fast and being unable to stop. He explained he was not in favour of the provision of cycle routes alongside major roads, but supported them being provided between major roads, going through the countryside where possible, (as already planned in the major new developments). These he believed, were safer and cheaper.

Issues raised by Members included:

- Concerns that the consultation undertaken did not target people outside Cambridge and one Member questioned its adequacy.
- The major concern raised from various Councillors on the Committee was the priority being given to cyclists over pedestrians at the proposed floating island bus stops. One Member stated that visually impaired / disabled people needed to have priority. Another Member raised concerns of how the frail, elderly would cope with his arrangement, fearing they could be stranded on a bus island, not having the confidence or mobility to cross at times when there were a constant stream of cyclists using the cycle-path.
- There was discussion regarding the issue of anti-social cyclists and how their activities could be controlled in relation to the current proposals, including police enforcement. Examples were provided of dangerous cyclists including those who failed to currently observed traffic lights, pelican crossings and those that cycled on pedestrian pavements etc. and who by their actions endangered pedestrians / potentially caused accidents with motorised vehicles. The officer in response explained that the scheme in the report provided for the cycle lane to narrow at such crossing places and included a raised section to both slow down cyclists and to warn pedestrians. He explained that the surface would also be coloured high visibility red as an additional warning. This was widely used in countries such as the Netherlands with no major issues.
- It was highlighted by one Member that section 7.3 of the report made reference to those associated with the blind or partially sighted being happier if at the very least, priority could be given to pedestrians at the island bus stops. The question was asked regarding what further consultation had been undertaken with disability groups to look to alleviating concerns. In response, it was indicated that talks were still ongoing to seek a solution, which had included attending and answering questions at a Disability Consultation Panel. Officers had been able to provide more assurance in relation to issues such as ramp heights for wheelchair users.
- One Member suggested that there was a need for the bus companies to play a greater part, suggesting that they could have announcements when they were approaching an island bus stop and cautioning passengers planning to alight to be careful, as cyclists had priority right of way.

- The need for the bus companies to provide, positive practical support for the floating bus islands concept to ensure their success. Some surprise was expressed that they still wished to pursue bus laybys, as these were known to be a problem in terms of buses being able to re-join the main traffic flow.
- The Member representing the Castle electoral division highlighted that the consultation event at the Kaetsu Centre meeting in Huntingdon Road listed in table 1 on page 5 had not taken place, as there had been no officer presence. Officers orally apologised for this. The same Member highlighted that there had not been much support for the proposals from residents who lived along Huntingdon Road in the Girton area and in the Castle electoral division. He also highlighted that the consultation appeared to be skewed towards cyclists living outside of the area. The Member indicated that local residents in his division wished to see more of the money spent on resolving conflicts further down, near Histon Road, as this was an area where there were more conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles.
- The need to ensure the appropriate surface was laid for the cycleways, citing the problems experienced at Cherry Hinton Road. Another Member in a related issue made the point of the need to ensure adequate drainage, so that water did not just drain onto the cycleway from the road surface.
- It was highlighted that the group under-represented in the consultation surveys set out in the report were bus users, who were the group most likely to be affected by cyclists having the right of way at the floating bus stops.
- One Member highlighted the dangers of drivers in left hand vehicles from abroad who had different expectations of where they expected cyclists should be. This would be alleviated by providing separate, segregated cycleways.
- The need to ensure any measures put in place could be future proofed and could be easily altered, should changes be required.
- In a discussion on London Borough of Camden's use of cycleways, it was indicated that while not well used by cyclists there, they were also more of a hazard for passengers departing from a bus, as they stepped off the bus, straight onto the cycleway. This was not being proposed in the County Council's scheme.

A question was raised regarding the implications of deferring any decision at the current meeting. It was indicated that as the Government funding had to be spent by May 2015, the timescales were already very tight and any proposals to undertake large scale design changes to the proposed schemes could seriously jeopardise implementation. While the majority of the Committee were in favour of the proposals in principle, including the concept of floating island bus stops, there were still serious concerns regarding pedestrian safety as a result of cyclists being given priority.

As a result, Councillor Reynolds moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Walsh to defer the report and receive a further report to address the issues raised to come back to the next meeting. Following a vote the resolution was passed.

It was therefore resolved:

To defer making a decision at this meeting and to receive a report at the next meeting in July with more detailed proposals that would be developed to take into account the issues raised by Members.

6. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY EXTENSION TO SCIENCE PARK STATION

A report was received to consider the form of construction for the extension of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway from Milton Road to the Proposed Cambridge Science Park Station. The options considered were to either construct it as a concrete guideway or as a tarmac road, limited to guided buses, with restricted access through initial sections of the Guideway. The latter being the recommended officer option.

Klaas Brümman spoke as a person for the Old Chesterton Residents Association and Cllr Ian Manning the local Member for East Chesterton both spoke in support of the report recommendation. They believed it would provide a simpler, cheaper and more flexible bus access to the new station, that could be modified later, if required, in away as slipcast concrete track could not.

Mr Brümman requested that the road was made future proof by constructing it to highway specifications making it usable to emergency services. He made the point that many of the local businesses were asking for a more direct access from Milton Road to the A10 and A14 to the Nuffield Road Industrial and Trading Estate. He suggested that in order to reduce and filter away general traffic, especially heavy commercial vehicles passing through the Nuffield Medical Centre, Shirley School and Green End Road bollards should be constructed east of Nuffield Close. The proposals were also supported by the Cambridge Cycling Campaign in their tabled submission, who also highlighted that a petition to use the first half of the road as a more direct access to Nuffield Road Trading Estate had reached 700 signatures.

Councillor Manning highlighted that paragraph 2.2 of the officer's report had ruled out the use of rising bollards. He suggested a change to paragraph 3.7 to delete the current words reading 'initial guidance' adding the words: "with rising bollards unless it can be proved that they will significantly slow down buses". As he was not a member of the Committee, this amendment was moved by Councillor Williams and seconded by Councillor Jenkins, but was lost on a vote.

It was resolved:

To approve the construction of an unguided tarmac road extension to the Busway running from Milton Road to the Science Park Station, with a parallel 4 metre cycleway.

7. BUSINESS PLAN BUDGET FOR 2014-15

The Committee received a report providing it with details of the budgets and performance indicators that it would be monitoring during 2014-15 through regular update reports received at each meeting.

During discussion the following points raised included:

- One Member who represented Little Paxton and St Neots(North) expressed his extreme disappointment that the budget did not include anything for infrastructure spend for St Neots, which he cited was the fastest growing town in the County.
- The performance indicator table should in future clearly specify which were cumulative targets / annual targets.
- The Vice Chairman indicated that the performance indicators must not sit in isolation to those areas the Council wished to enhance, such as influencing health impacts for the most vulnerable.

It was resolved to note the report.

8. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MARCH 2014

This report provided the Committee with the latest financial and performance information for the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Service and invited it to review and comment upon the report.

As already indicated earlier, during 2014-15 the Committee would be presented with the Finance and Performance report at each of its meetings, detailing the financial position and the latest performance information for the service. The Committee would be asked to both comment and agree recommendations as required, to order ensure that the budgets and performance indicators to which the Committee has responsibility, remained on target. It was highlighted that the July Committee meeting would also receive the Outturn report.

The significant issues were as set out in section 2.2 to 2.4 of the report with section 3 setting out the Capital Expenditure and details provided on major underspends. Appendix 1 provided details of the Budgetary Control Report, with Appendix 2 providing a commentary on the results. Appendix 3 provided details of virements and reconciliations and Appendix 4 provided details of movements on reserves.

Comments on the report included:

- One Member sought explanation on the significant underspend in relation to cycling schemes, asking whether this was as a result of a lack of staffing resources. It was indicated that this had been as a result of the funding announcements from Central Government not being made until the Summer, which had hampered recruitment.
- Linked to the above, One Member made the point that not all staff on the Cycling Project Team were on the County Council payroll / permanent contracts (*Note: as their work was funded by specific project time limited grants*) which left the Council vulnerable to people leaving to secure permanent positions elsewhere and losing valuable expertise in the area. It was clarified by officers that all the staff in the Major Infrastructure Delivery Team, including the Cycling Team,

were funded from project specific capital funds and grants. However as a result of the finance included in the City Deal for cycling infrastructure, steps were being taken to move all staff to permanent contracts.

- Requesting more detail on the overspend of £690k on Park and Ride as a result of a delay in the introduction of the car parking charge and why this cost had fallen on the client, rather than the provider. It was explained in reply that the delay had resulted from the political decision only being made in November, leaving insufficient time to procure and install the necessary equipment to start charging in time for inclusion in the then, current financial year.

It was resolved to note the report.

9. APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS, AND PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

This report asked the Committee to consider appointments to advisory groups and panels and partnership liaison and advisory groups, having taken into consideration any further direction / requests from the General Purposes Committee who had received the same report at their meeting on 20th May.

It was resolved:

- a) That in reviewing the appointments to the internal advisory groups and panels as highlighted in orange in Appendix 2 of the report to General Purposes Committee it was agreed that Councillor Peter Brown should continue as the representative on the Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Strategy – Steering Group.
- b) In reviewing the appointments to the partnership liaison and advisory groups as highlighted in Orange in Appendix 3 of the report to General Purposes Committee on pages 24-43 agreeing the names of the representatives on each organisation as shown in the report (*Note full list of the appointments agreed is provided in the appendix attached to these minutes*) with the exception of the following:
 - Anglian (Northern) Regional Flood and Coastal Committee – Agreed to appoint Councillor Butcher replacing Councillor Bates.
 - Cambridge Bid Board - This had been referred by General Purposes Committee as a decision for this Committee. It was agreed to re-appoint Councillor Shuter.
 - Cambridge City Centre Management Consultative Group – No appointment made and it was agreed to delete this organisation from the list of appointments as it had never met.
 - Chesterton Station Interchange – Agreed to appoint Councillor Manning.
 - Connecting Cambridgeshire Delivery Group – Agreed to appoint Councillor Chapman in place of Councillor Curtis, with Councillor Bates continuing as the other representative.
 - Local Access Forum - Councillor Topping appointed to a vacancy and Councillor Loynes re-appointed as the other representative.

- c) Agreeing the following additional appointments not included in the report which had been identified by officers as being appropriate for the Committee to agree:
- Natural Cambridgeshire - Councillor Shuter confirmed to continue as the representative.
 - Cambridgeshire Future Transport – appointing Councillors Bailey, Bates (as the Chairman), Hickford, Kavanagh, Reeve, van de Ven with the name of the Independent member to fill the vacancy to be notified by Councillor Hipkin following the meeting. *(Note: Councillor Hipkin has confirmed following the meeting that he will take up the place allocated for the Independents)*
 - Enterprise Zone Steering Group – Councillor Bates appointed.
- d) On a recommendation from General Purposes Committee to consider identifying any champions, it was agreed to appoint Councillor Kavanagh as the Council's Cycling Champion.

10. ECONOMIC AGREEMENT WITH NANJING

The Committee received a report outlining how it was proposed to take forward discussions in relation to the proposed economic co-operation with Nanjing in China. This had been in response to the motion agreed at Full Council on 13th May which called on the Economy and Environment Committee to draw up an appropriate forms of words acceptable to the City of Nanjing and the County Council, following consultation with principle business, trade associations and appropriate institutions in and around Cambridgeshire by the Committee's meeting in September.

It was reported that work would be undertaken to consult with the above identified institutions to determine the elements the agreement should contain in order to deliver maximum benefit to them and the broader economy. The results of the consultation would be presented back to the September Committee, together with a proposed response to the City of Nanjing.

The discussion from the Committee included the following comments:

- Councillor Lay requesting to be fully involved.
- It was reported that a further approach had been received from the Chinese Embassy who indicated their appreciation of the Council's support and seeking to meet with the Council, as part of the early stages of planning a visit to meet with the economic bodies representing the Cambridgeshire region.
- Concern was expressed by one Member regarding the amount of officer time that might be involved in relation to negotiations on a trade deal and whether these were better undertaken by parties with expert knowledge. In response it was highlighted that the Local Enterprise Partnership would be involved and that the Council's role would be more as a co-ordinator, consulting with partners, rather than necessarily taking the lead on determining the exact form of wording for any proposed agreement. This would also involve engaging with research

institutions and the University, as well as business institutions to help identify areas of interest with which to seek co-operation with partners in Nanjing.

- In discussion it was agreed that a report back should include details of any proposed agreement.
- One Member highlighted the need to include the district councils in the discussions.

It was resolved to note the way forward in relation to the proposed economic co-operation with Nanjing, China and to receive a progress report at the September Committee meeting.

11. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

This report presented the future agenda plan for the Economy and Environment Committee and invited Members to notify officers of any additional items they would like the Committee to consider for future meetings. It also reported legacy suggestions from the outgoing Overview and Scrutiny Committee suggestions in relation to:

- The Enterprise Growth & Community Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee suggesting that the Committee might wish to request further reports on the following service areas:
 - Mobilising Local Energy Investment (Note: this had already been taken up see addition to Plan below)
 - Strategic Transport Plan, including cycling (it was indicated that there would be a report on the Plan which would include cycling, later in the year).
- The Safer and Stronger Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee suggestion that the Committee might wish to continue work it had undertaken on Adult Learning & Skills Provision.

Attention was also drawn to a request from the Audit and Accounts Committee from its meeting on 28th January 2014 suggesting that each service committee should consider whether they would wish to undertake a review of two previously completed projects within their terms of reference remit, to confirm that they were satisfied that value for money had been achieved.

As an update to the published Plan, notification was given of two changes required to be made as follows:

- The report 'Transitional arrangements for Shadow Local Transport Body to become Local Enterprise Partnership Transport Group' to be moved from 8th July to 16th September Committee meeting
- An addition to the 8th July committee meeting report titled 'Mobilising Local Energy Investments (MLEI) Project Risks'

It was resolved:

- a) To note the Plan as amended.
- b) To note in relation to the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee request to receive further reports on the Strategic Transport Plan, including cycling, that this had been programmed for a future meeting.
- c) That further work should be undertaken by Councillor Schumann on Adult Learning and Skills Provision following his initial review presented to the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee to seek to ensure the effective delivery of Adult Education. It was agreed that this should be co-ordinated for inclusion in the Annual Adult Learning Self-Assessment Report, with a report to be presented to spokes at a future date.
- d) That further work initiated by Councillor Cearns originally presented to the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on reducing offending by encouraging employers to employ ex-offenders, should be continued by him and be presented to the Committee spokes at a future date.
- e) To agree that the request from Audit and Accounts Committee was considered more appropriate for that Committee, as part of the work of Internal Audit.
- f) To note and agree the proposal from the Chairman and Vice Chairman to utilise some of the reserve committee dates due to the amount of business to be transacted. (*Note: it was not intended to use the 17th June reserve date*)
- g) To agree, that if practicable, future meetings should be switched to the Council Chamber if it was anticipated in advance that there would be a considerable number of the public attending.

Chairman
Date: 8th July 2014