

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 13th July 2017

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 10.56 p.m.

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

Apologies: None

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

12. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st June 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

13. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minute Action Log update was noted.

14. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received

15. WATERBEACH BARRACKS – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION

The Committee received a report in order to consider and agree a formal response to the Waterbeach outline planning application (S/0559/17/OL) for 6,500 dwellings (1,400 in Phase 1) prior to determination of the planning application by South Cambridgeshire District Council. The response was in respect of the acceptability of the proposals as they primarily affected County Council infrastructure and services, including the mitigation measures proposed, and the emerging section 106 draft Heads of Terms.

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan allocated three new strategic scale residential led development including Waterbeach. For Waterbeach New Town, Policy SS/5 sets out the policy requirements to be included in the planning application including:

- Provision of community facilities, including primary and secondary education;
- Access from the existing village for pedestrians and cyclists whilst avoiding a direct vehicular route;
- High quality transport links to Cambridge including a new railway station, park and ride and segregated busway and cycleways; and
- Increased capacity on the A10 corridor.

In addition to the general principles set out in the Local Plan, South Cambridgeshire District Council were preparing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide greater clarity on key strategic issues to be published for consultation later in the year. Supplementary to this, the County Council and partners had commissioned a study to examine the implications of growth in the sub-region on the A10 Corridor to evaluate the impacts, and consider multi-modal solutions to enable growth to take place.

County Council officers in collaboration with South Cambridgeshire District Council officers had engaged with the applicant in pre-application discussions to help shape the planning application. While the application was broadly consistent with the emerging local plan policy, there were still either gaps in some of the information provided, or further clarifications required. Therefore, to protect the Council's position, holding objections were recommended in some areas. The full technical response was set out in Appendix 2 of the report with a summary of the key issues highlighted as follows:

Service	Key Comments
Education	Objection – insufficient provision (land + contribution) identified for Special Education Needs (SEN) and Post-16. Secondary school provision (single site) not sufficient to meet needs of the area.
Floods and Water	Object – concerns relating to discharge rates, climate change allowance, existing barrack drainage, and water quality treatment.
Waste Management	Support in principle, subject to detailed matters and planning condition.
Energy	Clarifications required in relation to fuel uses.
Sand and Gravel	Planning condition required.
Highways	Object on highway safety grounds.
Library	Support, subject to s106 agreement.
Transport Assessment	Holding objection - insufficient evidence to determine impact on road network. Robust, tested and costed mitigation package not yet provided.
Public Health	Holding objection until further information submitted and approved in relation to health Impact Assessment.
Ecology	Objection – until application demonstrates appropriate mitigation
Archaeology	Planning conditions required
Legal Obligations	Approach noted – subject to further negotiation

More detail on Education and Transport and planning obligation issues were set out on paragraphs 2.4 to 2.8 of the report.

Issues raised in the subsequent debate included:

- Whether the trip predictions included data on predicted cycling in the area including those wishing to cycle to other places such as Cambridge, in view of the Council's commitment to encourage take up of cycling through segregated cycle lanes etc. Another Member asked whether the trip analysis included estimates of numbers who would be coming to the station to then commute on to London as this would lead to further road traffic congestion. In response it was explained that the planning application was in outline and so there was very little detail at the current stage, but that officers would be ensuring that there would be sustainable travel modes built into all the new developments incorporating lessons learnt from earlier developments. Officers would wish to see exemplar cycle routes to Cambridge and Ely. In addition, the Local Transport Plan recognised the need for a new rail station at Waterbeach to deal with expected increasing commuter pressures for which advance discussions were ongoing with Network Rail and this, linked to studies on the A10 and A14, would feed into future mitigation discussions / solutions. The A10 Study was looking at the cycling road improvements required.
- The need to construct bus stops at an early stage even if no bus services had been agreed, as they would be needed later. In response, assurance was provided that the intention was for this to happen early in the development, as part of future proofing the transport infrastructure requirements.
- There was a query regarding developers, as part of the building programme, being required to install solar panels, as this could also be a selling point. In response it was indicated that as this was a South Cambridgeshire District Council issue, the matter would be raised with them. It was however highlighted that the experience at Trumpington Meadows was that this was not a priority where the build was for the 'buy to let market'.
- A query was raised regarding whether the views of the local Member for Waterbeach were known, as while noting that she had been consulted, there was no submission from her and she was not at the Committee to inform the meeting of her views. Another member of the Liberal Democrat Group indicated that the relevant parish councils had responded in respect of the application and that he believed that Councillor Bradnam was content with the proposals.
- In support of providing a 'dutch style' cycling project in the new town, a Member made reference to the submission sent to Members of the Committee in advance of the meeting from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. (Appendix 1 to these minutes). The County Council lead officer indicated that her officers agreed with many of the points set out in the letter. The Chairman requested that the letter was passed on to South Cambridgeshire District Council planning officers as the relevant authority to receive the submission. **Action: Juliet Richardson**
- Highlighting the need for a residential home to be considered as part of the necessary infrastructure requirements. Officers indicated that they had already recognised that this was an important requirement.
- Making reference to paragraph 2.14 and 2.15 of the response to achieving a 'BREAM Excellent standard' included in the planning statement for the new

schools and the CCC Education objection on the basis it would increase the cost delivery of the school, the Vice-Chairman commented that he still hoped that the 'excellent' rather than the 'very good standard' would be adopted.

- Paragraph 7.19 on health impacts - supporting safe street suitable for pedestrian, cyclist and community interaction, reference was made to the many studies undertaken which showed that young people and older people both had issues around being able to judge the speed of vehicles in terms of the danger they posed to them.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Approve the response to the outline planning application;
- 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; and
- c) Note the emerging draft S106 Heads of Terms and that these will be brought to Committee for consideration at a future date.

16. BIKEABILITY CYCLE TRAINING

As demand nationally for Bikeability funding has risen year on year, the Department for Transport (DfT) DfT cannot now guarantee that every local authority will receive the level of funding required to meet all the costs involved. Priority is being given to new schemes, rather than established ones like Cambridgeshire's. Based on the previous year's uptake for 2017/18 the total shortfall could be up to £60,000. At the March meeting of this Committee, a proposal to charge schools for Bikeability was discussed and rejected, with officers requested to seek alternative funding for the scheme through sponsorship or other funding streams and to come back with a further progress report.

This report provided an update the Committee, seeking approval for short term and long term proposals for funding Bikeability cycle training. Cycle training has been an established part of the school programme in primary schools, and given that the DfT had made a long term commitment to some level of funding, it would be difficult to cease the training programme. The training gives young people a life skill, and very much supports the Council's objective around helping people live healthy and independent lives.

The report explained that seeking sponsorship now for Bikeability, in isolation, was premature in advance of the guidance being completed by the Transformation Team. However opportunities were still being pursued and if it was not possible to find sponsorship in the current financial year, it was proposed to fund the shortfall from the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) underspend. Working with the Transformation Team on a longer term basis, and co-ordinated with other Council services efforts officers would continue to seek to secure long term sponsorship arrangements for Bikeability. If no opportunities presented themselves, further consideration would need to be given to the long term future of the scheme and the

potential to charge parents for the service or seek ongoing funding from Council resources.

In the ongoing discussion:

- The Council Cycling champion highlighted the health benefits of cycling as set out in paragraphs 4.2 and 5.6 of the report and asked whether it might be possible to receive a cross subsidy from the Health budget. In response the lead officer indicated that public health money was already supporting Road Safety work. Officers would investigate this proposal further with Public Health, while recognising that all service committee budgets were under pressure **Action: Bob Menzies.**
- Another Member suggested that cycling advocate groups should be asked to volunteer their services to help reduce the ongoing cost. In response it was explained that groups such as the Cycling Campaign already backfilled a lot of the work previously undertaken by Council employees, including attending and speaking at events such as 'University Fresher Week', bike lights initiatives with local employers and undertaking training activities. On a further point, one Member suggested that officers should ask the training provider if their training included safety tips regarding falling off bikes safely. **Action: Mike Davies to investigate and report back.**
- Another Member suggested that there could be a role for community navigators and area champions to seek further local volunteers. As this was an area of work being developed by the Communities and Partnership Committee, it was suggested that officers initially make contact with Councillor Criswell regarding this being included as a future item for that Committee to discuss further. **Action: Mike Davies to investigate and report back.**
- Another suggestion was for officers to investigate the cost benefits of the Council and its partners jointly funding training for volunteers. **Action: Mike Davies to investigate and report back.**
- That the Chairman raise the issue of lobbying the Department for Transport for retaining the same level of funding with the Local Government Association LGA **Action: Councillor Bates**

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Support the proposal to fund the expected funding shortfall for the Bikeability Scheme in the short term.
- b) Request that officers seek alternative funding for the Bikeability Scheme through sponsorship or other funding streams in the longer term.
- c) Agree to receive further updates on both the funding situation and the uptake of training.

17. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MAY 2017

Economy and Environment Committee received the latest Finance and Performance Report for the period to the end of May 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 early stage of the year ETE was forecasting an overspend of £62K but cautioning that there were potential pressures within the Waste budget, which would be considered by Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee who had the responsibility for this area. All ETE budgets were being reviewed to identify any underspends which could be held, if required, to offset other pressures. A new addition to the report was a tracker report appendix which monitored the Business Plan savings and would be presented on a quarterly basis.

Capital; the capital budget had been revised to carry forward unused budget from 2016-17 and to reflect the latest planning phasing for the schemes. In terms of the land negotiations for Kings Dyke and the subsequent emerging pressures, this would be the subject of a report to the August meeting.

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

Comments made in discussion included:

- On page 105 one Member queried why the Guided Busway graph for passenger numbers was not showing an increase and had instead plateaued out. The Member commented that he would have expected an increase of passenger numbers with houses now being occupied in Northstowe. He also asked if the University Group U Service was included in the figures, as if so, he would again expected these to have contributed to increasing the figures. In response it was explained that the figures in the report only covered the period to the end of April and that guided busway passengers had in the past shown a 3.5 % increase year on year. The lead officer present indicated that he would check the May / June figures and get back to the Member. **Action: Bob Menzies.**
- Regarding the capital expenditure information provided in paragraph 3.2, one Member asked for further details to that provided in the summary text. In response it was explained that the review of the phasing of work due to service diversions for the Ely Bypass project related to delays with power cables, with more detail to be provided in the next report to the Committee. In respect of the Kings Dyke pressure issues, these were as a result of having to pay more for the land than had been expected following the land negotiations, which had been complicated by changes to the Compulsory Purchase Power regulations in 2015. An updated report would

be coming to the next meeting. Councillors Tierney and Connor requested a briefing on Kings Dyke following the meeting. **Action Bob Menzies.**

- Although not within the Committee's control, (it was within the Highways and Community Infrastructure (H and CI) Committee's remit) as the question was asked, on this occasion only, the Chairman indicated he would seek more information for Councillor Kavanagh on page 108 (page 14 of the specific report) regarding the text under the heading 'Parking Enforcement' reading "Income from city centre access cameras was currently ahead of budget but is not expected to continue at this level as drivers get used to the new restrictions" Councillor Kavanagh asked whether this was wholly in relation to income generated from enforcement, as there were concerns from Cambridge residents regarding a perceived lack of enforcement action. **Action: Councillor Bates to clarify where the money was obtained from.**
- One Member queried the staff sickness figure on page 104 reading "During May the total number of absences within Economy, Transport and Environment was 133 days based on 534 staff..." and whether this was unusually high. The response clarified that the 12 month rolling average had reduced to 3.00 days per full time equivalent, which was below the 6 day target and was therefore good, and that ETE were routinely the best directorate. The Member was interested in how the performance figure for ETE compared with previous years. **Action: Sarah Heywood**

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was resolved to:

note the report.

18. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

The agenda plan was noted.

As an oral update it was explained that item 1 "Waterbeach Waste Management Park" organised by H and CI Committee due to have been held on 12th July had been cancelled as only one Member indicated they could attend. A replacement date would be sought in September / October with Members to be consulted in due course on proposed dates.

Members were urged to respond to invitations so that officers could gauge in good time the demand for a proposed seminar. Concern was expressed that in the past, even when a seminar went ahead, some had been very sparsely attended.

In response on whether there were any further areas within the remit of the E and E Committee that Members considered that they needed training, there was a request for a seminar in due course (the Member accepted that it might be too early in the current year as the remits were still being developed) on the role and how the functions of the E and E Committee fitted into the decision making process in relation to the terms of reference of both the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Action: RVS and Cathryn Rutangye

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the Training Plan.
- b) Add a note to the Plan, that in due course when the governance issues were clearer, a training seminar should be convened on how the Committee related to the Combined Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership.

19. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

The forward agenda plan was noted with a request that the report 'Connecting Cambridgeshire - Superfast Broadband update' shown for the August meeting should also provide details of the current pilots being undertaken in three areas, including Cherry Hinton, Cambridge, on super superfast broadband known as ultrafast broadband and how they fitted in to the overall strategy. **Action: RVS to inform Noelle Godfrey of the requested addition.**

20. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 10th AUGUST 2017

Chairman 10TH August 2017

APPENDIX 1

MINUTE 15. WATERBEACH BARRACKS – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION - LETTER FROM CYCLING CAMPAIGN

Dear Councillor,

We hope that you have had the opportunity to read our objection to this planning application.

We are supportive of new development at the Waterbeach Barracks and we admire the bold aspirations of Urban & Civic for a modern, sustainable and well-connected community and their use of the Dutch city Vathorst as their inspiration.

However, the details of what has been proposed so far will inevitably fail to deliver on these aspirations and look nothing like the Dutch new towns that the applicants have claimed to be their inspiration.

Our vision for the Waterbeach Barracks development is for it to be the first development in the UK where every child can cycle or walk to school independently and safely. We know this can be done and we have the knowledge to help Urban & Civic achieve this goal. We believe that a development such as this is very marketable and would ensure a strong return for investors.

We also know that the demographic that will move to this development (E.g. Science Park workers and their families) are already cycling at rates of at least 30% for commutes and possibly higher for all journeys. With the right infrastructure, this rate can easily be increased. The proposals from Urban & Civic, however, indicate a reduction in cycling rates down to 4.5% or less, a strange figure that is well below existing Waterbeach levels of cycling. Either they lack aspiration or something has gone awry with their modelling.

We will be reaching out to Urban & Civic to work with them on their plans and we hope that you will support our vision for cycling as the key driver of a modern, sustainable and well-connected development as follows:

Point 1:

Take note that contrary to Appendix 2 paragraph 2.2, the location of Primary School 1 has been placed adjacent to a primary road through the site, and not only that, adjacent to a questionable "shared space" junction on the primary road. We have grave concerns about the safety of this setup.

Please amend the response so that it calls for a safe location for Primary School 1 (and all of the Primary Schools) away from any primary roads, that "shared space" junctions should not be used, and that there are safe, family-friendly walking and cycling routes leading from all of the homes to the school.

Point 2:

Amend the response paragraph 4.26 to say that the street cross sections are not acceptable because the primary streets lack protected and segregated provision for cycling.

Point 3:

In many paragraphs, the county has indicated the importance of having safe, protected,

attractive, separate footways and cycleways with safe, protected junctions usable by people of all ages & abilities. This applies both to routes on the site, and the connecting routes off the site that are agreed as part of the application. We agree with the county's response on these matters and hope to work together to ensure that these goals are met.

Yours sincerely,

Roxanne De Beaux
Cycling Campaign Officer