

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> June 2005

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.

**Present:** Councillor J K Walters (Chairman)

**Councillors:** S F Johnstone V H Lucas, M W McGuire, L J Oliver, D R Pegram, J E Reynolds, and F H Yeulett

**Apologies:** Councillors J A Powley and J M Tuck

**Also in Attendance:** Councillors I C Bates, P J Downes and S J E King

### **11. MINUTES 24<sup>th</sup> MAY 2005**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **12. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None made.

### **13. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

No issues.

### **14. DECISIONS FOR COUNCIL**

No decisions to be made.

### **15. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN**

This report had been withdrawn and would be resubmitted in an updated form to the July Cabinet meeting.

### **16. A14 ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON PUBLIC CONSULTATION – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE**

Cabinet received a report in order to agree the main elements of the County Council's response to the Highways Agency's (HA) Public Consultation on its proposals for the improvement to the A14, Ellington To Fen Ditton.

It was considered that the HA proposals presented a fair representation of the original Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal study (CHUMMS) proposals for the improvement of the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton and were generally welcomed. However, the County Council recognised that further traffic modelling was required to determine the impact of severing the existing A14 by the removal of the Huntingdon Viaduct and to ensure that the provision of a

new junction on Brampton Road would not cause unacceptable traffic congestion in Huntingdon. There was also concern that the Highways Agency alternative proposal to replace the Huntingdon Viaduct would allow all through traffic, including heavy commercial vehicles (HCVs), into Huntingdon, and would therefore not substantially improve the environment in Huntingdon.

Disappointment was expressed that the HA had not reinstated their exhibitions beyond the period 17<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> May, following their withdrawal after only two days at the end of March, due to the General Election.

Other issues of concern related to the proposed standard of the new A14 south of Huntingdon which the County Council believed should be a three lane dual carriageway to take account of longer term needs and the varying standards of the new local roads alongside the A14, all of which the Council believed should be made up to dual carriageway standard. Another issue highlighted as an issue was the Girton Interchange, which the County Council believed should have provision for direct A14 to A428 and A428 to M11 linkages. A lack of these was likely to increase rat running in the surrounding villages.

In line with the provisions of the Cabinet Procedure Rules, the Chairman agreed to the requests made in advance by Councillors Downes and Bates (local members with electoral divisions affected by the A14 proposals) to be able present their views to Cabinet.

Councillor Downes, whilst supporting the general principles of the Council's proposed reply, tabled a short paper and a map requesting Cabinet's support for additional paragraphs to be included as part of the response to the Highways Agency. These were for an alternative proposal to the widening of the A1 to six lanes on the stretch south of Brampton Hut. This proposal aimed to reduce the environmental impact on Brampton, especially from noise, if the current proposals went ahead. The alternative proposal involved diverting the A1 coming south from Alconbury to the west of Brampton Hut to join the A14 in an all-ways junction. It was then proposed that the A14 going south should be expanded to a width of 6 lanes, leaving the present A1 with four lanes. Whilst not opposed to this proposal, Cabinet was unwilling to support it until the views of the HA had been sought, particular concerns being expressed about providing reasons for the HA to delay delivery of the overall scheme. However, the issue of environmental impact was a particular concern to Cabinet and it was indicated that the technical response would seek to ensure that all opportunities should be taken to minimise noise impact not only at Brampton, but at all affected areas along the proposed A14 route. Reference would also be made to the noise reduction measures already successfully used on the A1(M).

Councillor Bates agreed with the general principles that a three-lane dual carriageway for the A14 was the only option and that timely implementation was crucial. He considered that the general line of the A14 was acceptable. His concerns related to rat running, stating that this had increased at surrounding villages at the five junctions within his electoral division following the original A14 opening. He was concerned that an additional junction at the A1198 could

encourage additional rat running. He therefore did not support this proposal and did not see a need for a junction at this point. He considered the fewer junctions the better. He was particularly concerned to be kept informed and involved as a local member of the progress of the traffic impact study and stated that it was important that traffic modelling should address rat running. In response, the portfolio holder for Environment and Community Services stated that he hoped that there would be a full and detailed study in order to understand the traffic movements in Huntingdon and would progress consultation arrangements with local members.

Tabled at the meeting were proposals for an additional recommendation regarding the maximum height of the new river Ouse viaduct, in order to minimise environmental impact. Currently the HA proposal was for a height of 11 metres which was excessive in terms of the clearance required and was environmentally inappropriate. Also put forward was a new paragraph 6.1.5 suggesting the need for additional slip roads at the Brampton Hut and A14 Junction to link the A1 to the A14 to avoid increasing queues building up at the Brampton Hut roundabout. Minor changes were also proposed to the existing paragraphs 6.4.1 and 6.7.2 to include the most up to date information now available. The replacement paragraph 6.4.1 was an update following the revised Highways Agency proposal to create a combined Fen Drayton and Trinity Foot junction which would give direct access to Cambridge Services and also to Swavesey.

The replacement paragraph 6.7.2 was to update the housing figures to include houses also approved in Little Paxton, close to St Neots.

In respect of the minimum height for the new river Ouse viaduct, after discussion it was agreed that the extra recommendation being proposed should be specific in stating that the maximum height should be no greater than 5.5 metres.

It was resolved:

- 1) To agree that the County Council welcomed the Highways Agency's proposals to upgrade the A14 from Ellington to Fen Ditton, and fully supported the "orange" route proposed to the south of Godmanchester and Brampton on the basis that it must be to a three lane dual carriageway standard, as well as supporting the principle of separating through traffic from local traffic as reflected in the limited junction approach;
- 2) To agree to urge the Highways Agency to deliver the scheme as soon as possible, highlighting the following important detail points in response to the consultation:
  - i) The need for a traffic, economic and environmental study to consider the impact on the Huntingdon area of the new 3 lane A14 scheme to the south of Huntingdon

with a view to examining options such as the old A14 through Huntingdon remaining available for high quality public transport and local movements and /or the need for other measures, including the potential replacement of the viaduct, along with a ban on through lorry traffic. The wider traffic impact of a new junction with the A1198 should also be included. This Study should explore the local “vision” for Huntingdon.

- ii) The requirement for a full dual 2 lane carriageway on the local road between Fen Drayton and Bar Hill.
- iii) Stating the Council’s opposition to the original inadequate links to Cambridge Services at Swavesey, and its support for the new alternative improved access to Cambridge Services.
- iv) That the County Council considered it essential to provide slip roads between the A428 and the A14 towards Huntingdon and between the A428 and the M11 at Girton Interchange, to take account of Sub-Regional traffic growth pressures particularly from Northstowe, Cambourne and other locations in the A14/A428/ A421 corridor.
- v) The need for the scheme to take account of the additional journeys generated by local growth pressures, in particular consideration should be given to the extension of the scheme beyond Fen Ditton in the context of the eastern expansion of Cambridge.
- vi) The need for the provision of adequate environmental ameliorative measures for residents affected by the scheme.
- vii) The safeguarding and enhancement of Public Rights of Way along and across the corridor. This should include provision for non-motorised users and appropriately located bridges. In this respect the County Council considered that a pedestrian / cycle bridge at Impington would be justified.
- viii) The need for full reimbursement by Government of any ongoing Council maintenance costs arising from the scheme.
- ix) To express the County Council’s concern at the proposed height of the new River Ouse Viaduct and urge the Highways Agency to press the environment Agency to agree a height of no more than 5.5 metres

height, in order to minimise the environmental impact and land take of the viaduct and its adjacent embankments.

- x) Agreement to a new paragraph 6.1.5 titled “Brampton Hut and A14 Junction” to read “Concern is expressed at the traffic congestion currently building up at Brampton Hut interchange and the Highways agency is asked to consider whether its proposed junction arrangement might be further improved through the provision of additional slip roads to link the A1 to the A14”
- xi) Replacement paragraphs to the existing 6.4.1 and 6.7.2 in the printed report submitted to Cabinet to read as follows:
  - 6.4.1 The County Council notes that there is no direct access to Northstowe onto the A14, access to St Ives and the surrounding villages is circuitous, and Bar Hill and some villages along the A14 corridor will no longer have direct access to the A14.
  - 6.7.2 Additionally, significant growth is materialising along the A428 corridor, including developments at Papworth, the completion of Cambourne and in the St Neots area, where over 2,000 houses have been approved. Given the proximity of the new town of Northstowe, movement between these sites should be accounted for now, through planning for these links.
- 3) That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to make changes to the submission in the light of further information from the Highways Agency or requests from key partners. This authorisation to extend to the submission of an addendum to the officers’ report, to safeguard the County Council’s technical and other interests under this scheme.
- 4) That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to agree with the district councils and other key partners a joint statement of general support for the proposals.

## **17. WASTE PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) PROCUREMENT**

Cabinet received a report requesting approval to required updates to the terms of reference of the Waste PFI Procurement Board.

As a result of the reshaping of the Council from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005, the previous Member designated roles agreed at Cabinet in January 2005 for the Waste PFI Procurement Board now no longer existed. It was therefore necessary to approve the new Cabinet portfolio designations and to revise the terms of reference accordingly.

In respect of Appendix A and the schedule of procurement responsibilities, a Member raised the point that Cabinet required more information on timing issues, suggesting an updated schedule should be provided with timescales against each procurement activity.

It was resolved:

- i) To authorise the appointment to the Waste PFI Procurement Board of:
  - the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services
  - the Leader of the Council
  - the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services as a substitute for the Leader of the Council where necessary.
- ii) To approve the revised Terms of Reference reflecting the above appointments as set out in appendix A to the officers' report.
- iii) To receive a report back in due course regarding the timescales for the procurement activity set out in the schedule of procurement responsibilities in the report's appendix.

## **18. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

Cabinet received a progress report on matters delegated to individual Cabinet members or to officers on behalf of the Cabinet.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the delegations from Cabinet to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers to make decisions/take actions on behalf of the Cabinet, which had been, or were still to be discharged.

## **19. CABINET DRAFT AGENDA – 12<sup>th</sup> July 2005**

It was resolved to note the Cabinet Draft Agenda Plan for 12<sup>th</sup> July 2005.

Chairman  
12<sup>th</sup> July 2005