

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017

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

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

**Apologies:** None

**59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Fuller declared a non-statutory (non-pecuniary) disclosable interest as the Cabinet member for Housing and Planning at Huntingdonshire District Council who had provided comments on the report. With regard to the same report, Councillor Giles declared a disclosable non-pecuniary interest as a member of Huntingdonshire District Council.

**60. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

**61. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The Minutes Action Log update was noted.

**62. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions were received.

One Petition was received with over 150 signatures presented by Professor Tony Booth and John Hague reading "The residents of Trumpington are appalled at the recent cutting of the number seven service, following the earlier loss of the number 26 service. This particularly disadvantages people with young children, the elderly and disabled people, and those on low incomes. We want a regular service starting in the early morning and finishing late in the evening taking passengers into Cambridge City Centre and out to Shelford, Stapleford and Sawston".

In his presentation Professor Booth supported by John Hague suggested that the re-routing of the Citi 7 bus and the contraction of the 26 and 27 Bus services had, had a significant adverse impact on Trumpington residents. He stated that there was now no direct service into the city and the residents throughout Trumpington who had signed the petition were against the changes and did not believe that Stagecoach's proposed figure 8 service was the answer.

He understood that stagecoach had been lobbied by corporations on the bio-medical campus and believed this was the driving force behind the change. He suggested that its impact on residents had not been considered and had been told that Stagecoach were not obliged to undertake equality, environmental or sustainability impact assessments, which would have been a requirement if the County Council was wishing to change a service.

He highlighted that there was now no direct service to Long Road and Hills Road sixth form colleges and that there was only one service at 7.30 a.m. for children who attend Sawston Village College with the return bus leaving around 3.30 p.m. He suggested that this clearly disadvantaged children who had doctors' appointments or who wished to attend after school clubs. He also suggested that as a result, more parents were driving their children to school which added to the problems of congestion and environmental pollution. He also suggested the changes had significantly adversely impacted on the elderly and disabled people who relied on the bus service to get to Waitrose or the shops in Anstey way –particularly the chemist and post office. This had stopped some people from being able to collect their pension or pay their bills. The local chemist and opticians had highlighted to him that customers were having difficulty collecting prescriptions or attending for eyesight tests.

He additionally highlighted the adverse impact on low paid workers who started work at 7.00a.m. or earlier or who worked late in the evening. Stagecoach's stopgap solution of a temporary stop for the Park and Ride was not helping as it did not run early enough or run late enough. He suggested that the proposed new Figure 8 service proposed by stagecoach might help residents access the hospital but would not help people who work in Cambridge City. It was also stated that as a result of the change some people had lost their jobs. He stated that there was now no direct service to the main City Railway Station or to the station in Great Shelford and no service to the shops and other facilities in Saffron Walden or Royston or places in between.

He concluded by suggesting that Stagecoach seemed to have listened more to the concerns of powerful voices in Astra Zeneca or others at the Bio-medical campus than to the residents of Trumpington. On behalf of the petitioners he asked that the County Council ensure that Stagecoach reinstate services through Trumpington that were sustainable, environmentally friendly and equitable and which met the needs of all Trumpington residents.

Issues of clarification to the petition presenter/officers included:

- In answer to a question asking where they felt the root of the problem was the reply was that it was in respect of the lack of consultation and in seeking the views of the Trumpington residents and not undertaking the impact assessments (referred to in the presentation).
- Whether the petitioners were aware that the service was a commercial service run for profit by Stagecoach and that the Council, while having to be informed of a decision to suspend or change a service, did not have responsibility or powers to require a commercial company to reinstate a commercially operated bus route. In response, Professor Booth suggested that County and City Councillors were elected to stand up for citizens and should take notice where there was

substantial local concerns being expressed. They were lobbying councillors as their shareholders.

- Whether the Service had a good number of customers using it on a regular basis. In response this was difficult for him to answer as the Service was no longer running but it was indicated that the temporary bus service stopping at Anstey Way received good patronage.
- Whether local councillors had been asked to help. The reply was yes they had lobbied on their behalf.
- Asking had any dialogue been undertaken with the bus company regarding keeping the service running with local support. In reply the reply was yes but the bus company did not appear to be willing to restart the previous service suggesting that the company had indicated that they were not keen to run services into Cambridge.

The Committee expressed their sympathy for the position with all Councillors around the table experiencing similar issues in their own area. The experience being even more exacerbated in some of the rural areas of the County.

In asking the officer to clarify the position on this particular route it was confirmed that the decision to divert the bus to access the bio-medical centre was a decision made by Stagecoach and while the County Council were consulted, the decision to agree or not agree the decision to say yes or no was with the Traffic Commissioner, not the Council. **He indicated that officers would ask Stagecoach for details of the previous patronage figures for the bus before its discontinuation, (Action Paul Nelson)** but cautioned that they were not obliged to provide this information (*Note: on the grounds of commercial sensitivity*)

In summing up the Chairman explained that a full written reply to the issues raised in the petition would be provided within 10 working days following the meeting.

**It was resolved:**

To provide a written response to the petition organiser and spokesperson Professor Tony Booth within 10 working days.

**63. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK (ITB) FUNDING ALLOCATION PROPOSALS**

This report sought Members' comments and support for the proposed projects to receive ITB funding for Delivering transport strategy aims for rolling 3 year period from 2018-19 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report and Appendix 1 to these minutes.

It was explained that previously funding for the Local Transport Plan (LTP) from the Department for Transport (DfT) was received by the County Council as local highway authority. With devolution, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CA), is now responsible for the LTP and the associated funding, including the Integrated Transport Block and the Maintenance Block funding. At its meeting in April 2017 the CA Board agreed to passport the funding to Cambridgeshire County Council

and Peterborough City Council according to their respective indicative allocations. Funds were received for:

- the Integrated Transport Block (ITB),
- the Key route network elements of the Maintenance Block,
- 'Incentive', and
- National Productivity Investment Fund (non-competitive allocation)

The CA 2018/19 Budget setting strategy will consider how the 2018/19 LTP funds receivable from the DfT are managed and whether any elements of the LTP funding should be top-sliced to provide investment into the key route network. Until the CA budget proposal for transport and infrastructure is approved later in December, this report proposed to allocate the ITB funding as current year in accordance with the County Council's priorities. Should the ITB funding be top-sliced, it was proposed that the reduction should be taken from the Delivering Transport Strategy Aims budget category.

The report highlighted that the indicative LTP allocation for Integrated Transport was £3.19M. The allocation of the 2018/19 fund by budget category was proposed to be unchanged and was as follows with more detail in paragraph 2.1 of the report.

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Proposed 2018/19 allocation</b>
Air Quality Monitoring	£23K
Major Scheme Development	£200K
Strategy Development and Integrated Transport Schemes	£345K
Local Infrastructure Improvements	£682k
delivery funding made up of:	
Local Highway Improvement (LHI)	£607k
Accessibility	£15k
Right of way (RoW) improvements	£60k
Road safety schemes	£594k
Delivering Transport Strategy Aims	£1,346k
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,190k</b>

The detail for each was set out in the report. A progress update on the 2017/18 schemes indicated that most of the schemes with approved ITB funding are on track for completion section 5.1 of the report provided details of the four schemes experiencing delay with their funding to be carried forward which would not affect the 2018/19 budget. Appendix 3 of the report provided a mid-year progress update of all the schemes with committed 2017/18 funding.

The report proposed that allocation of ITB funding to the Papworth scheme (A1198 Ermine Street South to A428 new cycleway) should be on condition of match funding from Highways England's Designated Fund. Councillor Mandy Smith the Local Member for Papworth fully supported the recommendation thanking everyone involved for their hard work in developing the scheme.

In discussion issues raised included:

- Page 30 – Air quality monitoring allocation of £23k - One Member queried the value of this amount as it was such a small allocation and asked if it was added to by the District Councils. In response it was explained that the money was a contribution to the district councils own funding as the function was their responsibility and was the same figure as for the previous year. **Officers undertook to find out both how the money was distributed and also how much those district councils receiving funding contributed themselves. Action Elsa Evans.**
- Page 33 – Paragraph 5.2 reference to the £5,000 allocation for ‘County Wide Small scale bus stop facility improvements– one member suggested that this amount would be insufficient to install one bus stop facility. In response it was explained that this allocation was for minor work to improve bus stops / modifications to existing bus stops and was not for the installation of one entirely new bus stop facility.
- Page 49 – TIP ID 702 St Neots Eaton Ford – Green North Road Cycle Route Huntingdonshire reading ‘widening the footpath between Lowry Road and Queens Gardens’ - the local Member for St Neots and the Eatons commented that this was a footpath hardly currently used and suggested that this was an example of one that should be lower on the list and that the money would be better spent on other local schemes currently listed lower and asked if the list could be reviewed. It was suggested that the local member should take up any issues he had with the officers outside of the meeting.
- Page 52 - Appendix 5 - Delivering Transport Aims Scheme Scores – TIP ID 788 - Cambridge Road Fulbourn cycle improvements new lighting. The local member queried why this was still listed as the scheme was on the LHI approved list and was currently in hand to be installed and completed. **Action: Officer to write to the member with clarification.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Support the allocation to the ITB budget categories as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the officer report,
- b) Support the prioritised projects in Appendix 1 of the officer report for allocation of ITB funding in 2018/19, and earmarked for 2019/20 and 2020/21, and
- c) Support the prioritised projects in Appendix 1 for inclusion in the Transport Delivery Plan, subject to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority’s final budget allocation
- d) Confirm funding for the Papworth scheme (A1198 Ermine Street South to A428 new cycleway) is conditional on match funding from Highways England’s Designated Fund.

#### **64. LAND NORTH OF CHERRY HINTON - SPINE ROAD ASSESSMENT**

This report provided details of options for a spine road to support access to a new residential development north of Cherry Hinton which had divided opinion locally as in pre-consultation some residents and local members had expressed a strong preference for the link to be through road, while policy interpretation of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridge was to discourage vehicle traffic and help reduce congestion, with the preferences for achieving being by using either a bus gated route or a spine road designed to discourage through travel.

The current report provided details of a high level assessment carried out by consultants which had considered both a Bus Gate and a Complete Link using the section between Coldham's Lane and Gazelle Way junctions as the primary route through the site. Paragraph 2.9 of the report provided the pro and cons of the two options, with the detailed analysis presented in Appendices to the report. The current report concludes that while there were mixed pros and cons associated with either option, on balance the provision of a through route was recommended. Further analysis will be undertaken on whether this route should be a perimeter route or a route through the urban centre.

Councillor Crawford the local Member for Cherry Hinton spoke in support of the report recommendation stating she was also speaking on behalf of City Councillors who supported the report recommendations (City Councillor Mark Ashton had originally also intended to speak to fully support of the report recommendation) and residents from both Church End and Cherry Hinton. She highlighted the issues of gridlock in Cherry Hinton High Street and concerns that 1200 new homes could potentially lead to another 1200 cars. She therefore supported a spine road that could be used by estate people to avoid more traffic congestion on Church End and Cherry Hinton High Street. In reply to a question, the Member for Cherry Hinton explained that speed humps / cushions installed in Church End had not proved successful in alleviating traffic. She confirmed that a temporary road closure application had been submitted as it was recognised that there was still the potential for residents of the new estate to use the road as a rat run. In reply to another question she suggested that the spine road could go around the perimeter of the new estate to avoid going through residential housing, highlighting that currently traffic went through Church End and Cherry Hinton which was through residential housing areas.

In the subsequent debate issues raised included:

- The local Member for Fulbourn suggesting that as some traffic using Cherry Hinton High Street was using it to access Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Bio medical campus centre, the Spine Road was unlikely to reduce current levels of congestion on either Cherry Hinton High Street or on Church End, as the latter may still be used for rat running. He highlighted that the creation of a through road would adversely increase the amount of traffic on Coldham's Lane and the Coldham's Lane / Barnwell Road junction. His view was that new roads encouraged greater car use, especially when capacity was not being reduced on other roads. He indicated that he could not support the through road recommendation but had no issues with the report's second and third recommendations. In addition, he opposed the link through road as it went against the County Council policy to reduce car trips into Cambridge and

believed it would lead to more vehicle traffic through Fulbourn and Teversham. He suggested that even if it alleviated traffic in the short run, he believed that Cherry Hinton would have the same congestion problems in two or three years time.

- The above view was challenged by other members of the Committee who indicated that with proposed new settlements it was not practicable or appropriate to not provide vehicular access.
- One Member indicated that more roads did not necessarily result in congestion provided that there were sufficient entry and exit points.
- Another member opposed to additional road building suggested the Predict and Provide transport planning model was a total failure and that instead of encouraging more car traffic, there should be a greater provision of cycle routes / bus routes.
- The Council Cycling Champion supported the proposals for walking / cycling / public transport and suggested that siting the spine road on the outside of the development was the best way to ensure safe walking and cycling routes in a development.

In reply to questions raised, officers clarified that more detail on the sustainable transport proposals was included in the Supplementary Planning Document and would be further developed through an outline application. There was still flexibility regarding where the spine road should be positioned and more technical work was required to be undertaken before the outline proposal came forward.

As there had been a request to vote separately on the three recommendations, on being put to the vote for recommendation a) the vote was eight in favour, two against and no abstentions while recommendation b) and c) were approved unanimously.

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the spine road as a through route.
- b) Unanimously note - the option of a central versus a periphery route is flexible, with further assessment required on the relative merits.
- c) Unanimously note that the County Council requires a decision be made concerning the spine road design prior to an application for the site being submitted.

## **65. ST NEOTS NORTHERN FOOT AND CYCLE BRIDGE**

It was agreed at this Committee's November 2016 meeting that resources should be directed to developing a business case for a northern foot and cycle bridge in St Neots. The outline Business Case provided in Appendix 1 to the report resulted in a public

consultation on a new bridge. The current report sought determination of the preferred location for the bridge.

An option study on possible locations for the new bridge had recommended two possible locations north of the existing road bridge. These were largely dictated by where gaps existed in the building line on the east side of the river, and to the north by the presence of a nature reserve. An option of making alterations to the existing road bridge was also identified, and as the river south of the existing road bridge is much narrower than further north, a further option was considered in the study.

Section 2 provided details of the four options, section 3 the results of the consultation and section 4 details of the options appraisal methodology. Section 5 set out the proposed timetable programme, the funding required, and the key risks. In respect of funding, it was orally highlighted that the shortfall on the funding of £3m was to be covered by the Combined Authority.

The option appraisal process scoring suggested either Options One or Two. Both were favoured in the public consultation offering safer, more attractive onward journeys, ease of construction, and also fulfilled the original Market Town Transport Strategy aim of having a northern bridge to complement a southern one. Option Two was located relatively close to the existing main crossing of the river for pedestrians and cyclists, and by offering a safer, traffic free crossing with good quality approach routes was suggested as having greatest potential to meet the project's aims of encouraging more journeys by foot and cycle in the town. The officer recommendation was to proceed with progressing a design for a new bridge at location Option Two.

District Councillor Barry Chapman spoke in support of the proposed bridge as a much needed piece of infrastructure due to St Neots continued population growth which was currently the largest in the UK. It would also help reduce pollution as he highlighted that the High Street suffered the highest rate of pollution in the County. He explained that the current bridge did not have a cycle route so the proposals would provide a very necessary addition and encourage more people to switch from cars to bikes. He was however disappointed with the current proposed timescale and believed the Combined Authority was looking to deliver the project sooner rather than later, and he hoped that this would be before 2021.

A question to the District Councillor asked which option he supported. In response he indicated that while it was equally balanced between Options 1 and 2, his personal preference was for Option 2 which was more environmentally friendly and was less expensive. Another Member asked his opinion of Option 4. In reply he stated that the fourth option was seen as less popular, but would have been a more popular option if it had been combined with the Falcon development project.

In subsequent discussion issues raised included:

- Members thanked Councillor Giles who in his role as Town Council mayor had facilitated a valuable site tour visit.



- The Council Cycling Champion in expressing his support for Option 2 highlighted that Option 4 would be located near houses which could cause problems if adopted.
- One Member queried why Option 1 appeared more popular with the public? In response it was agreed there was a larger percentage who strongly supported Option 1, but when those that supported or strongly supported either Option 1 or 2 were added together, they were the same. In addition, the Town Council did not support Option 1 on both cost grounds and that if built, would spoil the view of the river. Councillor Giles added that he did not believe people who supported Option 1 had been aware of this at the time of the consultation. In addition, due to its location, more young people would need to continue to use the original bridge with the detrimental side effects of being exposed to greater levels of pollution.
- Highlighting that Huntingdonshire District Council also favoured Option 2.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Note scheme progress to date;
- b) Note the public consultation results;
- c) Support the proposal to site a bridge at location Option Two; and,
- d) Support the development of bridge design options for public consultation.

## **66. GRAFTON AREA OF MAJOR CHANGE – SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT - CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE**

This report presented the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response to the Grafton Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) prepared by Cambridge City Council. Due to the timings of the Committee, the response was submitted on 6 November 2017 following liaison with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

The plan at Appendix 1 to the report provided a high level overview of the key connections proposed and site opportunities. The CCC response was attached as Appendix 2 with the table in paragraph 2.3 of the report identifying the key transport proposals associated with the SPD and a summary of the feedback provided to Cambridge City Council. The response was supportive of the overall aspirations for the area, the connectivity enhancements proposed and the principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity. Proposals for cycle parking and the Public transport interaction were supported subject to the comments provided. The officers indicated that they required more detail regarding the proposals to move the bus stop to East Road as the present information did not justify the proposals. It was made clear in the response that the County Council did not support taxis using Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as a through route after 5.00p.m. as this would result in rat running with potential safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists.

As she was unable to attend the Committee, the Local Member for Petersfield had provided a written submission (included as appendix 2 to these Minutes) which was circulated to Members in advance of the meeting with paper copies made available at the meeting.

In discussion:

- The Committee member representing Fulbourn spoke in support of the objection to the proposals to allow taxis to use Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street as this would undo all the work to make it both an attractive and safe pedestrian thoroughway. He expressed his concern regarding the proposed removal of the bus station from the Grafton footprint to East Road as currently being off road they had time to dwell and when waiting to pick up passengers and was currently well used. He had serious concerns that the relocation onto east Road would result in greater congestion due to the impact on traffic flows when two to three buses were loading up with passengers.
- The County Council Cycle Champion expressed his full support to the concerns raised in the submission from the local member for Petersfield regarding allowing taxis after 5.00p.m. as being a completely retrospective move as this was re-allowing traffic to enter what had been for a long time pedestrian only streets. He therefore supported the robust response from the Council on this issue. He also warned against any hidden agenda regarding removing current cycle parking provision.
- It was suggested more detail was required regarding bus dwell times in any new configuration and on whether sufficient cycle spaces would be provided.

Having considered the response,

It was unanimously resolved to:

Endorse the County Council response, which was submitted to Cambridge City Council in early November 2017, in line with the consultation deadline.

## **67. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OCTOBER 2017**

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

The main issues highlighted were:

**Revenue:** at this stage of the year ETE was forecasting an overspend of £6k at year end. There was an estimated £1.6m pressure on waste an increase of £600k since the last report which came under Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee with underspends on the Concessionary Fares budget estimated at £400k and £250k from Highways Development Management to be used to offset the pressure.

The Adult Learning and Skills budget line was no longer showing in the report as it had

been vired out to the People and Communities budget. In addition as two performance indicators were previously reported for Adults Learning and Skills, only 12 performance Indicators would be tracked going forward.

**Capital; ‘Connecting Cambridgeshire’** was now showing slippage of £3.4. Delivery was on track but the expenditure had been re-phased into next year.

**Performance: on the revised suite of Twelve 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) two 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).

With regard to paragraph 4.5 - Passenger Transport - one Member highlighted that two sets of statistics had been produced for the number of passengers using the guided busway. There was a request for the officer to clarify which was the correct set. **Action: David Parcell to provide the clarification outside of the meeting. Update Note:** *two sets of figures were shown, one to the end of July and one to the end of August. The increased figure to the end of August was the more up to date set.*

It was resolved to:

note the report.

#### **68. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2018-2019 TO 2022-23**

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee. There had been no substantial changes since the previous report.

It was highlighted as an oral update that there was an error re two figures in appendix 5 pages 53 and 54 re the fees and charges with the amendments being as follows;

Internet email and access 2018/19 figures are under review and for Events for Adults the charge for 18/19 now reads £5 suggested donation.

The previous report to the October meeting had indicated that £5.540m of residual savings was still to be identified in 2018-19 with details of the action being taken to identify and close this gap set out in section 2 of the report. As a result, the unidentified savings had reduced by £2,808k but there was still £2.738k to be found, with work continuing to find ways to fill the gap with a further update to be provided in January.

Section 4 of the report set out an overview of the Economy Transport and Environment’s directorate draft revenue programme with section 6 providing details of the overview of the economy Transport and Environment Directorate’s draft capital Programme. Section 7 provided details of the Directorate’s fees and charges with the detail included in appendices 4 and 5. Discretionary charges were reviewed on an

annual basis taking account of the Council's standard inflation rate of 2.2% and changes in the market for the discretionary services. All statutory charges had been set at their legal maximum.

The Member for Fulbourn expressed his full support in respect of Section 4 B Revenue overview - budget heading B/R 4.015 'Removal of Park and Ride Parking Charges'. The funding to replace the income would come partly from partners, plus from the utilisation of Bus lane enforcement income.

It was noted that following the December Committees, General Purposes Committee would review the overall programme at their meeting on 19th December before recommending the programme in January as part of the overarching Business Plan for full Council to consider in February.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2018-19-2022-23 Business Plan Revenue proposals for the Service.
- b) To note the draft revenue proposals that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2018-19 to 2022-23

#### **69. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN**

The most up to date Training Plan was included. The Vice Chairman asked whether the seminar on the 18<sup>th</sup> December could include an update on the East West rail link. Officers agreed that this would be provided. **Action Bob Menzies to speak to relevant officers.**

The Committee noted the most up to date version of its Training Plan.

#### **70. 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:

'Wisbech Access Strategy' moved from the January to either the February or the March Committee meeting

'Mobile coverage and the Government Full Fibre Programme likely to be added to 11<sup>th</sup> January meeting

The following likely to be added to the February meeting:

- a) Ely Cambridge Transport Study recommendations and next steps
- b) Transport Scheme Prioritisation Process.

**71. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2018**

As it was the last meeting of the year, the Chairman thanked all the Committee Members for their contributions during the year and all the officers who supported the Committee and wished them all a happy Christmas and looked forward to seeing them in the New Year.

**Chairman:  
11th January 2018**

**Appendix 1 included as a separate document**

**Appendix 2**

**MINUTE 66 - COUNCILLOR LINDA JONES COMMENTS FOR COMMITTEE – GRAFTON  
AREA OF MAJOR CHANGE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT –  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (CCC) RESPONSE**

Dear Committee members

Thank you for inviting me as a local interested member to comment on the Grafton Centre issues. I cannot attend ETE on 7<sup>th</sup> December but would want you to take the following issues into account as you discuss the county's response to the Grafton Area Supplementary Planning document. I welcome and support the County Council's response to the plans for redevelopment, in particular the concerns raised about access and traffic flows. My key concerns, some of which are reflected in the CCC response, are as follows:

My division is directly affected by the redevelopment of the Grafton Centre yet there has been no direct consultation with residents of Norfolk St, the St Mathews area and the Staffordshire area estate. This is an area of dense housing and local residents who use the Grafton centre regularly. They will be heavily affected by noise, pollution and upheaval during the redevelopment process. This would also be true of other divisions bordering the area. It would be helpful to add something to the response about ensuring adequate wider consultation, although I realise that this might come at a later stage.

The particular concerns that I have relate to routes into the area from Norfolk st and Petersfield in general. The idea of reconfiguring East Rd and improving connectivity is a good one, but moving the bus stops onto the road has not been well thought through. It would result in pedestrians having to cross the road to reach bus stops with lack of clarity about safe crossing points. The removal of the off-road bus access points (and of the surface level West Grafton car park) is entirely about increasing retail space and not about local amenity.

The developer's proposal (4.5.4) to allow taxis to access Burleigh and Fitzroy streets after 5pm is extremely retrogressive and negates the claims to be improving the area for pedestrians

and shoppers. The proposal to make Burleigh St a 'primary route' as marked on the map, is very worrying and would change the whole character of the area. As the county council response makes clear, it also endangers pedestrians at the major crossing point of East Rd between Norfolk and Burleigh St. This is a very important junction for pedestrians and cyclists and provides safe access to the Grafton area. Yet this is proposed to be an access/egress point for taxis (4.2.24).

There is real confusion about what the future Fitzroy and Burleigh St area will look like, with claims for shared space and footways proposed (4.5.3) – a real muddle as the County response makes clear. This is a dangerous muddle and perhaps a deliberate one, designed to slip motor vehicles back into an area where they have been rightly excluded from, in order initially to enable taxis to use the route but perhaps in future to use this 'primary route' for access to the proposed new underground car park at Grafton west.

Alongside this, there is also a vagueness about cycle parking, with a proposal to remove some on-street parking – which is highly valued, very well used and indeed at present only just sufficient for local needs. The current secure parking further along East Rd is in the wrong place – too far away and very little used – and I have a concern that this may be seen as providing sufficient spaces. We know from elsewhere in the city that lack of cycle parking space in the right place results in cycles obstructing footways to the detriment of pedestrians.

I fear that the developers do not value pedestrians and cyclists and would like to tidy them away as they open up the area for motor vehicles, with a resultant increased in noise, pollution and congestion for local residents in my own and other divisions.

Linda Jones Labour County Councillor for Petersfield, Cambridgeshire E:  
[linda.jones@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:linda.jones@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)