

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 29th September 2009

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.25 p.m.

Present: Chairman Councillor J M Tuck

Councillors: M Curtis, Sir P Brown, S. Criswell, D Harty, L W McGuire R Pegram, J Reynolds and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors T Orgee

Also Present: Councillors K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, N Clarke, P Downes, N Harrison, D Jenkins, S Johnstone, G Kenney, L Nethsingha, L Oliver, C. Shepherd, M Smith, T Stone, J West, F Whelan, M Williamson and K Wilkins

35. MINUTES 8th SEPTEMBER 2009

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 8th September 2009 were approved as a correct record.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Members declared interests as follows:

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as the chairman of Renewables East and as a member on the Fringes Planning Panel in agenda items 6 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan Submission Plan', item 8 'Bock Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan - Supplementary Planning Document Consultation', item 9 'The Location and Design of Waste Management facilities Supplementary Planning Documentation' etc and item 10 'The Recycle for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Partnership Waste Management Design Guide Draft Supplementary Planning Document' etc.

Councillor McGuire declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in agenda item 12 'Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders' as a Huntingdonshire District Councillor.

Councillor Harty declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in agenda item 12 'Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders' as a Huntingdonshire District Councillor.

Councillor Criswell declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in agenda item 12 'Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders' as a Huntingdonshire District Councillor.

37. PETITIONS

A) Petition against De Freville Estate Parking Controls.

Andrew Watson presented a petition of 227 signatures which read: We the undersigned, residents of De Freville Estate, petition Cambridgeshire County Council to take into account the views of the majority of respondents to the Council's survey of February 2009, and not to implement parking controls on any of our streets. We specifically oppose the plan proposed by the Cambridge City Area Joint Committee (AJC) on 27th April 2009 to implement a resident's parking scheme on a subset of the estate's streets, since this would reduce the number of parking places available to residents of those streets while displacing any non-resident parking on the rest of the estate".

A fuller summary of Andrew Watson's speech is set out in Appendix A.

In response Councillor McGuire thanked the petitioners and agreed that the views expressed would be taken into account by officers when preparing a report on parking controls and issues associated with the AJC decisions taken on 27th April 2009 which was to be included on the 20th October Cabinet agenda under the provisional title "Cambridge Area Joint Committee Operational Matters". All petitions received in relation to issues relating to that report received in advance would be taken into account by the officers when preparing the report.

B) Petition regarding Blinco Grove Parking Controls.

This petition did not come forward but was likely to be submitted to the 20th October Cabinet meeting and if received early would be taken into account in the report being prepared for that meeting.

C) Petition of 55 signatures from Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Action Group regarding South Cambridgeshire Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Issues as set out in report 15 on the agenda.

The Chairman of the Action Group John Penny spoke in support of the following petition which was also supported by a previous petition of 1300 signatures which read:

"We, the undersigned, request that Cambridgeshire County Council objects to the proposed inclusion of the Gypsy and Traveller site at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn by South Cambridgeshire District Council in its Development Plan Document on the grounds that:

- The history and risk of flooding in Spring Lane and its environs and the potential for pollution of the aquifer if there was mixed use on the site.
- South Cambridgeshire District Council have failed to make even a basic cost assessment and evidence shows considerable expense will be incurred in providing the infrastructure to support the site.
- No consideration is given to the lack of employment opportunities or the impact of developments, including the affordable housing currently under construction, on County Council services.
- The area approaching and beyond the proposed site is much used by residents and others from outside the village as an important local recreational amenity for walking, cycling, exercising dogs and family strolls into the countryside. The access road is earmarked for an extension to the national cycleway.

- Loss of high grade agricultural land.
- The schools were already overburdened in the area and this would be an additional cost on their resources”.

He also indicated in his oral presentation that Bassingbourn was the 6th most expensive site and that the additional 5 pitches being requested would result in actual costs of £450K in two years and questioned whether this represented good value for money.

The petition spokesperson was thanked for his presentation and invited to stay to hear the debate and decision on the report included later on the agenda. The contents of the petition and presentation were considered along with written and oral submissions regarding the various sites from Councillors Johnstone, Oliver, Jenkins, van de Ven, Williamson and Wijenback when considering agenda item 15 (see minute 39 and Appendix B)

D) Petition to oppose the building of a cyclepath / footway between Milton Impington if this will lead to the loss of the school bus.

Jane Coston spoke in support of this petition. The issues raised were considered along with oral and written representations from Councillors Williamson, Clarke, Jenkins, Kenney, Gymer and from the chair of school governors at Milton Primary School. A transcription of the speech made at Cabinet is included in Appendix A.

The petition spokesperson was thanked for her presentation and invited to stay to hear the debate and the decisions on the report included later on the agenda. The Cabinet Member for Learning Councillor Harty indicated that he would be taking on board the issues in relation to school sizes raised in a number of the representations.

E) A 267 Signatures Petition regarding opposition to Recycling Centre Southern Fringe had been made available to Cabinet several days before the meeting which read:

“We the undersigned object strongly to the proposal to site a Household Waste Recycling Centre in the Green Belt south of the new Addenbrookes access road.

Although the new developments in Trumpington will have local recycling facilities, we know that there needs to be a larger recycling facility to serve the southern part of the city and surrounding villages. However, the proposed site is close to the houses on Shelford Road and the new development planned for Glebe Farm. It will attract many more cars and lorries to the area. A large warehouse with car and lorry access, parking and loading bays is not appropriate for a green belt site.

We consider that other sites identified in a previous search are more suitable for this industrial scale facility. We therefore ask the County Council Cabinet to reject the current proposal.”

The above petition had been received in April and had been passed to officers by former Councillor Kent and while no speaker was present and Anne Kent had been unable to attend to speak on behalf of the petition, the views had been taken into account when preparing the report at agenda item 6 “Cambridgeshire And Peterborough Minerals And Waste Plan - Submission Plan” (Note the officers would be responding to Anne Kent to

inform her of the final decision agreed by Cabinet which was taken later in the meeting see Minute 43)

38. ISSUES FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – None received

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

In order to allow petitioners to hear the decisions on reports which they had made representations as early as possible it was agreed to take the two reports 'South Cambridgeshire Gypsy And Traveller Development Plan Document Issues And Options Report 2 Site Options And Policies And Longer Term Implications' and 'Cambridge – Cycling Town' next in the agenda running order.

39. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD) ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT 2 SITE OPTIONS AND POLICIES AND LONGER TERM IMPLICATIONS

Cabinet received a report in order to consider South Cambridgeshire District Council's (SCDC) Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) published for consultation including the implications for County Council owned sites.

Cabinet noted that in accordance with Planning Circulars 01/06 and 04/07 South Cambridgeshire District Council was required to set criteria for the location of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites and allocate land within their area for the number of pitches and plots identified in the East of England Plan. The plan identifies sites in order to meet an urgent need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and to address the needs of Travelling Showpeople.

Following a sifting and testing process against relevant planning criteria, 20 sites had been carried through to the current consultation for Gypsy and Traveller provision, with additional provision for transit pitches (one site) and Travelling Showpeople plots (one site). Of these sites, the following three were on County Council property and were under active consideration as part of this consultation:

- Land at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn – new site for Gypsy and Traveller provision.
- New Farm, Old North Road, Whaddon – expansion of existing site for Gypsy and Traveller provision
- Blackwell site, near Milton, Cambridge – existing site of residential pitches proposed to be used for transit purposes.

A number of submissions were made to the Cabinet meeting including those from a local residents action group, the tenant of Haygate Farm (submitted since the report had been produced) and from local Councillors opposing the proposals for Bassingbourn and Willingham. It was agreed that all the representations received, including those received at the Cabinet meeting would be considered in the preparation of the final submission to be made to South Cambridgeshire District Council for their due consideration before making a final decision. A summary of the representations made is included as Appendix B to these minutes.

The Cabinet member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning provided a response indicating:

- The County Council acknowledges the petition received from local residents and the concerns they have expressed relating to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn.
- This site is known to be susceptible to surface water flooding and the proposed response requests that the District Council seek the Environment Agency's advice in relation to flood risk for this site.
- District Council has undertaken initial work looking at relative costs for this site but further work will need to be undertaken as the document is progressed and a planning application were to be submitted.
- The proposed response requests further discussions between the County and district officers in relation to the additional pressures on county services including both primary and secondary schools at Bassingbourn, Cambourne and Willingham required further to ensure that the sites at these settlements could be accommodated.
- In terms of employment opportunities the village Bassingbourn has been identified by the District Council as a better served Group Village which is suitable for small scale residential development and access to public transport and services have been considered in the site assessment process.
- No objections have been made by officers in relation to highway matters associated with this site.
- The assessment made by the District Council suggests that this site would have a limited landscape impact.
- The District Council is required to consider the potential loss of high quality agricultural land together with other sustainability considerations. However national planning guidance states that this is not an overriding constraint to development.
- Fire and rescue services will have the opportunity to appraise and comment upon the planning applications.

Cabinet made the following points:

- The District Council needed to take account of all the views received and to carefully consider what residents were saying.
- The Cabinet Member for Learning would wish to ensure the concerns around education provision schools and the impact on existing pupils in schools in affected areas would be taken up with the District Council
- A question was raised with regard to the land referred to at the top of page 7 between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (University site) and whether this was fettered in terms of it only being available for university purposes. It was indicated that while that would be its primary purpose the University would need to comply with planning requirements and that the issues raised by the member would be brought to the attention of the district council.
- The need for new and existing sites to be properly and responsibly managed and for Registered Social Landlords to be non discriminatory.
- Raising a question of how much travellers had been involved in respect of site selection. In response it was reported that they had been part of the review of traveller needs undertaken several years ago and have subsequently been involved in the preparation of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree the draft County Council response to the South Cambridgeshire Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document consultation subject to due consideration to the issues raised in the representations received including those made at the meeting. (A summary of which are set out in Appendix B of these minutes.)
- ii) To delegate to the Portfolio holders for Growth Infrastructure and Strategic Planning and Resources and Performance, in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services and the Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance, the authority to amend the draft response taking into consideration the submissions received orally and in writing to enable a final response to be submitted by the closing date of 9 October 2009.

40. CAMBRIDGE – CYCLING TOWN

Cabinet received a report in respect of the recent consultation on a programme of proposed new and improved cycleways seeking approval to further develop some schemes towards implementation.

Cabinet noted that Cycling England (CE) had been tasked by the Government with delivering a national programme to increase cycling levels, creating examples of best practice and demonstrating what could be done with the sort of levels of investment in cycling that was found in much of continental Europe. The County Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) had been successful in its bid to become one of 11 new Cycling Towns and this would provide £3.6m of additional funding which requires match funding up until April 2011.

In order to ensure the 2009/10 allocation of £1.55m was spent, a number of schemes that could be regarded as ‘quick wins’ had been taken forward to public consultation. Having set out the results of the consultation, Cabinet was asked to approve six South Cambridgeshire Cycleway schemes developing further and commencing construction.

The local Member for Fulbourn spoke as a local member in support of the Horningsea to Fen Ditton cycleway which was potentially a very important strategic cycleway being a gateway to the fens, cited that the large turnout of residents for the consultation events at Horningsea Village hall and at Fen Ditton Church Hall in support of the cycleway represented local democracy in action. He indicated that the route was about the right distance to cycle and would meet local residents needs in helping protect children who currently had to cycle beside a busy road. In addition, the proposed A14 junction improvement would make the road even busier.

Councillor Jenkins as one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington applauded the paper congratulating officers for being very open early on in respect of the proposals. He supported the proposed Cottenham to Histon cycleway as being an absolute necessity highlighting the dangers of the current narrow, unlit cycleway which was not currently separated from the main road. In terms of the Histon to Cambridge cycleway he had the same comments as above but also reminded Cabinet of the current speed limit / HCV / freight reviews and the need to ensure all reviews were joined up in terms of

planning future provision in terms of ensuring safety for cyclists, citing the A14 junction as requiring a safe crossing to avoid an otherwise inevitable future fatality.

While declaring a personal interest as a school governor at Impington Village College he considered that the first line in paragraph 2.11 of the report reading “that this scheme will provide a safe route for children from Milton to cycle or walk to Impington” should be deleted as an editorial comment as it was both speculative and conflicted with paragraph 2.13 which stated that “It is possible that free school bus travel could be withdrawn for Milton children attending Impington Village College once the route is in place. This would be determined by a separate process with full local consultation once the cycle route is complete” and therefore his view was that at the current time it could not be determined that the route was safe. He suggested that the officers needed to look very carefully at this route and the reasons for it being undertaken and while supporting the proposed cycleway provision, future decisions on the current free bus provision required to be kept separate.

In respect of the Milton to Impington cycle route, along with the petition, there had been other objections opposing the building of the cycleway (a letter from the chair of Governors at Milton Primary School who was seeking rejection for the proposals to implement Milton Cycle Path on the grounds of safety if it involved losing free bus travel to Milton Students attending Impington Primary School) which were also taken into consideration having been made available to Cabinet members before the meeting (attached at appendix C to these notes) Comments received from local members Councillors Gymer and Williamson were also taken into consideration and have also been reproduced in Appendix C to these minutes.

It was clarified orally at the meeting that any decision on this particular issue should be the subject of a separate process with full local consultation once the cycle route was completed and further consideration given to whether the cycle route was safe for children. Assurances were provided that any final decision would be based on ensuring school children’s safety was paramount.

Councillor Kenney as one of the local members for Sawston while fully supporting the Harston to Cambridge cycle route made reference to the results of the consultation exercise suggesting that the poor number of attendees (17) at the consultation programme event held at Harston Hall on 27th August was as a result of insufficient notice having been given for the event (a week).

Approval was also sought to the proposed Hills Road Bridge Safety Scheme pilot scheme to segregate cycle users from car traffic through the introduction of ‘hybrid cycle lanes’. It was reported that it was expected that the results of the trial would be presented to Cabinet in January to allow a final decision to be made as to whether to proceed with the substantive hybrid lane layout following the end of the trial period and an analysis of the results.

It was resolved:

- (i) To note the results of the consultation.
- (ii) To give approval for the following schemes to be developed further and implemented:
 - Cottenham to Histon

- Histon to Cambridge
- Harston to Cambridge
- Babraham Road Park & Ride to Wandlebury
- Fen Ditton to Horningsea
- Milton to Impington

- (iii) To approve the proposed Hills Road Bridge Safety Scheme pilot scheme for the introduction of 'hybrid cycle lanes'.

41. TRANSPORT INNOVATION FUND (TIF) – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Cabinet received a report setting out details in respect of the Cambridgeshire Independent Transport Commission's Report for Cambridgeshire County Council, July 2009 and its recommendations in order to consider the suggested response to the recommendations of the Commission for final full Council approval.

Cabinet was reminded that the role of the Commission was to review the TIF proposals and identify if there were other options for tackling congestion.

Cabinet noted that on the issue of a congestion charge, the Commission had found a wide range of opinion than was the case for the proposed package where there was strong support, but by far the majority view was that such a measure could only be acceptable if there had been significant investment in the basic transport infrastructure prior to its implementation. The Commission also indicated that before a charge could be implemented, there should be a detailed debate with the public and local stakeholders to agree the point at which congestion would become unacceptable and a charge should be implemented – the Commission referred to this as a trigger point.

In addition to the detailed conclusions around the proposed transport investment package and the principle of a congestion charge, the Commission also considered a range of other specific points that were raised with them. Two notable conclusions were:

- The development of any package around TIF should embrace the views of local stakeholders and particularly the district councils. To that end, a group that the Commission referred to as the *Transport Partnership for Cambridgeshire* was recommended to be created to develop future transport thinking in the area;
- Suggestions for an Integrated Transport Authority for the area were dismissed as unnecessary and confusing and it was noted that the current joint working between councils was effective but still had room for improvement.

The proposals were included at appendix C of the report and outlined the submission, reflecting both the scale and nature of the level of investment being sought from the Government and seeking Council approval to submit the proposal to the Department for Transport for their appraisal and consideration later in October with a view to the County Council receiving a response to the three stage submission by the end of this calendar year. Stages 1, 2 and 3 were outlined in paragraph 3.4 of the report. Appendix D which was the full proposition document had not been finalised at the time of the second despatch

of the agenda, but had been made available to Cabinet Members and Group Leaders under limited distribution due to its size, a few days before the Cabinet meeting.

An oral update provided at the Cabinet meeting indicated that at the Joint Transport Forum meeting on 24th September the meeting had supported the proposals for Chesterton Station as part of the Stage 1 submission. District council partners on the forum had emphasised the need for early engagement between the County Council, district councils and local stakeholders on stage 2 (the outline bid for the balance of the transport investment package). Particular issues highlighted as requiring further negotiation would be in respect of carbon reduction measures / monitoring issues, the strategy for the city centre and the trigger points for any possible future introduction of congestion charging.

Questions were raised regarding:

- What assurances could be given by officers in relation to the access that would be provided should Chesterton station be built. It was explained in reply that access arrangements would need to be negotiated / agreed in the near future. In addition the Guided Busway link funding would also need to be secured as part of the TIF process. The legal powers to provide this access had already been agreed through the Transport and Works Act process.
- In terms of a question on where funding would be secured for upgrading roads to link the Chesterton rail station, officers reported that these were included in the overall cost of the scheme as was the case with the car parking provision of 400 places. 10 % of the total scheme would need to be found locally and at present it was assumed this would be provided from local section 106 funding agreements.
- In terms of Chesterton Station creating its own traffic, officers were asked if they were able to assess the level of local congestion that was likely to occur and whether traffic would be diverted away from Cambridge main station. In reply it was indicated that as Chesterton Station would have its own new car park with provision for 400 spaces, it would reduce car journeys in the city to the main Cambridge Station. It was estimated that 80% of car trips to the Cambridge Central Station were from the north of the city and could be intercepted by using Chesterton Station.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the Cambridgeshire Transport Commission's Report for Cambridgeshire County Council, published in July 2009 and its recommendations.
- ii) To endorse the suggested response to the recommendations of the Commission, and the proposed 'Package and Funding Proposition, September 2009' subject to any required minor adjustments for consideration by Full Council on 13 October.
- iii) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services to make any final minor textual changes to the proposed 'Package and Funding Proposition, September 2009' prior to consideration by Full Council.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Due to there being a number of local members wishing to speak on the Guided Busway report Cabinet agreed that the report should be brought up in the order of the agenda and taken next in the running order.

42. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY UPDATE

Cabinet received a report relating to two specific issues in relation to the construction and completion of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.

Cabinet noted that the maintenance track running alongside the Guided Busway was also a bridleway, footway and cycleway and the original plan had been to construct the track from compacted granular material. While this type of surface was suitable for leisure and recreational cycling, it was later considered that an all weather surface would encourage more cycle commuting, particularly at the Cambridge end of the route. As a result, Cabinet agreed in July 2006 to amend the scheme to include a blacktop surface on the maintenance track between Milton Road and Histon and throughout the Southern Section.

The current report to Cabinet explained the history of why it has not been possible to reach agreement up to now on this issue and provided details of a new proposal put forward by BAM Nuttall. The new proposal provided a blacktop surface to the maintenance track between Milton Road and Park Lane without any additional delay for a lump sum price of £340,000 subject to the agreement of satisfactory contractual terms which was within the anticipated range of the work.

In written comments Cllr Gymer one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington supported the decision to provide a blacktop surface to the maintenance track between Milton Road and Park Lane and was pleased that an agreement had been reached.

Cabinet was also informed that the plans for the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway also included a small short stay car park and turning area near to the Swavesey stop on the Busway to allow for passengers to be dropped off and picked up, known colloquially as a 'Kiss and Ride' and is the only facility of this type on the route. The proposed facility had been the subject of a contractual dispute with the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway contractor and therefore expert legal advice received is that the financial risks would be best managed by deleting the car park from the current contract.

Representations were received at the Cabinet meeting from the local members representing both Willingham and Papworth and Swavesey who expressed strong concerns and disappointment about the proposed non-provision of this facility and sought assurances regarding the need on safety grounds for there to be robust, regular monitoring in respect of keeping the cycleway free from parked cars and taking immediate action when such violations occurred, as well as highlighting the dangers associated with drivers turning inconsiderately near to the Swavesey stop. Cllr Gymer supported any parking/dropping off points to access the Guide-way and expressed disappointed that they could not be actioned sooner.

Councillor Jenkins speaking as a local member suggested that at the same time the maintenance track was prepared, serious consideration should be given to stud lighting

being put in place, since the track heading into open country would not have any lighting at night.

Cabinet having listened to the views of local members and also taken into careful consideration the legal advice received, agreed to support the removal of the Swavesey short stay car park from the BAM Nuttall CGB contract in order to mitigate the risk of financial overruns but agreed that officers should ensure that regular monitoring was undertaken place once the Guided Busway was operational to ensure cycleways were kept free of parked cars.

It was resolved:

- i) To accept BAM Nuttall's proposal to provide a blacktop surface to the maintenance track between Milton Road and Park Lane, subject to satisfactory contractual arrangements being concluded.
- ii) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services final agreement on the contractual arrangements for surfacing of the maintenance track as detailed in recommendation (i) above;
- iii) To approve the removal of the Swavesey short stay car park from the BAM Nuttall CGB contract in order to mitigate the risk of financial overruns.
- iv) To agree to reconsider the provision and affordability of the short stay car park after completion of the Guided Busway.

43) CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN - SUBMISSION PLAN

Cabinet received a report on the above plan being jointly prepared with Peterborough City Council which would guide minerals and waste development over the period to 2026. Due to its size, hard copies of the full plan and supplementary papers had been made available for inspection in the Members Lounge.

Cabinet noted that the Minerals and Waste Plan is the 'parent' Plan to the following three Supplementary Planning Documents which were to be considered later in the meeting:

- The Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan
- The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities
- The Recycling for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Design Guide

Together this suite of documents would help support the growth agenda for the area, by providing the raw materials required, a modern generation of sustainable waste management facilities while at the same time minimising the impact on the environment and communities.

Whilst the Minerals and Waste Plan and the Master Plan would guide and provide the locations for such development, the two Design Guides would play an essential role in raising the quality of new facilities, in terms of how they looked, how they fitted into existing and planned communities, and how they operated.

Cabinet noted that the key challenges they addressed were:

- allocating sites to ensure a steady supply of mineral to supply the growth agenda
- to secure a step change in the way we manage our waste by allocating sites for new modern waste management facilities (increasing recycling and diverting our waste away from landfill)

Following several rounds of consultation, the County Council had reached the 'Submission' stage at which Members were being asked to endorse the Plan so that it could be subject to the final round of consultation (in February / March 2010), before being submitted to the Secretary of State. The Plan would then move to the public inquiry stage. It was highlighted that once the Plan was submitted the opportunity for the Council's to make changes would be limited to minor changes which could be proposed prior to the public inquiry. The report set in detail the proposals of the Plan under headings including Minerals, Waste, lorry traffic.

Members noted that in terms of lorry traffic during the consultation stages of the Plan, local communities had expressed concern over lorry movement through their villages on their way to development sites. Cabinet raised questions regarding what measures were included in the Plan to mitigate the concerns. While an increase in heavy commercial vehicles was inevitable on some routes, the plan required all development proposals to demonstrate that the opportunities for the use of sustainable transport had been evaluated and that the most appropriate route had been pursued.

It was noted that the Highways Authority was in the process of defining routes which were considered suitable for Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCV) movement. This exercise would assist in clarifying the implications of related policies in the Minerals and Waste Plan and was likely to be subject to public consultation later this year to be finalised by the end of 2009. This HCV route network would therefore be available when public consultation on the Minerals and Waste Plan took place in February 2010. There was some concern regarding the number of different names for the same review / or similar sounding reviews and reassurance was provided by the portfolio holder that all traffic / road hierarchy / HCV reviews would be shared and co-ordinated to ensure a final joined up solution which would become part of the Transport Plan. It was also considered important that the consultation exercise should include details of all the reviews.

Reassurance was provided in response to a question raised that there was confidence that the consultants firm 'Jacobs' who had been appointed to assist in finding the best locations for waste resource and recovery facilities through the use of their model 'Netwaste' was a highly regarded gravity model which reflected the application of the "proximity principle in the location of waste management facilities. The results obtained were supported by the officers as many of the routes remained on major roads.

Other issues raised by Cabinet Members included:

- A question was raised regarding how the plan fitted in to the Regional Spatial Strategy growth agenda and if the final HCV review was to suggest that a route to a site was unsuitable what flexibility was there to change the route. Reassurance was provided that the whole purpose of the Plan was to complement the growth agenda and to actively

seek to make improvements to main routes etc. If a route was designated unsuitable then an alternative would need to be found. It was emphasised that all quarries currently followed major A class road routes.

- Concerns were also expressed regarding the extra wear and tear on the road network as a result of what would be a massive increase in material transportation and what the costs / risks were associated with it. In response officers confirmed that there would be additional wear and tear as a result of increased HCV movements. It was agreed that further analysis of future risks /costs on highways repairs would need to be considered.
- In relation to Table 2 on page 6 of the report and the line on imported non hazardous waste, a question was raised on whether all imported waste was pre-treated before being transported into the County. In reply it was stated that the expectation was that waste being imported would be pre-treated but that this would not fully be the case until 2016 and this to an extent was dependent on the investment undertaken in adjoining counties and London. The major Energy and Waste plant at Peterborough when on stream would help with this aim.
- In answer to whether more imported waste resulting from the requirement to import London waste and other county waste could be transported by train, it was explained that this was only economical presently if the distance was a 100 miles or more. Currently none of the county's railheads carried waste, although there were plans for a waste rail head at Chesterton Station and those at Ely and March could be upgraded for such tasks.

It was reported orally that at its meeting on 10th September, the Development Control Committee had considered the report and noted that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Plan had reached a more advanced stage than the plans of most other counties. They commended the hard work carried out by the officers concerned to achieve this progress and resolved to convey to Cabinet the Committee's appreciation of the hard work and professionalism of the officers.

It was resolved:

- i) to note the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan - Submission Plan.
- ii) To recommend to Council that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan be approved for the purposes of Pre-Submission Consultation in February / March 2010, and submission to the Secretary of State in July 2010.
- iii) To recommend to Council that it delegates to the portfolio holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor amendments required (that do not materially affect the content of the Plan).

44. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY (NIAB) FRONTAGE SITE DEVELOPER SECTION 106 DEFERRAL REQUESTS

Cabinet noted that as result of the economic slowdown, the County Council had received a number of requests from developers who were seeking to defer Section 106 payments that had already been negotiated. A process to deal with such requests was agreed by Cabinet on 7 July 2009 and the recommendations in the report were based on that process which required deferral requests in excess of £250,000 to be considered individually.

Cabinet was reminded that the County Council had statutory responsibilities for the provision of certain services, such as education. Any agreement to defer S106 payments were required not to jeopardise the County Council's ability to deliver services it had statutory responsibilities for. The assessments had taken this into consideration in the recommendations brought forward.

The local member for Castle stated that many residents were opposed to the NIAB development and she argued that the developments should not be undertaken without proper infrastructure and transport provision. She was opposed to accepting deferrals in the cases of Education: Pre-school as this discriminated against mothers wishing to go back to school and also in respect of the Transport: Bus Infrastructure deferral request. She was concerned that where deferrals were agreed, this could lead to developers never paying the agreed contribution. She wished therefore to ensure that the cycleway proposals were safeguarded.

Cabinet noted that all s106 contributions were index linked from the date of the s106 agreement (or date negotiations commenced) to the date of payment. Index linking ensured that the County Council was protected against rising construction prices or any other changes. Any deferments which were agreed would not affect indexation in any way. Therefore in cases where a deferral was granted, indexation would continue to be added up until the point of payment.

It was resolved:

to approve the following as the decisions in respect of the five S106 deferral requests:

- i) NIAB Frontage (Transport: Cycle crossing Contribution) – Accepted for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report.
- ii) NIAB Frontage (Transport: Real Time Information Contribution) – Accepted subject to the developer being offered instalments to stagger the payments as set out in the Cabinet report.
- iii) NIAB Frontage (Education: Pre-school) - Accepted subject to the developer being offered instalments to stagger the payments for the reasons as set out in the report
- iv) NIAB Frontage (Transport: Bus Infrastructure) - Accepted subject to the developer being offered instalments to stagger the payments as set out in the report

- v) NIAB Frontage (Transport (Cycleway)) - Rejected for the reasons as set out in the report

45. BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN – SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT CONSULTATION

Due to its size a full copy of the document had been made available in the Members' Lounge.

Cabinet received a report noting that the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan would provide detailed guidance on the development in this area to supplement the policies in the 'parent' Minerals and Waste Plan. Block Fen / Langwood Fen would play a major role in the future maintaining a supply of sand and gravel for the Growth agenda recycling and disposing of construction waste arising from the growth agenda. Restoration proposals in the plan link with high level objectives held by the Government and the Environment Agency, in particular in:

- creating strategic flood storage bodies to enable more sustainable flood management in the Cranbrook / Counter Drain catchment area
- creating a large area of enhancement lowland wet grassland immediately adjacent the Ouse Washes
- providing for ancillary water storage and supply (or irrigation)
- providing a strategic recreation afteruse, coupled with navigational improvements linking the Forty Foot Drain to the Counter Drain. It was explained there was a clear opportunity by permitting mineral extraction south of the Forty Foot to enable the land to be sealed and would help stop the current migration of water out of the drain.

It was proposed the Master Plan would be the subject of a six weeks public consultation exercise to take place in February / March 2010 and is the same time when the Pre-Submission consultation on the Minerals and Waste Plan is also planned to take place. Consulting at the same time will enable people to see how the two Plans relate, and will facilitate savings on the cost of public consultation.

Cabinet noted comments submitted from the local Member for Sutton who supported the plan but emphasised that the traffic issues must be addressed to the satisfaction of local residents.

It was resolved:

To approve the draft Block Fen / Langwood Fen, Mepal, Master Plan (Supplementary Planning Document) for public consultation in February / March 2010.

46. THE LOCATION AND DESIGN OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTATION (SPD) LINKED TO THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN

Due to its size a full copy of the above document had been made available in the Members' Lounge.

Cabinet received a report noting that the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is being jointly produced between the County Council and Peterborough City Council and will be linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. It will provide guidance on the location and design of waste management facilities over the Plan period. It is intended to guide the design and location for the waste management facilities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to ensure high quality and to demonstrate how these facilities can be developed in both urban and rural settings.

The key difference between this revised SPD and the current SPD linked to the adopted Waste Local Plan is that it has been updated to take account of key issues raised during previous consultations for the Plan. Unlike the previous SPD the updated document has a broader scope, extending beyond 'major' waste management facilities to cover important matters such as the location and design of local community facilities, including Household Recycling Centres. The title of the document has been amended to reflect this difference.

In accordance with the Government's emphasis on community involvement and standards set in the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement this SPD required to undergo a period of consultation. This would be conducted over a statutory 6 week period in February / March 2010, at the same time as the Plan documents. In answer to a question raised it was confirmed that it would be a joint consultation undertaken with Peterborough to ensure full coverage of the entire plan area.

It was resolved:

- i. to approve the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Submission Plan) for the purposes of public consultation
- ii. to delegate to the portfolio holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to approve the final draft SPD for public consultation, including any amendments required (that do not materially affect the content of the SPD)

47. THE RECYCLE FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH PARTNERSHIP (RECAP) WASTE MANAGEMENT DESIGN GUIDE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) LINKED TO THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN

Due to its size a full copy of the document had been made available in the Members Lounge.

Cabinet noted that The Recycle for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) Partnership Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was being jointly produced between the County Council and Peterborough City Council and would be linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. It would provide guidance in relation to the design of waste management facilities as part of residential and commercial developments and the requirements for expanded and / or additional household waste management infrastructure.

The purpose of the SPD was to set out a series of development principles based on recognised good planning and design practice.

The Design Guide was important as it would help to ensure that waste management facilities were incorporated into all future residential and commercial developments within the County. It included guidance on:

- the location and design of internal and external waste storage to be provided within residential and commercial developments,
- how waste collection should be considered as part of the highway design,
- the requirements for developer contributions to expand the existing network of Bring Sites and Household Recycling Centres.

The SPD would be an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It would need to be read in conjunction with the relevant planning policies and the existing and emerging development plans and transport plans. It did not replace the policies of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan but would supplement them with design standards and expanded upon the requirements needed to provide additional waste management infrastructure in a sustainable way.

One member raised an issue of concern regarding insufficient space in some places in being able to store waste bins which often detracted from the street scene and requested looking at whether it was possible to strengthen the requirements for storing waste.

It was also intended that the SPD would go out for public consultation in February / March 2010 as part of the Submission Plan of the Minerals & Waste Plan.

It was resolved:

- i. to approve the Recycle for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Management Design Guide Draft Supplementary Planning Document for the purposes of public consultation.
- ii. To delegate to the portfolio holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to approve the final draft for public consultation, including any amendments required.

48. CONSULTATION ON NOISE ACTION PLAN 2010-2015 BY BAA `STANSTED

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to a consultation response running until 2 October 2009 in respect of BAA Stansted's Draft Noise Action Plan for 2010 to 2015 which set out proposals for managing noise in the vicinity of the airport.

Cabinet noted that considerable concern had been expressed by local people in Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire about increased aircraft noise over their villages. Currently it was considered that the draft Noise Action Plan would fail to have an impact on this problem and the distress it caused.

It was noted that the consultation did not include any proposals for changes to airspace. Nevertheless, given the wide impacts of aircraft noise, particularly affecting South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, Cabinet agreed that the County Council should respond to the consultation to ensure that the concerns of residents beyond the airport were highlighted.

It was resolved:

To agree the draft response as set out in this report and to delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services the authority to amend the response for submission to BAA Stansted by 2 October 2009.

49. HUNTINGDON WEST OF TOWN CENTRE LINK ROAD COMPULSORY PURCHASE AND SIDE ROAD ORDERS

Cabinet received a report on proposals to make Compulsory Purchase and Side Roads Orders for the Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road.

Cabinet noted that the proposed Link Road would help support the aspirations of Huntingdonshire District Council for the regeneration of land on the western edge of the town centre as set out in the emerging Huntingdon West Area Action Plan. The scheme was supported by local members.

In answer to questions raised regarding the availability of the funding for the road from the Housing Growth Fund (HGF) following recent Government announcements on cutbacks, it was indicated that it was still expected that this funding would receive high priority, as any delay in agreeing the orders would result in delay the whole regeneration programme.

It was resolved:

To agree to make the Compulsory Purchase and Side Roads Orders for the Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road.

50. CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT (CPE)

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to officers undertaking further negotiations with the four District Councils (South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Fenland) to explore participation in joint CPE operations for on and off street parking; and preparing a detailed financial model for extended CPE operations.

Cabinet noted that the Department for Transport (DfT) was strongly encouraging a joined up approach to encompass both on- and off-street enforcement. Therefore, a consensus with district councils would help in the development of any countywide scheme. Informal discussions with district councils had been ongoing since last year to assess the appetite for a countywide CPE arrangement and further, more formal discussions were now required to explore the potential for a joined up countywide parking enforcement scheme for both on- and off-street parking.

Members comments included:

- One Member highlighted that there would need to be a great deal of work undertaken in terms of financial modelling for those districts operating free car parking and to address problems of parking outside schools and across driveways. The officer reassured members that if offences were committed under the CPE scheme enforcement action would be taken, as the income from parking penalties would be used to meet the cost of undertaking enforcement.
- On the issue of bad publicity and the perception that councils were using such schemes to raise revenue, this would need to be countered with publicity regarding why enforcement action was undertaken and making it clear the type of illegal parking which would attract enforcement action. It was also indicated that where particular parking problem areas were identified, enforcement officers from other areas could be deployed when required to provide the necessary resources to help deter future repeat offences.

It was resolved:

To support further negotiations with the four District Councils (South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Fenland) to:

- explore participation in joint CPE operations for on and off street parking; and
- prepare a detailed financial model for extended CPE operations.

51. STRENGTHENING LOCAL DEMOCRACY CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report in order to brief it on the national consultation on the future shape and funding of adult care and support services, launched through the Green Paper, *Shaping the Future Together*, and to seek its advice on the questions posed to inform the Council's response. The consultation ran until the 13 November 2009.

Cabinet noted that Strengthening Local Democracy was a consultation document published on 21 July 2009 by the Department for Communities and Local Government and followed *Building Britain's Future* also published in early July setting out the current Government's priorities for the rest of this Parliamentary term and beyond. The latest document was a wide-ranging consultation that all public sector organisations in Cambridgeshire would be considering. The consultation set out a range of measures which the Government claimed aimed to help promote democratic renewal, and strengthen the power and responsibility of local government.

Comments made at the Cabinet meeting for possible inclusion in the final version of the document included:

- that in relation to the second paragraph on page 7 currently reading "sub regional working should to an extent, be determined locally based on the needs of each particular area" while supported should specify that it should be on the basis of being issue and area based;

- consider adding comments about being able to scrutinise the Government Office where its activities impacted on the work the Council carried out or has responsibilities for;
- that the response to Question 26 on page 8 and 9 of the Cabinet report under the heading “Clear Relationships with Local Government” should be more robust in rejecting / opposing very strongly the proposal for an “ombudsman style arrangement and a joint select committee of both houses of parliament to oversee and enforce the principles” as this was seen as another unacceptable attempt by central government to control the activities of local government.

It was resolved:

To note the current draft response to the consultation, and agree that approval of the final response be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance in consultation with the Corporate Director: People, Policy and Law taking on board comments made at the meeting.

52. GREEN PAPER SHAPING THE FUTURE TOGETHER

Cabinet received a report briefing it on the national consultation on the future shape and funding of adult care and support services, which had been launched through the Green Paper ‘Shaping the Future Together’.

Due to it being one of the most important papers in the last four years, with its message of invest to transform and the need to make difficult financial decisions on an agenda that impacted on the lives of everyone, Cabinet agreed that it should be referred to the full Council meeting for debate to ensure the widest possible all member / party debate and seek advice / comments / views on the questions it posed as set out in the report in order to inform the Council’s response to the consultation which required to be submitted by the 13th November.

Cabinet noted that the key message was for the need for radical reform as the current system originally designed in 1948 and at 61 years old and despite a range of improvements and additions, was no longer sustainable or fit for purpose for today’s demography. Life expectancy had extended by 12 years from an average of 66 years then to 78 years now. There was therefore a need for the separate systems of social care, disability benefits and housing support to come together in a more joined up way to deliver the most effective outcomes – integrating with health systems.

A more effective use of resources in the reform of this system was being recommended through investment in better joined up services between health, housing and social care, and a preventative focus to keep people ‘well for longer’, including rehabilitation services.

The following three key changes had been identified as being needed:

- More joined-up working between health, housing and social care services and between care and benefits services
- A wider range of care and support services
- Better-quality, more innovative services, based on the best evidence about what works.

It was stated that the development of any new system needed to involve its users at its heart, and as such the Big Care Debate would include consultation with the public, stakeholders and staff and will take place over a 16 week period until 13 November 2009. It was agreed that the report should be forwarded to the next Council meeting in order to enable all party participation and that officers should also seek to include it as soon as possible as an item on the members seminar programme.

In a reply to a question whether there had been a response from the County Council's health partners on future roles and partnership working, while no response had yet been received, this would be pursued to ensure a joined up approach for the common good.

It was resolved:

- (i) To note the detail of the Green Paper.
- (ii) To invite discussion on the Green Paper and the specific questions raised in the consultation at the Full Council meeting on 13 October, to inform the Council's response to the Consultation that would be presented at the Cabinet meeting on 20th October.

53. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

To report progress on matters delegated to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet up to 8th September 2009.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions / take actions on its behalf.
- ii) To amend the delegation regarding item 2 Parking Policy Review so that the responsibility is now with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access.

54. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA 20th OCTOBER 2009

The draft agenda for the 20th October was noted with the following amendment:

Item 5 Cambridgeshire Integrated Development Programme moved to 24th November
Cabinet

Chairman
20th October 2009

Appendix A

PETITION SUMMARIES FROM TRANSCRIPTIONS PROVIDED

A) Petition against De Freville Estate Parking Controls.

Cabinet should honour the opinion voiced by the majority in the Council's recent consultation and maintain the status quo, with no on-street parking controls in our area.

While De Freville area residents often cannot park on-street outside their own front doors, they can almost always park within a couple of minutes' walk, except on a few days annually when there is mass parking by non-residents attending events on the adjacent Common. (Fire work display / fair) Many felt these rare occasions do not justify the expense and organisational overhead of parking controls, and a majority of the 505 respondents were opposed to the controls proposed in the Council's February 2009 consultation. This had led council officers to recommend that the Area Joint Committee should "note the results of the opinion survey and resolve not to pursue" parking controls.

However, instead (at the meeting) the ward county councillor suggested that difficulties in the west of the Estate were caused by non-residents parking there before walking into town across the nearby footbridge and that this problem was "too great to ignore", and that the proposed controls should therefore be imposed on just Pretoria Road, Kimberley Road, and other streets west of De Freville Avenue.

There are several problems to this. Firstly, it ignores the Council's own policy that "avoiding the need for consensus ... by reducing the area of control is not ... effective or efficient", since any non-residents' parking will transfer to the borders of the controlled area. Residents of De Freville Avenue and other streets to the east are particularly concerned about this, as evidenced by our petition. Secondly, if footbridges cause parking problems, one might expect a similar effect near our eastern footbridge, conveniently close to Newmarket Road and the Grafton Centre. However, there is no evidence for this.

In fact the overnight parking problem on the western streets results mainly from the number of residents' cars. Consultation response data not seen by the AJC shows that (for instance) Pretoria Road residents use at least 60 cars, on a street with only 62 spaces. Walking the western streets late at night, when there is little non-resident parking, confirms that in places there are almost no available spaces. The proposed scheme would actually exacerbate this problem by designating 31 parking spaces on adjacent non-residential streets as Pay and Display, making it inconvenient or expensive for residents to use them as overflow parking, as they do now.

In conclusion, we're asking the Cabinet to overturn the AJC decision because it's contrary to County Council policy, because it cannot address the overnight parking problem, and would very likely make things worse. The majority of residents oppose on-street parking controls.

B) Petition to oppose the building of a cyclepath / footway between Milton and Impington if this will lead to the loss of the school bus.

I am here to say - do not build the cycleway between Milton & Impington if you are then going to take away the school bus.

The school bus was provided in 1992 because the route was deemed unsafe. 2.11 of your paper states:- This scheme will provide a safe route for children to walk or cycle to Impington Village College.

If we lose the bus many parents have said they will not allow their children to cycle because they feel it will be unsafe and will take their children to school by car.

7.5 States that - the schemes will result in positive climate change effects from less car journeys. Over 200 children at the moment travel to school on the bus and if it is lost then there will be many more car journeys. An AA study backs this view.

Those children who are left to cycle will have to:-

- cross a narrow footbridge with low parapets which does not get
- gritted and is not suitable for cyclists and was not built to take the
- numbers of children at peak times
- cross the Park & Ride Exit as well as the landfill site entrance and
- the entrance to a huge warehousing complex
- cycle along a lonely and unlit cycle path that will not get gritted
- and has heavy traffic travelling at 60mph
- negotiate narrow roads in Impington where there is not enough room
- to continue the cycle path

Children will also be cycling sometimes in weather that many of us would not take a car out in such as foggy, windy, icy and snowy conditions.

In 1991 before the bus was provided I took my children to school by car. I witnessed children riding dangerously in huge clumps. I saw children who had fallen off their bikes and others who were walking on their own. No amount of training will stop children cycling dangerously. My young niece was killed in a cycling accident so even though my own sons were trained and well aware of the dangers I still found them cycling dangerously.

Both the Parish Council and Milton Primary School were not consulted but have written to say they are opposed to the scheme. I spent an afternoon in Shire Hall looking at a large file of comments sheets and letters that the County received from Milton residents – the majority were against the scheme and others still raised concerns about parts of the route or were opposed to the loss of the bus.

There has been tremendous support in the village for the petition and over 350 signatures were collected in only 5 days. In 2.13 of the appendix it mentions the possible loss of the school bus. It also says it would be after a full local consultation - does that mean that if we said we did not want to lose the bus it would not be taken away – I think not.

As a cyclist I am keen as others to see more good cycle routes but not at the expense of losing our school bus because we think that children's lives will be put in danger if it is lost. All we are asking for is your assurance today that the school bus will not be taken away - without that assurance we oppose the cycle path.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS REGARDING SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT 2 SITE OPTIONS AND POLICIES AND LONGER TERM IMPLICATIONS (MINUTE 39)

BASSINGBOURN

A) D V Pettitt the tenant of Haygate Farm since 1991 A letter was received objecting to the proposed Gypsy Traveller site as Bassingbourn for the following reasons:

Environmental Impact on the Area

Since becoming the tenant, I have entered into various environmental schemes, with the support of County Council to improve the area for both the people of Bassingbourn and wildlife. We have created various permissive paths joining existing footpaths so that people can do a circular walk including Spring Lane. These are in constant use by families, dog walkers, etc. We have also done a lot of hedge restoration work in Spring Lane and have planted a new wood on the edge of the village. This environmental work is having a significant positive effect on the area, as proved by a recent Bird Survey we had carried out.

There has in the past been a problem with flooding in Spring Lane, particularly the winter 2000/2001 when a local farmer's irrigation pump was used to pump excess water away to prevent houses flooding. This had to be carried out over a period of several weeks. Adding hard standings in this area would only exacerbate the problem in the future.

Access

Because of the nature of our farm, i.e. the main farm is in Fen Road and the majority of our land lies to the south of the village and is accessed via Spring Lane, we are constantly moving tractors and machinery along this single track lane. Bearing in mind that there are only 2 residential properties beyond the village boundary, the creation of 5 pitches (which could be 10 – 15 caravans) would mean a vast increase in the amount of traffic using Spring Lane. Considering the fact that the lane is in constant use by dog walkers and families with small children and push chairs, and the poor visibility when driving along the lane, Presumably if the scheme goes ahead the road from the edge of the village to the proposed site would be widened in order to alleviate the problems with the extra traffic and improve safety for members of the public.

General

There are no services i.e., sewerage, water and electricity to the proposed site. Putting these services in place, along with the necessary road widening mentioned above, would incur a significant cost to the environment and taxpayer, as well as significant disruption to the local area.

I believe that there is already a high concentration of travellers, showmen, etc. in this part of South Cambridgeshire with Whaddon Gap and 3 sites in Mettle Hill, Meldreth. Spring Lane is the most unspoilt part of the village and as such is enjoyed by many villagers. From a personal perspective the disruption to my business would be considerable.

I would also like to remind you that I was the tenant next to New Farm Travellers Site in Whaddon when it was developed and opened and had lots of problems arising from that site and would not want to go through that again. I would urge you think again on the viability of this site.

Cllr Johnstone the local Member for Willingham

Cllr Johnstone Indicated in writing that she wished to see the recommendations changed with a view to deleting Willingham from further consideration. She supported the recommendation that the County site should not be included and at the meeting highlighted that Willingham school already had 35 traveller children 12% of the population (the highest number of traveller children in the county) and that Willingham along with Cottenham Primary school were oversubscribed compared with many other schools and was therefore concerned at the school's ability to cope with any further children and the negative impact on existing children (including traveller children) in the Willingham village primary school.

In relation to Northstowe she was suggesting that the new pitches should be at Northstowe and not up to 1km from the new settlement in either Longstanton or, indeed Willingham parish.

Councillor Linda Oliver Local Member for Bassingbourn

Spoke to disagree with the assessment made by the District Council for the following reasons:

1. Spring Lane is a dead end and is narrow which would prevent refuse collection and emergency vehicles accessing the site.
2. Issues with lack of water for fire hydrants
3. Significant costs to provide new site in relation to provision of utilities, flood prevention measures, archaeological works and transport improvements, including sight lines and realignment / widening of existing road.
4. Lack of employment opportunities in Bassingbourn and its immediate surroundings.
5. Local primary school is currently at capacity with the exception of the reception class.
6. Materially changes the environment of Spring Lane characterised by Country Lanes as set out in South Cambridgeshire LDF.
7. Impact upon biodiversity of the area around Spring Lane.
8. No indication that the current tenant farmer would wish to relinquish their use of this land.

Councillor Jenkins Local Member for Cottenham, Histon and Impington

Welcomed the report stating that gypsies and travellers had as much right to benefit from economic growth as any other member of the community and making reference to paragraph 4.6 (Children and Young People's Services raising concerns regarding potential school capacity issues in relation to the proposed sites in the Willingham area and any further sites being developed in the Chesterton Fen area) and Gypsy and Traveller sites should be well served by education provision and public transport services.

Councillor Van De Ven Local Member for Melbourn

1. Meldreth

Supported the recommendation that the former local authority owned site was not a viable site

option which she stated was the overwhelming view locally, shared by the parish council, villagers who had made their views known to her over many years, and also an overwhelming number of residents on the two Travelling Showpeople's sites in Meldreth. In respect of the recommendation for an additional six plots on 'the boulevard,' which is the newer of the two showpeople's sites she commented that the two showpeople's sites sat directly alongside one another. The first showpeople's site, five acres, consisted of ten plots and was very successfully integrated with the settled community of Meldreth. Children attended the local primary and secondary schools, families participated in school fundraisers and local sport and were employed locally including at the village shop etc.

She highlighted that the boulevard had a number of unresolved planning issues and had not yet evolved into a cohesive community, although it had the potential to do so. While it had planning consent for 11 plots, it had been divided and mostly sold into 40 subsections, creating a complex and unresolved layout. Permission to increase the site from 11 to 17 plots was rejected by South Cambridgeshire District Council in August, with strong concerns expressed from residents of the boulevard itself about the prospect of overcrowding. This view was shared by Meldreth Parish Council and herself as a district councillor.

Attention was drawn to the fact that Meldreth Parish Council's formal representation on this consultation, which was now in the process of being submitted, pointed out that the showmen's Guild of Great Britain had identified a need for only three new travelling showpeople's plots in South Cambridgeshire in the next five years. Furthermore, the GTDPD "issues and options report 1, general approach" published in 2006 stated that pitches should be proportionately distributed throughout the district and concentration of sites should be avoided. The recommendation of the GTDPD now to add six extra plots onto a site where overcrowding was already a concern, and went against the GTDPD'S own principles. It would not in her view contribute to successful community building and therefore she could not support the recommendation.

2. Land Near Meldreth

Her representation stated that Spring Lane, Bassingbourn, had well known limited access and it was difficult to envisage how this would accommodate the type of traffic expected in association with a traveller site.

She commented that it was difficult to understand why a true distribution of sites across the district was not evident in the proposed site options. Meldreth, Whaddon and Bassingbourn formed a distinct cluster within the district, while large areas elsewhere in the district did not form part of the broad picture of new site provision.

Councillor Williamson Local member for Waterbeach comments on Chesterton Fen

He supported the concerns about the capacity of Shirley School in the Council response. In addition, there were a number of issues of infrastructure (e.g. sewerage, road links) that are of concern and need improvement before any further development of Chesterton Fen takes place.

He also emphasised that Chesterton Fen was something of an enclave and, although part of his division could only be accessed by road through East Chesterton.

Councillor Wijsenbeck Local Member for East Chesterton comments on Chesterton Fen

Had no particular issues with the proposed response or with the proposals for enlarging the site. He has indicated that for residents one of the big issues is that the fen road access is not large enough for the commercial vehicles using it on a regular basis e.g. Carrying skips. There are also issues with sewage / drainage on the site which need to be addressed. In terms of the school being at capacity, he asks whether measures could be taken to expand the school to meet any increased demand.

He made a separate point in terms of highways issues that if Chesterton Station was eventually built, as the current level crossing over Fen Road was already perceived to be inadequate, that consideration should be given to making fen road for pedestrians / cyclists only and creating a separate cut and cover tunnel to take heavy traffic away separately.

Appendix C

CAMBRIDGE CYCLING TOWN COMMENTS

Councillor Gymer Cottenham, Histon and Impington - general comments

In my community the report is well supported and cyclists especially are eagerly awaiting more detailed plans. The Parish Councils have been consulted and look on these projects favourably.

B1049

I would like to remind you that we have had two fatalities along the B1049, one at the Histon Green traffic lights and one just outside Cottenham (on the path - I understand), this new path/cycleway will, I hope restore people's confidence in using the path after such tragedies. I have noticed that there is an increase in teenagers (sixth formers) using this path over the last few weeks and it would be great to give them the encouragement to continue cycling by providing all with a suitable and safe track.

Concerns are that it should comply with the Government standard along the entire length.

Butt Lane

I have had a number of verbal comments and e-mails about this much needed path. The path would be regularly used by farm workers and those wishing to visit Milton for the shops, riverside access and the country park. This is supported by the Community but not at the cost of the school bus. Residents of Milton fear for their children's safety if the bus is lost, and residents of Impington worry about increased traffic if the bus were to be withdrawn.

I regularly travel between Histon and Girton/Oakington and I see how much the path (not up to full standard) is being used by adults and children alike. Here the bus still runs but the villagers choose to use the route and perhaps this will happen with the proposed path as well. I personally will be more inclined to use my bike if the path was wider and set further from the road.

Councillor Williamson Local Member Waterbeach comments on Milton-Impington Scheme

It is unfortunate that so much emphasis has been given to the fact that this route will serve children going from Milton to Impington for school. This is in the first sentence of the relevant part

of the report and is bound to stir up significant concerns among parents. The scheme will not "provide a safe route for children from Milton to cycle or walk to Impington Village College".

In my view this cycleway will be of benefit to many of those who wish to travel between Milton and Impington by a means other than motor vehicle. As the appendix to the report says, there is quite widespread support in Milton for such a facility and it is bound to increase safety along Butt Lane, a fast bendy road between the villages. However, I repeat that I do not believe that the will provide a safe route to school for those attending Impington Village College from Milton and I would strongly support any campaign by Milton parents to retain the school bus. Many of the reasons for it not providing a safe route for school children have been given in the letter from the Chair of Governors and I would support that letter insofar as it makes those points.

However, I am not prepared to go as far as Milton School and Milton Parish Council in opposing the scheme if the future of the school bus cannot be guaranteed at this point. There are people currently cycling and walking along Butt Lane, and their safety has to be considered. I have been contacted by a number of people who believe that a properly designed scheme will be of benefit to many in both Milton and Impington and I would support their desire for increased safety along that route provided that the safety of school children is not compromised.

Proposed Impington to Milton Cycle Path Letter from David Lees Governor Milton Church of England Primary School

I write on behalf of the Governors to express our concerns regarding the proposals to build a new foot and cycleway to link Milton with Impington. We understand that if the scheme goes ahead it could mean the loss of free bus travel for Milton students attending Impington Village College. More than 200 Children travel from Milton to Impington Village College using the school bus daily.

Milton primary school is a Healthy School that has also been awarded the Active Mark and is a supporter of children walking or cycling safely to school. We would be supportive in principle to a safe cycle way, which increased the options for children to travel to school; however we are very concerned that the proposals contain significant safety problems and that if implemented, would probably result in the withdrawal of the school bus.

We have a number of very real concerns regarding these proposals. Although the cycle way may be deemed safe for accompanied children this is very unlikely to be the case in practice. The Cycle Touring Club (CTC) have raised concerns in their response that the proposals are not safe and have stated that *'the proposed scheme is a busy commuter / Children's access to school route and that a 2.5m path is too narrow'*, the CTC have also raised concerns about the safety of the proposals as set out specifically in terms of the waste site and the return to the road safely at Impington. To be safer, the cycle path needs to run all the way to Impington Village College. We would also be concerned that the cycle way would need to be well away from the road.

Further, we are very concerned about the foot bridge because the safety railings are too low and this is a real danger for cyclists and indeed a cyclist has fallen over these railings previously. Furthermore, it is a very narrow foot bridge rather than a cycle bridge. The mix of pedestrians travelling to the Park and Ride site and up to 200 young cyclists would be unsafe.

There will be a significant number of parents who will judge the route as proposed to be unsafe and who will feel forced to join the school run and drive their children to school, increasing traffic and congestion both at the A10 junction and around Impington Village College.

If children are encouraged to cycle, they will all need to travel via Butt Lane (the part within the village boundary) past the entrance to Milton primary school to access the foot bridge over the A10. The school entrance on Butt Lane Milton becomes very congested with children arriving for school. There have been a number of accidents involving children on this road and up to 200 additional young cyclists plus accompanying adults, travelling to school via this route will cause further congestion and potentially more accidents.

Parents with children at both Impington Village College and Milton primary school who do not judge the cycle route to be safe will have problems dropping their children at school. Parents, who previously walked with their younger children, while their older children travelled on the school bus, will now be forced to drive so that they can get both children to school on time. The older children will need to be dropped at school early so that the parents can travel back to Milton in time to get their younger children to school, resulting in more cars on the road.

Whilst the proposed route may be an improvement and be safe during the summer months there are real concerns about how safe it will be during the rest of the year. Will the cycle path be treated during the winter months? What lighting will be provided for dark mornings and evenings during the winter? Would traffic lights be installed at the park and ride entrance to allow cyclists to cross safely?

We do not consider that these proposals have been well thought through and we believe that they pose a significant danger to both pupils attending our school and to our past pupils who now attend Impington Village College.

We are supportive in principle of a safe cycle route for children travelling between Milton and Impington Village College, however, given the number of safety concerns we have raised we would ask that unless you can guarantee that the school bus will remain you reject these proposals.