

**ECONOMY AND  
ENVIRONMENT  
COMMITTEE****Minutes-Action Log**

This is the updated action log as at 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2015 and captures the actions arising from the most recent Economy and Environment Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

**Minutes of 16th September 2014**

<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Action to be taken by</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>26.</b>	<b>MINUTES AND ACTION LOG –from September meeting</b>  a) Adult Learning and Skills follow up work from Overview and Scrutiny	<b>Lynsi Hayward-Smith</b>	<p>At the March Committee meeting it was agreed to set up a working group to look at Adult Education to consider how to improve equity and a county-wide offer, with a report to be presented to Spokes on detailed terms of reference / proposed goals.</p> <p>The subsequent action was for Councillor Schumann who had led on the original Overview and scrutiny review to liaise with Lynsi Hayward-Smith on preparation of a report to Spokes before coming back for Committee approval.</p>	<p>.</p> <p><b>The Report is included on the current 14<sup>th</sup> July Committee agenda</b></p>	<b>Ongoing</b>

## MINUTES OF 10<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2015

Min No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
105.	DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT CYCLE CITY AMBITION PROGRAMME 2015-18	Mike Davies Team Leader - Cycling Projects, ETE	<p>a) The Chairman reiterated the need for full consultation with residents, especially in those areas where it was known that there was opposition to two way cycling / other cycling issues concerns</p> <p>e. g. Panton Street / Hills Road and that this should include formal traffic surveys being undertaken, as well as taking on board the further proposals for additional cycling routes raised during the debate.</p>	<p><b>a) Response</b> - Mike Davies met initially with the North Newtown Residents Association on 9<sup>th</sup> April in what was to be the first of a series of meetings to discuss officer aspirations for cycling in their area, to hear their concerns and ideas, and agree the required traffic surveys.</p> <p>Officers are currently undertaking surveys, drawing up plans and will then arrange further meetings with residents for further discussions.</p>	ongoing
106.	ADDITIONAL 2015/16 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE	Graham Amis / Joseph Whelan	One Member queried why the target to increase passenger numbers to the prior level was a four year target, suggesting 18 months to two years might be more appropriate. A report on Park and Ride Charges had been requested for the Committee's July meeting and it	<p>The officers agreed to liaise to ensure a review is included as part of the July Report.</p> <p>A report is included on the current agenda which explains the most up to date position.</p>	actioned

Min No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status
			was suggested this might be the appropriate opportunity to consider whether the performance target should be revised.		
<b>MINUTES 26<sup>th</sup> MAY 2015</b>					
<b>130.</b>	<b>CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSE TO THEA14 IMPROVEMENT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO)</b>	<b>Dearbhla Lawson</b>	a) In approving the draft Statement of Common Ground authority was delegated to the Executive Director for ETE in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee to amend the items in Appendix 3 and 4 of the Officer report as necessary to inform the County Council's input to the Examination.	<p>The written representation and local impact report as submitted were updated with minor changes and can be found at the links below.</p> <p><a href="\\ccc.cambridgeshire.gov.uk\data\Et_Shared\A14 Improvement Scheme CCC Project folder\29 - Examination\Submissions to PINS\Written Representation of Cambridgeshire County Council v1 15.02.2015.pdf">\\ccc.cambridgeshire.gov.uk\data\Et_Shared\A14 Improvement Scheme CCC Project folder\29 - Examination\Submissions to PINS\Written Representation of Cambridgeshire County Council v1 15.02.2015.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="\\ccc.cambridgeshire.gov.uk\data\Et_Shared\A14 Improvement Scheme CCC Project folder\29 - Examination\Submissions to PINS\Joint Local Impact Report Submission version 1 150601 text cover.pdf">\\ccc.cambridgeshire.gov.uk\data\Et_Shared\A14 Improvement Scheme CCC Project folder\29 - Examination\Submissions to PINS\Joint Local Impact Report Submission version 1 150601 text cover.pdf</a></p> <p>The Local Impact report was little changed and was only amended in terms of formatting and tidying up.</p>	<b>actioned</b>

				<p>The Written Representation had additional text added, links to evidence added, re-formatted, a table of contents added, and a list of references.</p> <p>In relation to the Statement of Common Ground This action was undertaken on 23<sup>rd</sup> June and uploaded to the Council website and published on the Council website on 26<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>The details can be viewed at the following link:</p> <p><a href="http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CommitteeMinutes/Committees/Committee.aspx?committeeID=89">http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CommitteeMinutes/Committees/Committee.aspx?committeeID=89</a></p>	
			<p>b)A response was to be provided to Councillor Shellensone of the Local Members for Godmanchester and Huntingdon East in relation to points he had raised at the meeting.</p>	<p>A response was provided on 23<sup>rd</sup> June. See appendix 1.</p>	<b>actioned.</b>

Min No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Status																		
133.	FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – MARCH 2015	Graham Amis	On appendix 7 page 19 with reference to the performance indicator resulting to the number of people starting as apprentices, there was a request for more information on the outcomes for the 2,000 plus apprentices, in terms of numbers passing their apprenticeship and whether there was any data available on the numbers that had gone on to full time jobs or further training. Officers agreed to look into this further and write to the Members outside of the meeting.	<p><b>Officer response</b></p> <p>the data available for starts does not directly correlate with achievement as apprenticeships have different learning times. We are not able to track individuals due to Data Protection issues. However, we can track trends.</p> <p>The 2000 starts referred to will be for the first half of this current academic year, the latest start data available, which takes us to Jan 2015. There is no achievement data for this period yet.</p> <p>In order to track success listed below are the starts and achievements for the last 5 years to give members an idea of the direction of travel. I would be happy to discuss at Committee if requested</p> <table><tr><td>Year.</td><td>Starts.</td><td>Achievements</td></tr><tr><td>2009/10.</td><td>2110.</td><td>1380</td></tr><tr><td>2010/11.</td><td>3220</td><td>1510</td></tr><tr><td>2011/12.</td><td>4180.</td><td>1980</td></tr><tr><td>2012/13.</td><td>4400.</td><td>2060</td></tr><tr><td>2013/14.</td><td>3770.</td><td>2190</td></tr></table> <p>The reduction in starts for last year was as a result of Government policy regarding the requirement to obtain a loan over 24 which has now been reversed. This was a national trend.</p>	Year.	Starts.	Achievements	2009/10.	2110.	1380	2010/11.	3220	1510	2011/12.	4180.	1980	2012/13.	4400.	2060	2013/14.	3770.	2190	actioned
Year.	Starts.	Achievements																					
2009/10.	2110.	1380																					
2010/11.	3220	1510																					
2011/12.	4180.	1980																					
2012/13.	4400.	2060																					
2013/14.	3770.	2190																					

				Any further queries please contact Andy Sanders at;  <a href="mailto:Andy.Sanders@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Andy.Sanders@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

## **Appendix**

### **EXTRACT FROM MINUTE 130 -CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSE TO THE A14 IMPROVEMENT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO)**

Councillor Shellens had requested to speak as a local member and as the Vice-Chairman of Brampton Parish Council and raised the following issues, while making clear that although the views on the project relating to Brampton were agreed by a majority on the Parish Council, it had not been unanimous. In his presentation he:

- highlighted while that the parish council broadly accepted the national need for the road, recognising that there were benefits and that areas of Brampton would have cleaner air and that the removal of the viaduct was supported, he also drew attention to concerns about the effects of 140,000 extra vehicles running close to some areas of housing and a local school.
- There was concern that the parish might be given the borrow pits after the 10 year maintenance period was exhausted which was not a responsibility they wished to take on, in view of the potential safety / liability issues and wished to receive assurance that they would not be forced to take on the commitment. *In reply officers indicated that they would press for appropriate management and safety measures to be put in place. Officers also clarified that they and did not believe that the pits were proposed to be passed on to the Parish Council and it was understood that the Parish could not be compelled to take on such responsibilities. It was indicated that HE policy would be to eventually dispose of sites not operationally required to any interested parties, and that this would be a responsibility for the HE to arrange.*
- There was a need for a footbridge at the station to take pedestrians across the East Coast Main Line (ECML), thus freeing up road width for what was seen as a critical need to widen the road and create an additional lane for vehicles going into town.

- Raised the concern of residents in Mill Common, Castle Hill and Waters Meet regarding the extended route they would need to take from the east to now be able to access their roads.
- Highlighted that Highways England had claimed that by using the borrow pits they could not only control run-off from the new road, but also reduce the pre-existing risk of flooding in the village. He stressed that most of the village flooding during his time originated from back flow from a raised Great Ouse river, and he did not see how this could be avoided, as the pits were the wrong side of the housing to absorb high water. Also at times of high flows, the pits, would be receiving sideways water from the river. The officers thanked the Member for drawing this to their attention.
- Indicated that forecasts of 60% reduction in traffic flows along Thrapston Road were not considered realistic by the village who feared that local drivers would utilise the shortest route from the station to Brampton Hut by coming along this road. As this had been discussed at great length in the past without positive resolution, he asked whether it would be possible to have a contingency budget item within the scheme to fund remedial measures should traffic levels reach an agreed trigger point. In response the officers indicated that that they were still working with Highways England on the traffic model and would consider the request when the process was completed.
- Asked whether it was possible to some trees planted around the school to reduce and impede the access of particulates. The officers undertook to look at this request.

## **Actions**

- 1) **The Local Member was thanked for his contribution with the Chairman indicating that the officers were aware of the issues he had raised which would be looked into further, and a fuller response would be provided outside of the meeting. Action. Fuller response to be sent to Cllr Shellens**

## **Officer Response**

Dear Mike,

Our written representation to the Examining Authority has pressed the need for CCC input into the detailed design of the borrow pit restoration to be secured by Condition on the Secretary of State, and for there to be more clarity over the intents of Highways England in after use of the borrow pits. As previously set out I do not believe that Brampton PC can be compelled to take on the borrow pits after 10 years, but appreciate your concern over unmanaged open water. This is a matter for consideration in detailed design of the restoration, and the development of the legacy plan for the A14, of which more below.

We have put into the CCC written representation that was submitted on 15 June 2015 that CCC is not satisfied that the width of Brampton Road will be adequate for all user groups and that as Highways England will have to construct a substantial temporary structure to protect the railway during demolition, and that some kind of “tunnel” through the work site will most likely be needed to protect cyclists and pedestrians, the additional cost to construct a permanent footbridge might not be significant. In our statement of common ground we have set out that the matter of not providing a footbridge is not agreed between CCC and Highways England. We still await details from HE to demonstrate that a bridge is not needed.

Regarding the flooding I assume that Highways England has now replied to your email to them. In any case I have consulted with Sass Pledger, and she has consulted the Environment Agency. Their reply is as follows:

*The Ouse influences the Brampton Brook which flows through the village. The Brampton Brook starts far upstream of the A1 and has a large rural catchment which means it takes a lot of rural drainage upstream of Brampton that then flows through the village. Upstream end of the A1 it is an ordinary watercourse, downstream of the A1 it is Main River as it flows through the village down to join the Ouse. When the Ouse goes into flood it does use the Brampton Brook but its level of influence is only to Buckden Road Bridge. The Brampton Brook often at the same time will experience high flows from the similar wet conditions. The runoff from the village itself and the rural upstream flows will all be trying to flow downstream along the Brampton Brook to the Ouse. However it is almost tide locked at Buckden Road Bridge if the Ouse is in flood so the Brampton Brook starts to come out of banks in the village further upstream, as well as the surface water runoff backing up and causing flooding as well. So in essence it is not the Ouse that floods Brampton but Brampton Brook and the runoff from the urban areas trying to get into the Brampton Brook which has nowhere to flow downstream, as the Ouse has filled up the channel. Therefore having two deep attenuation storage areas upstream of Brampton would take the rural upstream flows (which can be very high). This would leave Brampton Brook more capacity to take the flows from the village itself.*

The Environment Agency considers that a structure to divert water in Brampton Brook into the upstream borrow pits would be beneficial as it would increase the effective capacity of Brampton Brook in times of flood.

We are now reviewing the Highways England traffic model update released on 15 June, and working through local impact testing to gives us full confidence in the predicted flows. We would be more than happy to take you through the model and Thrapston Road when that process has been completed. In any case we have now agreed a statement of common ground with Highways England that provides for post opening monitoring and the implementation of works at Highways England cost should that monitoring show an unexpected and significant adverse effect due to the A14 on the local road network.

We put in the our written representation to the Examining Authority the following statement:



Area 2: Huntingdon, Brampton, Hartford and Godmanchester

- 1.1.1 The validation of this area falls below the accepted standards and therefore CHARM2 does not accurately reflect the base year. Examination of the change in traffic patterns as a result of the introduction of Edison Bell Way in the future year Do Minimum scenario shows traffic re-routing from the Inner Ring Road on to Edison Bell Way to Stukeley Road. This is a change that has been observed on the ground as a result of the opening of Edison Bell Way in April 2014.
- 1.1.2 As a result of the Do minimum re-routing due to the introduction of Edison Bell Way seeming reasonable, the re-routing of traffic in this area as a result of the introduction of the scheme has been investigated. The results of this indicate that traffic that currently uses the racecourse junction to access either the A141 or areas to the north of Huntingdon (i.e. traffic that is using this route to avoid Spittals interchange in the base and Do Minimum scenarios) re-routes and remains on the de-trunked A14 to Spittals Interchange, accessing North Huntingdon via the A141
- 1.1.3 The impact of the A14 scheme along the B1514 varies with the section between the Racecourse junction and Hinchingsbrooke Park Road seeing a significant reduction in traffic. The introduction of the Views Common Link does result in an increase in traffic on the section of the B1514 between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Edison Bell Way east bound in the morning peak. This is because this link provides an alternative route for access to Huntingdon Town Centre.
- 1.1.4 As a result of the above assessment the County Council considers that, despite the less than optimum validation of CHARM2 in this area, the re-routing indicated as a result of the introduction of the scheme seems reasonable. However, the quantum of the flow change is uncertain due to weak validation, and this needs further work to improve levels of confidence.

This was based on the CHARM2 traffic model, and we are updating it for comments on CHARM3A for submission to the Examining Authority on 7 July. There will be a further update in August/September to reflect the output from local impact testing, by which time we expect to have greater confidence in the validation of the traffic model, and confidence that it is making valid predictions of flow changes. In any case the B1514 is on the list of roads for monitoring submitted to the Examining Authority.

Discussions over the legacy of the A14 are now taking place, and we have had discussions around what legacy might include and trees around Brampton Primary School is one item that has been identified as an example of a possible legacy project. We understand that Highways England has a budget for legacy projects outside the scope of the A14 project itself. We have made it clear that legacy is not mitigation, and that legacy funds should not be used to provide mitigation that should be part of the scheme itself, for example noise barriers. At the moment these discussions are at a very early stage, and the next steps are to start community consultation over legacy. We want this to be a bottom up rather than top down process.

I hope this helps, and do not hesitate to get in touch if you need more information.

Kind Regards

**Andrew Munro**

A14 Project Manager  
**Cambridgeshire County Council**

[andrew.munro@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.munro@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

01223 715471 | 07542 965351