

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 14th March 2019

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 12.40 a.m.

Present: Councillors: I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, L Harford (substituting for Councillor Ambrose Smith) D Jenkins (Substituting for Councillor Batchelor), N Kavanagh, T Sanderson (substitute for D Giles), S Tierney J Williams, and T Wotherspoon (Vice- Chairman)

Apologies: Councillors D Ambrose-Smith, H Batchelor, R Fuller and D Giles

217. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bates declared a non-statutory (non-prejudicial) disclosable interest as a member of both the East West Rail Consortium and as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Councillor Kavanagh declared a non-statutory (non-prejudicial) disclosable interest as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Councillor Williams declared a non-statutory (non-prejudicial) disclosable interest as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership and as Cabinet Member for South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Councillor Wotherspoon declared a non-statutory (non-prejudicial) disclosable interest as the Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Councillor Kindersley declared a non-statutory (non-prejudicial) disclosable interest as the Chairman of the Cambridge Bedford Rail Road Lobby Group

218. MINUTES

With an amendment on Minute 212 'Extending the funding on Contractual Bus services to the end of 2019-20 Financial Year' to change the word 'exiting bus services' to read 'existing bus services' the minutes of the meeting held on 7th February 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

219. MINUTE ACTION LOG

With the above update noted in the reference in the Minutes Action Log, the log was noted.

220. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS / REQUESTS TO SPEAK

No petitions were received by the deadline. Public questions and requests to speak were all in relation to the next agenda item and were taken in the subsequent discussion.

221. EAST WEST RAIL COMPANY CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS BETWEEN BEDFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

The East West Rail Consortium formed in 1995 includes the County Council, South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire District Councils as Members with the detail of its history as set out in the report. On 28th January 2019, the East West Rail (EWR) Company launched a consultation on options for a new railway line between Bedford and Cambridge. The consultation set out five potential route options, all of which were in a broad route corridor between Bedford and Cambridge via Sandy. The five route options were shown in Figure A1 in Appendix A to the report. To help with identification, colour versions of pages 33 and 37 were tabled at the meeting. It included a detailed commentary on the key impacts and issues raised by the route options. Set out in Appendix B for the Committee's consideration was a draft response to the consultation.

In considering the response to the recommendations, officers had used the following broad points of principle to inform the proposed County Council response to the consultation:

- That the Council strongly supports the delivery of the EWR central section.
- That the Council wishes to see a route that:
 - provides fast connectivity between the East of England and Central, Southern and Western England; and
 - supports housing and economic growth planned in the Oxford to Cambridge arc.
- That the EWR central section should not duplicate already planned capacity to provide for the transport demand from planned housing and economic growth, and should deliver capacity and that allows for additional growth consistent with national and local policy.

The strategic case for the route highlighted the significant imbalance between supply and demand for housing in the Greater Cambridge area. Along with other interventions as detailed in the report the EWR central section was expected to help correct this imbalance.

The report detailed the different transport characteristics of the five route options with more detailed commentary provided in paragraphs 11 to 39 of Appendix A to the report with Table 1 setting out the costs, transport benefits and journey times for the following five route options presented.

Option A

(Bedford South – Sandy – Bassingbourn)

Option B

(Bedford South – St Neots south / Tempsford / Sandy north – Cambourne)

Option C

(Bedford South – Tempsford – Sandy – Bassingbourn)

Option D

(Bedford Midland – Tempsford – Sandy – Bassingbourn)

Option E

(Bedford Midland – St Neots south / Tempsford – Cambourne)

Of the five route options presented, the officers analysis in respect to the Government's Green book requirements was that while none of the options provided good values for money on a narrow interpretation of cost- benefit analysis with no metrics having been provided on the business case for any of the options, Option A was the cheapest and would provide the lowest journey times between Oxford and Cambridge. Option A would also provide for development in the Bassingbourn area, should such development be considered acceptable. Option B was more expensive than Option A and had longer journey times for the same level of assessed transport benefits. Option E was significantly more expensive than all of the other options, and had only marginally higher assessed benefits than Options A and B. Journey times were almost as long as for Option D. Officers view was that that Options B and E would be competing with the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet scheme and the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme. The additional cost of Options B and E via Cambourne compared to Option A via Bassingbourn were considered to be significantly greater than the cost of the GCP's Cambourne to Cambridge scheme.

For the reasons listed in paragraph 3.10 of the report, officers recommended that Option A via Bedford, Sandy and Bassingbourn should be the Councils preferred route option. None of the options had formal status at the current time.

As the route options were currently defined as broad corridors, it was not possible to assess in detail the impact of the routes on local communities and the environment in detail. The Technical Report accompanying the consultation stated that "Route alignments would be developed to avoid direct impacts on significant environmental features" with paragraphs 40 to 57 of Appendix A to the report providing more detail on the issues setting out the further requirements of the Council in relation to them as the EWR Company took forward the development of the central section.

The consultation also asked for views on whether the EWR Company was right to focus on routes that entered Cambridge from the south. Paragraphs 17 and 18 of Appendix A to this report set out why officers recommended that the Council confirm that it agreed that the EWR central section should enter Cambridge from the south.

The following speakers contributed to the debate and are summarised in the appendix to these minutes:

- Councillor Alex Hirtzel speaking on behalf of Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Parish Council.
- Councillor Nigel Strudwick representing Whaddon Parish Council
- Councillor Doctor Roger James representing Meldreth Parish Council
- Michelle Howchin speaking on behalf of St Neots Residents
- Councillor Mandy Smith Local Councillor For Papworth And Swavesey
- Councillor Van De Ven Local Member Melbourn And Bassingbourn
- Cllr Sebastian Kindersley the Chairman of the Cambridge Bedford Rail Road Lobby Group

A written submission from Mr Mike Tarbit, bsc. Phd was circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting with copies available at the meeting and is also summarised as part of the appendix.

Having listened and considered the submissions made, the Committee debated the report. Those with concerns regarding the recommendation on Option A made the following points:

- several Members considered that the consultation had been unsatisfactory and required a greater degree of honesty on where the houses would be located and therefore could not support the recommendations. The suggestion was made that they had no right to consult on new communities.
- The need to look at all routes again in more detail.
- It was suggested that a report of this nature should have a workshop in advance to help Members with the details.
- Once the route was agreed, this would put pressure local councils to build the number of houses, even if not supported by local employment.
- The way the report was written suggested that the figure of the number of houses was what would be required to support a railway link and implied most people would be commuters.
- Road closures was an issue of concern with no detail provided.
- Houses should not be built that would just serve for commuters to travel to London.
- The paper had been written with an East West Rail Company slant rather than what was best for Cambridgeshire.
- Some members disagreed with the assertion that some of the routes would be in competition with the A428 as they were different transport passenger carriers.
- One Member suggested the emphasis should be looking east of Sandy.
- St Neots and Cambourne required better transport links.
- Concern was expressed regarding blocking rights of way. One Member on this issue suggested he would like to see the cost of Option A include costings for underpasses so rights of way were not blocked. In response the officers suggested there would be the opportunity to have parallel rights of way provision like had been undertaken with the Guided busway. It had been raised so that the East West Rail Company was aware of the need for early engagement as it was easier to construct bridges / underpasses on a new railway line than on existing rail lines.
- The press release in advance of the meeting had been premature.

Those in favour supported Option A as the best option and in respect of the need for improved transport links. The point was made that the old Bedford-Sandy rail route could not be revived as a great deal of development had been built over parts of the original route in the intervening years.

General points made in the discussion included:

- Disappointment being expressed that the trains proposed had been down-graded from electric to diesel hybrid.
- That this was only a consultation by the East West Rail Company and that the County Council was not the decision maker.
- Highlighting that Central Government in making a decision would look at the wider strategic benefits for the region and not just a cost benefit analysis of any finally agreed route in isolation.
- That with reference to the Council's experience with the ongoing Anglia level crossing closures programme by Network Rail, officers considered that they should highlight to the East West Rail Company the risk issues in this area and need for engagement at this early stage, to help minimise the risks of objections from the Council at a later stage.
- That new settlements were strongly revenue negative for local authorities with the Vice Chairman already having made representations with regard to the Waterbeach development that Government needed to look to providing £1 billion of infrastructure cost for every 10,000 houses.
- Requesting more information regarding the stop at St Neots station. In reply officers clarified that the East West Rail Company had not looked at any options to use the existing St Neots station. Cambridge to St Neots would be well served for transport by the busway and A428 improvements. Improving rail links through St Neots would be a Government decision in terms of whether it met their objectives for new communities, as while additional lines could be physically provided, it would have a significant cost implication.

Following consideration of the comments received from the public, parish councillors and county councillors and the extensive discussions undertaken, as there was a divergence of views within the Committee, the Chairman took individual votes on each recommendation.

It was resolved:

- a) Unanimously to confirm the Council's strong support for the delivery of East West Rail central section.
- b) By a majority to support Option A via Bedford South, Sandy and Bassingbourn as the Council's preferred option
- c) By a majority to confirm that the Council agrees that the central section should enter Cambridge from the south.
- d) Unanimously to confirm the vital importance of the early delivery of Cambridge South station and four tracking between Cambridge Station and the Shepreth Branch junction.
- e) Unanimously that a summary of the comments made at the meeting should be included as part of the final response to the consultation.

- f) Unanimously to delegate to Executive Director Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, the authority to make minor changes to the response; and
- g) Unanimously to confirm the Council's strong support for the development and delivery of the East West Rail eastern section.

222. NORTH EAST CAMBRIDGE ACTION PLAN - ISSUES AND OPTIONS – CONSULTATION 2

Councillor Williams declared a disclosable interest in this report as a Cabinet member on South Cambridgeshire District Council who were to make an announcement later that day and took no part in the discussion of the item.

The report asked the Committee to consider the key issues arising from the consultation on the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan – Issues and Options 2 report and endorse the response set out in Appendix 2 which had been provided separately from the main despatch agenda with spare copies made available at the meeting.

The North East Cambridge (NEC) site is located between the A14 and Chesterton containing one of the last remaining substantial brownfield sites in Cambridge, referred to as Cambridge Northern Fringe East, (CNFE), as well as the Cambridge Science Park.

The report included a series of questions seeking views from the community and stakeholders. Consultation commenced 11 February 2019 and is due to close on 25 March 2019. This is the second Issues and Options consultation for the area. The first, held in December 2014 was referred to as Cambridge Northern Fringe East. E&E Committee endorsed the County Council response to the first consultation in March 2015. Following the first Issues & Options consultation in December 2014, work on the AAP was paused to consider the way forward, and whilst the Councils' Local Plans were progressed. In the following years, there had been a number of significant developments in particular, submission of a successful bid to Government for the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) to relocate the Water Recycling Centre off-site, the delivery of Cambridge North Railway Station with Guided Busway link, and completion of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study.

The Council strongly supports the vision for NEC having delivered the extension to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, and been involved in the delivery of the new Cambridge North railway station both infrastructure providing sustainable transport links for the development of the area.

Officers broadly supported the policies of the AAP although a number of responses to the questions were subject to further detail as set out in the report including:-

- The transport study is currently being undertaken including establishing a highway trip budget. As this work had not yet concluded officers considered it premature to give too much commentary on some of the questions.
- Primary school and early year's provision would be needed on site, to be

informed by the number of dwellings and housing mix. The scale of required provision could only be given once more detail was known.

As a result of the announcement of the successful **HIF bid?** the previous day, there would be a need to make some minor textual changes to the response as currently presented.

The local Member for Chesterton raised two issues one strategic and one divisional. On a strategic level he highlighted the need for a fast Shuttle Train Service from Cambridge North to the South to help minimise the use of cars. He also raised the issue of the closure of the Fen Road rail crossing which during the rush hour could close for up to half an hour in the hour. He highlighted the need for an alternative access point to be provided at the other end of Fen Road to allow commuters to exit the site to help avoid more social isolation and friction between different communities living in the area. The local community of Chesterton Fen had made it known that they did not wish to be included in the AAP with many having signed a petition against the proposals and with the view expressed by those that spoke to the local member that they wished the status quo to remain.

Questions of clarification included the Committee asking for more precise information on the length of time the crossing was closed during peak periods to be provided outside of the meeting. It was suggested that Councillor Manning could help with this response.

In discussion:

- One Member suggested the last line of the response in paragraph 2.4 reading “Consideration of this matter should include the wider implications of the ongoing operation of the railheads for potential new neighbouring development including the impact of any HCV movements, dust and noise emissions” regarding the Concept plan being revised to remove residential use from the immediate proximity of the railheads, should be strengthened, and should be a condition submission prior to it taking place. **Action: Officers agreed to strengthen the wording in this paragraph.**
- A question was raised regarding where the water works would be potentially relocated. **Action The officer indicated she would consult with the Waste and Water team and write to the Committee outside of the meeting.** Regarding secondary school provision one member was concerned that no additional school was being proposed on site and suggested all options should be kept open. In response it was explained that there was sufficient secondary school places to meet the expected demand from the development in the surrounding area.
- On paragraph 2.20 of the response a query was raised regarding whether consideration should be given to the use / type of development. **Action Officers agreed to look at use classes**
- A question was raised regarding how parking would be controlled on the site. Officers would be working closely with Trinity Park to ensure this was kept to a minimum and would be part of the planning consent. Currently the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study identified that 70% of employees travelled to the site by car and that included those living nearby and therefore going forward, this

needed to be reduced through restrictions on parking provision.

- Additional development should only be undertaken that severely limited vehicle parking provision if not eliminating it completely to encourage other modes of travel. One way to achieve this was to provide jobs in the vicinity of the development and through high density housing with no parking provision. Another member on the same point highlighted that high density housing required good public transport provision with bus routes being kept and not stopping at 8.00 p.m. in the evening.
- In reply to how trip management would be undertaken this would use the same principle as used at Waterbeach.
- Assurances were sought with regard to health implications and that attention would be paid to all pollution impacts and air-borne pollution and in particular, the siting of primary schools. Assurance was provided that officers would be keeping a watching brief in terms of the site and the location of the primary school. The Education Service already had noise and air pollution restrictions requirements and would ensure any location for a school was environmentally appropriate.
- The Vice Chairman highlighted the need to include all existing residents in the consultation to ensure they felt involved and did not feel isolated and that the proposals were being imposed on them. It was important that they had a voice and could contribute. The emphasis needed to be on cohesive growth.
- The Chairman queried whether the changes to the text would be minor and if it was found that more major changes were required, then they should be circulated to the whole Committee.

Following consideration of the Committee's comments and local Member contributions

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the County Council's consultation response to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan – Issues and Options; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director: Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, the authority to make any minor changes to the consultation response prior to submission and that if more significant changes were required, they should be shared with the whole Committee.

223. LAND NORTH WEST OF SPITTALS WAY AND ERMINE STREET GREAT STUKELY OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

This report asked the Committee to consider and endorse the officers' response to an outline planning application from Bloor Homes South Midlands and Narrowmine Properties Ltd for up to 1,000 new dwellings at Ermine Street, Great Stukeley to Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC), as the local planning authority. The officer response to the planning application consultation attached as Appendix 1, had already been submitted to HDC on the 13th December 2018 in order to meet the consultation deadline.

Issues highlighted included:

- Table 1 of the report set out the out the key infrastructure items required by the County Council.
- That in respect of the location of the primary school in relation to noise from Ermine Street, officers recommended repositioning its siting as detailed in the report with suitable crossing places and that additional information should be provided regarding both internal and external noise levels at the school, having regard to Building Bulletin and the Acoustic for Schools Design Guide (2015).
- The land offered for the primary school sites was for two forms of entry which was sufficient to meet the development but not cumulative need when including the land to the north of Ermine Street. Education had therefore requested land for three forms of entry.
- Contributions towards the expansion of the local secondary school was required to be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement.
- Due to the low density of housing the proposal was for library provision through a contribution to expand Huntingdon library rather than providing one on site.
- Agreed contribution towards Special Education Needs provision at the Alconbury Weald special school had been sought from the District Council.
- As the applicant had now addressed the issues highlighted in the report, the holding objection in respect of issues highlighted in the County's responsibilities as the lead Local Flood Authority had now been withdrawn.
- A revised full Transport Assessment should be submitted as the current traffic assessment and mitigation measures were not acceptable. As a result, a holding objection had been included in the initial response. Once the flows and modelling had been revised, a suitable package of traffic, walking and cycling mitigation measures could then be agreed.
- The Council's Definitive Map team were objecting to the application until a Public Rights of Way strategy was provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and the County Council.
- Public Health, Archaeology, County Planning and Strategic Waste and Library Service had raised issues of concern which would either be addressed by way of planning condition or by working with the application to agree appropriate mitigation measures.

In discussion:

- The Vice-Chairman queried the average household size multiplier of 2.25 people per dwelling in paragraph 2.12 on page 78 when the figure in the explanatory note on page 79 gave an increase in population of 3591 which in his calculation only gave a multiplier of 2. It was explained that 2.25 was HDC's multiplier, while the Council may have used a higher one.
- It was suggested consideration should be given to vegetation barriers for noise pollution reduction.
- The local member for Huntingdon West referencing page 74 paragraph 1.20 that while noise levels on outdoor teaching spaces should not exceed 55Db this limit would be exceeded in the external areas and playing fields closest to Ermine Street asked about the effect on residents and their properties. In response, it was recognised that the noise issue was a challenge and developments with schools tended to be near roads for access. There was the issue of the siting of schools to be able to serve both parts of the community. The officers felt the

proposed general location was appropriate. The developers were being asked to look at the design of the school to see what mitigation could be achieved.

- Asking whether the special school provision would be from CIL or Section 106 monies, officers confirmed that the County Council had sought Section 106 contributions towards the Special Education Needs facilities.
- Some of the traffic studies undertaken had highlighted the need for crossings across the A141 and Ermine Street. In response it was indicated that signalled crossings were being proposed.
- Whether a children's centre would be included on site. In response it was explained that a community centre was being proposed which would include children centre provision
- A question was raised regarding what the access would be for the community to access local roads and the A14. In response the access proposals would be for access to Ermine Street and the A141 but that there were no proposals for the A14. **Action: More information was requested outside the meeting on the access to be provided to local roads**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse the response as set out in Appendix 1; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director - Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

224 KENNET GARDEN VILLAGE OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

This report asked the Committee to consider the Council's response to an outline planning application for up to 500 new dwellings at Kennett. There had been extensive public consultation by the applicant to ensure an opportunity for everyone to express their views.

Prior to submission of the planning application, pre-application discussions were held with Council officers to determine the main issues for the development site, which included traffic movements through the site and education provisions – particularly the relationship with, and impacts on Suffolk infrastructure due to the close proximity to the county boundary.

To provide for the new children from the development, as well as those from existing Kennett homes, it has been provisionally agreed that the existing primary school in Kennett would relocate to the heart of the new development site, subject to planning permission, with good links to be provided to the existing settlement. The primary school site was large enough to allow for expansion, should there be a need to do so in future years. Officers had liaised with Suffolk County Council officers to ensure any impacts on Suffolk education infrastructure could be planned, with many children currently accommodated at Kennett primary school from Suffolk catchments.

The original report stated that the development was not proposing any bus service improvements and was therefore subject to a holding objection as detailed in Appendix

2 of the report. A holding objection had also been raised against potential flood impacts. An oral update indicated that as a result of detailed information having been provided by East Cambridgeshire District Council the previous day, both objections had been withdrawn. Appendix 1 contained the officer response made to the outline planning application which has already been submitted in order to meet the local planning authority deadline.

Table 1 detailed the main S106 contributions sought by the Council. Officers would come back to Committee with a further report to agree the final S106 requirements. It was advised that the secondary school mitigation would need to be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement and not from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as identified in the officer response. The Council's Highways section were continuing to work with the applicant to overcome highway safety and design issues. Officers would continue to liaise with the applicant and the local authority to progress the Heads of Terms for a S106 Agreement and to agree suitable planning conditions to secure the necessary infrastructure and make the development acceptable in planning terms. It was highlighted that there had been no viability discussions raised to date.

As changes were now required, it was agreed to add a delegation regarding approval to minor changes.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) endorse the response previously submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, the authority to make any minor amendments to the response.

225. WELLCOME TRUST GENOME CAMPUS OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

The planning application for the mixed use development of the land known as Wellcome Genome Campus Development was submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council in December 2018. This was an outline application made by Wellcome to expand the existing Wellcome Genome Campus. The purpose of this report was to update the Committee on the progress of the outline planning application and to appraise the Committee of the Council's response to the application.

Prior to and since the submission of the planning application, the County Council, the applicant and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) were holding ongoing discussions to identify and resolve issues relating to the application and in respect to the planning obligations (section 106 agreement).

Officers had reviewed the application and supporting documents and a summary of the key issues were set out in the main body of the report with detailed comments included in Appendix 2. This section sets out the key issues arising from the development.

Key issues highlighted included:

- The Council recognised that general multipliers would not produce the most likely forecasts for this site and had therefore agreed to draw a comparison with the Eddington site in Cambridge being developed by Cambridge University.
- Regarding early years provision as there were limited spaces at existing providers, the Council supported the proposal to provide early years facilities on the site.
- The pupil yield was unlikely to be sufficient to justify the provision of an on-site primary school but the impact of the development on existing schools would require mitigation as detailed in the report.
- The County Council supported the view that there was no need for a new secondary school on site. However, proportionate contributions towards a one form of entry expansion to Sawston Village College was required to mitigate the impact of this development.
- Regarding transport, a holding objection was recommended as there were a number of issues identified primarily concerning the development mix, trip generation, internalisation of trips, accident data and mode share as well as a number of outstanding issues concerning the site strategy, off-site improvements and parameter plans which required to be addressed.
- There was a requirement for a “Detailed Waste Management and Minimisation Plan”
- An objection to the generic mitigation strategy for archaeology had been registered for the reasons detailed in the report.
- A request for funding through section 106 contributions has been made to secure early intervention and preventative services in order to support new residents in the community.
- A library facility should be located in a shared building with partner services. Other service providers might include information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and Children’s Centres.
- The detailed review and recommendations regarding public health were contained in Appendix 2.
- Officers were working with the applicant and SCDC to progress the Heads of Terms for a Section 106 Agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure required in planning terms with the table in the report providing a schedule of the planning obligations that were currently proposed and considered necessary to mitigate the impact of the development.

In discussion issues raised and responded to included:

- On a question on how primary children would travel to school it was explained that site was within statutory distances to the nearest schools and therefore no school transport was required, but officers would be looking for sustainable walking and cycling routes.
- A request to remove the derogatory name for Cambourne from the response.
- In reply to when the bio-medic centre would be going forward to South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee it would be in the next month.
- The Vice Chairman asked for and received the approval of the Committee to represent the County Council at the District Council Planning Committee.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the Council's comments on the planning application and delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to conclude negotiations on the section 106 agreement; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Place and Economy) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the Council's response in Appendix 2.

226 CONNECTING CAMBRIDGESHIRE PROGRAMME FULL FIBRE TARGET

This report sought approval to the proposed approach and target for “full fibre” to support better digital connectivity for Cambridgeshire.

In March 2017, this Committee approved the “Connectivity Blueprint” for the County and in August 2018 endorsed an expansion of the Programme and approved a partnership approach with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) to support new targets for mobile and full fibre coverage. This included endorsing the expansion of a threefold increase in the full fibre footprint coverage target for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to take coverage to just over 12% by the end of 2022. (In line with the UK average)

Following on from the publication of the ‘Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review ‘(FTIR), the Government had set a revised target of achieving almost 50% (15m premises) full fibre coverage across the UK by 2025, with ubiquitous coverage by 2033. As by January 2019 the full fibre coverage for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had risen to 8.29%, (compared to the England coverage of 5.69%) the report detailed the initiative to be undertaken in the next four years to help facilitate a further increase in fibre coverage across the County. The report proposed an increased target from 12% to 30% following successful funding bids to the Department of Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Rural Broadband Scheme and the Local Fibre Network Programme (LFNN) which would enable such an expansion within the budget available. The aim was to enable fibre upgrades to over 100 public sector sites focussing on the more rural locations across Huntingdonshire, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire.

The report also provided detail of the LFFN Public Sector Assets Re-use (PSAR) bid which focused on the development of the Council's fibre duct assets in the Northern and Southern sections of the busway. It includes plans to link and extend the ducts in the busway by deploying additional fibre ducting and access chambers as part of the Chisholm Trail and the Linton Greenway walking and cycling scheme to provide a 40km fibre corridor from St. Ives to Linton.

A report outlining more detail about the proposed collaboration with the University of Cambridge was to be considered by the Council's Commercial and Investment Committee, with a recommendation to proceed with the establishment of a joint venture arrangement for the commercial development of the Council's fibre duct assets. Given that 90% of the cost of fibre ducting was associated with retrofitting, deploying ducting as part of transport infrastructure schemes would significantly lower cost, minimise

disruption and potential damage to new roads/pathways associated with retrofitting ducting. The report proposed incorporating to all new schemes, and existing schemes already underway fibre ducting design and deployment within the scheme design.

In discussion:

- The Member of the Committee for Whittlesey South highlighted that some villages still lacked any fibre coverage, with reference being made to the village of Benwick as an example where assurances had been provided that they would receive coverage within the agreed original work programme. **Action: The officer would provide a progress update to the member outside of the meeting.**
- While congratulating the officers on achieving 97% fibre coverage by the end of the year, one Member suggested that as the target agreed several years ago had been for 100% coverage, this could not be seen to be a success. *(Post meeting note: the target at the outset was to achieve “over 90% coverage by 2015” – which was achieved (93% by 2015). The targets were subsequently increased to exceed 95% by end of 2017 (achieved early), 97% by end of 2019 (achieved early) and over 99% by the end of 2020).*
- Another Member highlighted that with regard to the above, the Team’s success had led to high expectations and the emphasis now needed to be on eliminating ‘not spots’
- The Vice Chairman highlighted that on Page 195 paragraph 5.12 and 5.14 required some tidying up. **He would share his suggestions with the report author outside of the meeting.**
- The Chairman requested that officers prepare a list of ‘Not Spots’ including a timetable for their rectification to be circulated in due course to all county councillors and also made available to district councillors and their relevant officers. **Officer Action required.**

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Approve setting a new full fibre target to achieve over 30% coverage across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough by 2022, within the existing Connecting Cambridgeshire budget.
- b) Note the approach to the Government’s Local Full Fibre Network (LFFN) Programme delivery, including use of Council assets to support better connectivity.
- c) Approve the creation of a *Fibre Ducting in Transport Schemes* policy for the Council, to include design and delivery of fibre ducting in all infrastructure schemes going forward.

- d) Delegate to the Executive Director - Place & Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, authority to finalise the detailed wording and oversight of implementation of *Fibre Ducting in Transport Schemes* policy.

227. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – JANUARY 2018

The Committee received this report in order to comment on the projected financial and Performance outturn position as at the end of January 2018.

The main issues highlighted were:

Revenue: The Service had started the financial year with two significant pressures for both the Coroners Services and Waste (both which came under Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee). The Place and Economy Service was now forecasting an underspend of £78K at year end.

Capital the forecast spend for Kings Dyke in 2018-19 had been revised down from £6m to £5.4m to reflect the contract with Keir being signed slightly later than previously assumed and the spend would now take place in the next municipal year but this did not impact on the overall scheme cost.

Performance: Of the eight performance indicators, three were currently red, one was amber and four were green.

The indicators currently red were:

- Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area.
- The average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes
- % of Freedom of Information requests answered within 20 days.

At year-end, the current forecast was that the local bus passenger journeys and the average journey time indicators would remain red, two would be amber and four green.

In discussion comments included:

- With reference to page 205 and bus journeys originating in Cambridgeshire showing a downward trend one Member stated that in his opinion there was a direct correlation to actions taken by the County to reduce bus subsidies and was not just a national issue as suggested by the text.
- With reference to page 210 a Member queried why the text to the graph for motor traffic entering and leaving Cambridge compared to the previous year was said to be a decrease of 1% but the line was going up. This was as the figures in the graph showed it being from a minus 2 position in 2017 to a minus 1 position in 2018.

It was unanimously resolved to note the report.

228. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIP, LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

This report invited the Committee to review its Agenda and Training Plans which had been included as appendices to the report. The Training Plan details had not changed since the last meeting with the only training still to take place being the next days' Member Seminar on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. There were no updates to report in respect of the agenda plan and no appointments were required to be made. The Committee was however asked to confirm the proposed cancellation of the April Committee meeting.

It was resolved

- a) To Note the Agenda Plan.
- b) To agree to the cancellation of the April reserve meeting date.

229. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 23RD MAY 2019

**Chairman:
23RD MAY 2019**

APPENDIX MINUTE 221 - EAST WEST RAIL COMPANY CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS BETWEEN BEDFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

COUNCILLOR ALEX HIRTZEL SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF BASSINGBOURN CUM KNEESWORTH PARISH COUNCIL.

4 key objections the proposals for routes coming to Bassingbourn.

The transport needs are better served geographically elsewhere.

- the transport needs are better served by either a more northerly route, or indeed Royston
- the route is geographically too close to an existing excellent rail track that already goes into central Cambridge and London
- We believe, as currently happens, new buildings at Bassingbourn would mostly serve and attract London commuters to Royston station which is already at capacity during peak times.

Further Transport Issues

- the destructive impact on existing transport connections
- the proposed southern routes would split the area in half; its roads, its footpaths, its villages.
- Hidden costs to the local infrastructures have not been quantified : such as the undeniable need to upgrade the A1198 and the full dualling of the A505
- Bassingbourn High Street has its own serious traffic issues and around the village there are many minor roads, which link communities and must be all taken into account

The Environmental Impact (Now Called Local Natural Capital)

Highlighting

- the important sites at both the RSPB and Wimpole, which bring a connected framework of natural corridors to other smaller nature reserves which must be protected.
- Equally important were the heritage sites, in the immediate area. There were two as yet uninvestigated sites of importance, once lost, much local and wider history would be lost.
- Increased sound: due to the expensive raised rail tracks passing over the flood plain, impacted by the noise pollution the diesel hybrid trains would make.

- The Visual impact of such a huge development would mean the loss of the beautiful Cam valley area; the old villages would lose their identities, joined up by strings of poorly thought through development

Fourthly the inadequate process

East West Rail have only given the communities information a few weeks ago, not enough time, and not enough clarification of information to enable us to provide a more comprehensive response. In reply to a clarification question from a member regarding this the consultation had only been run between 28th January and 11th March.

For the above reasons, they stated there was not enough justifiable need for a second rail route into Cambridge positioned in the area.

COUNCILLOR NIGEL STRUDWICK REPRESENTING WHADDON PARISH COUNCIL

Highlighted and questioned

- that the consultation being undertaken by East West Rail was not a statutory consultation.
- The East West Rail case for routes was predicated on the decommissioning of the barracks. The Barracks at Bassingbourn were being reopened / recommissioned with more regiments being housed on site. CCC appeared to be unaware of this while local residents were aware. The decommissioning of the barracks and sale by Ministry of Defence proposal did not form part of the recently adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan,
- How the Council could be asked to support an option that may have no benefits for the local South Cambridgeshire community when there may not be an access point to a new railway in the area?
- The Road and rail have two different user groups and provide complementary and not competitive benefits and questioned why the Committee concerned about competition with A428 improvement schemes?

COUNCILLOR DOCTOR ROGER JAMES REPRESENTING MELDRETH PARISH COUNCIL

While participating in the consultation the core unanswered question was whether the consultation was about the route of the new railway or was it about the choice of a site for a New Town in Cambridge?

If it was about a new railway then just the Northern corridor routes B and E – which go via Cambourne - are the only contenders to serve any of the centres of population in Cambridge. If it was about the site of a New Town then was this consultation and decision process the appropriate mechanism to pre-determine this question and was it to predetermine a town. Are we simply masquerading the decision on the New Town as the choice of a railway route? They had not had a satisfactory answer from EWR Co to the question of development and the fixing of the route will have in pre-determination the choice of the New Town irrespective of any subsequent process. In the various meetings with EWR Co they do not discuss

development even though the whole scheme is critically dependent on development. They offered no information to provide an accurate 'like for like' costing including the consequential roadworks in South Cambridge a Bassingbourn development would necessitate – including dualling the routes from Bassingbourn to the A428, to the M11 and to Royston. Equally if the choice for EWR Co is to find the cheapest route this has been identified as via Hitchin and is estimated to cost just £1bn.

He reiterated the question was the consultation process designed to ask about the route of a new railway or to make a de-facto choice on the site of a New Town? If it is the former, then why are any routes other than B & E considered?

MICHELLE HOWCHIN REPRESENTING ST NEOTS RESIDENTS

Speaking to gain support for the largest town in Cambridgeshire, St Neots, to be included on the new East West railway connecting Cambridge and Oxford. She indicated she was representing over 1,400 people who had signed a petition in less than two weeks and were hoping to reach 5,000 shortly.

She was not supportive of a new rail station called St Neots South, but rather was campaigning for the existing St Neots Station to be a stop on the new EWR line.

In support of her case she highlighted that:

- St Neots was already the largest town in Cambridgeshire with 40,000 people and 45,000 if you include the Paxtons Making it the second largest population after Cambridge itself
- The town has extensive growth plans with 4,000 new homes and 15,000 new residents actively being planned
- The town is a strong rail commuter town with over 1.3m journeys a year
- The station is strategically placed near the industrial centres where multi-national companies are already located
- Many people walk or cycle to the station and have chosen their homes for their proximity to the current station
- And the growth plans for new housing estates and business parks are all located within close proximity of the existing station and being sold with key rail infrastructure links

She highlighted that the town felt it was being neglected and forgotten despite having some of the highest council taxes in the county. She was seeking the support of the county council to invest in St Neots by including the existing rail station as a stop along the new East West rail link. This would:

- enable people to improve their daily commutes to Cambridge, Bedford and Milton Keynes; replacing lengthy and congested road journeys.
- widen people's choice of work location and increase their mobility, swapping a London commute by rail for a more local role in Cambridgeshire or Bedfordshire
- attract businesses to invest in St Neots and put life back into empty industrial units or brown field sites
- provide much needed local employers and support the carbon reduction targets by providing local work
- reduce the traffic and congestion on the roads surrounding the town

She highlighted that if you look at a map of Cambridgeshire and draw the infrastructure which already exists connecting towns to Cambridge, there was already:

- Guided bus rail from the North via Huntingdon and St Ives
- Great Northern railway from the South via Royston, Meldreth, Foxton

Then if you overlay the map with the areas of maximum population and plans for growth it follows the spine of the A428, and therefore in their view it was apparent that the best route for serving the people of Cambridgeshire and most profitable railway would be via:

- St Neots
- Cambourne/Papworth and
- Northstowe - Where 80% growth is expected and a further 33k homes.

It does not make commercial sense or act in the best interests of the Cambridgeshire people, to support a route via Sandy or Bassingbourn.

Why St. Neots over Sandy or Bassingbourn?

- Sandy has a population four times smaller than St. Neots
- Bassingbourn has a populations of 12.5 times smaller than St. Neots and is within 4 miles of the existing rail connection to Cambridge via Royston
- The previous railway connection was closed for being unprofitable due to rural small village stops, let's not make the same mistake again!
- Tempsford has a population of 600 (75 times smaller than St. Neots) and is 5 miles away
- Require extensive road infrastructure improvements between St. Neots and Tempsford
- Increase local pollution and congestion on single lane roads for people to travel to the new station
- Reliant upon train synchronised schedules and timely running for connections from St Neots station
- Increase London commute times with an additional stop (which no one wants)
- Or worst case, relocates the current St Neots Station
 - Disrupting thousands of peoples logistic plans
 - Increasing pollution as cars are required instead of walking or cycling to the station
 - Increasing costs as people need secondary cars or increase childcare, commute costs
 - Reducing the value of local housing as proximity to the station is significantly reduced
 - Reducing the attraction for St Neots companies to remain in St. Neots

In response to questions raised she explained that she had been in consultation with Councillors Barry Chapman and Councillor Paul Davies the St. Neots Parish Council Chairman. On being asked which routes they would support the answer was B and E.

COUNCILLOR MANDY SMITH LOCAL COUNCILLOR FOR PAPWORTH AND SWAVESEY

She supported the report recommendations as did residents she had spoken to in her area.

COUNCILLOR VAN DE VEN LOCAL MEMBER MELBOURN AND BASSINGBOURN

She opposed Route A.

Her views included:

- the question of endorsing a specific route option was at least as much about development site selection as it is about choosing where a railway line was to run.
- Expressing deep concern that the current consultation exercise was taking place outside of the statutory planning processes that existed to protect the integrity of new settlements and their accompanying infrastructure. She highlighted that it should be the Local Planning Authorities rather than a railway company leading and managing the process.
- none of the Local Plans covering the Bedford-Cambridge segment of EWR had assessed housing growth and associated infrastructure requirements on anywhere near the scale implied in EWR's proposals – a figure of 30,000 homes have been mooted.
- Flood risk and environmental assessments, have not been carried out.
- The Wildlife Trust had already shared its overwhelming concerns on the ecological impacts of all five route options.
- Development on the route that EWR decides to propose may not be viable.

Cost estimates

The cost of Route A, as the so-called cheapest option, omitted

- Cost of a new Basingbourn station.
- Cost of surrounding highway and other infrastructure for the new town that is implied for Basingbourn, and for the weight of the shadow of development in surrounding communities.
- Cost of relocating the MOD site at Basingbourn Barracks.

Any planning gain for Route A may be wiped out by the need to dual the A603, the A1198, the A10, and the A505, for example.

EWR's claim of undertaking economic analysis cannot be accepted as sound, given that EWR has not published its own high growth scenarios.

Multi-Modal Corridors

Adhering to the principle of multi-modal transport corridors to encourage and facilitate sustainable transport in heavily populated areas, at a time when climate change and biodiversity crises was so well understood, should be an overriding factor in weighing route options.

With reference to the stating that a rail line via Cambourne would 'compete' with capacity allowed by upgraded roads she queried that surely the goal should be for roads to be complemented by high quality public transport.

Option A ran in isolation of the multi-modal transport corridor principle. It already has a rail line, but lacks the kind of road infrastructure required for the scale of development that is implied.

Options B and E most closely adhere to a multi-modal transport corridor and sit largely within a statutory growth area subject to transport infrastructure investment.

Local dis-connectivity:

The officer report highlighted that all public rights of way were potentially at risk. If a railway line was built on a no level-crossing policy and along a series of viaducts and embankments, on whichever route, it would have the effect of a wall, bringing profound **dis-connectivity** to a wide area. She highlighted that many county councillors and district councillors were involved regarding Network Rail's proposed level crossing closures last year when the council deployed very significant officer resources on the issue.

A railway project could not be properly assessed in isolation: as the proposed project had very significant impacts and consequences about which EWR has been able to provide very little detail.

On being asked which options she would support, these would be options B and E. She suggested she had not been consulted in advance on the report recommendations.

Cllr Sebastian Kindersley

In his presentation he highlighted the following:

- that regarding the Bedford and Cambridge Route it was far too early for an organisation to be making recommendations.
- that East West Rail link was required to be built as soon as possible to unlock land for new homes.
- Making reference to the Multi Model corridor along the A428, Option A did not provide this.
- The process fails to comply with the National Infrastructure Commission report.
- There had been no cost benefit analysis of any option. Regarding Option A there were no detailed costs provided and therefore questioned how Option A could be considered to be the most affordable.
- No environmental assessment had been undertaken taking into account either the proposed 30,000 new homes in Bassingbourn and 50,000 in a new city, Tempsford in Bedfordshire. These could not be built without massive infrastructure being provided.

- The National Trust had already objected as the proposed infrastructure would have a detrimental impact on the trusts estate however far south the route was located.
- The plans were not deliverable with Bassingbourn as the Ministry of Defence had different plans for the barracks.
- The current proposals were outside the Transport Planning framework and was not the right vehicle.
- that EWR being a DfT arm's length company was not effective
- it was too early to agree any option without cost benefit and environmental impact information.
- Option A did not provide the Multi Modal Corridor along the A428
- That without massive infrastructure and a rail link the proposed housing at Bassingbourn and Tempsford could not be built as the latter was required to unlock the necessary land.
- that while the report set out issues with the north east approach to Cambridge, it ignored problems with the southern approach.
- He asked the Committee not to express a preference for any option. He could not support recommendations B and C.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION FROM MIKE TARBIT, BSC., PHD.

He had read with astonishment, that officers were advising acceptance of the Route A option proposed by East West Rail in their project outline. He queried how can a route that was driving the construction of 30,000 houses on an undeveloped MoD site with no facilities nor infrastructure be considered as “Lowest cost”; suggesting this was specious. He suggested that it was apparent even to a lay person that the main reason the southern routes existed was actually to drive the development of those houses, not provide urgently needed transport links within the region and beyond to Oxford. The presence of this number of houses would require a greater need for infrastructure than had been delivered in any other housing development in the area in recent years. He suggested that no one could reasonably expect that a few shops and banks such as developed slowly on the Cambourne site would satisfy a development of this size. It would require new hospitals, fire services, Police stations etc., otherwise it would grossly magnify the pressure on those facilities in Cambridge. He suggested Addenbrooke’s, the Rosie and Papworth were struggling already and suggested they would not cope with an increase in their catchment of this size. Nor will this development serve the businesses of Cambridge and surrounds to any significant degree. He also suggested that most of the people dwelling here will simply drive the 3 or 4 miles to Royston station and commute into London! He queried whether it necessary to have two stations three or four miles apart, both linking to the main line north.

He also highlighted the wholly detrimental effect it would have on the rural environment, and Wimpole Hall National Trust land in particular. He suggested most local people felt that the project had been almost pre-determined.