

**MINUTE 612C) ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION FROM MR PETTIT -
REQUEST FOR A BETTER BUS SERVICE FROM TEVERSHAM VIA
TESCO.**

The hourly number 17 bus service which travelled into Cambridge via Teversham and Tesco's in Yarrow Road was extremely useful for the elderly and young families, without their own transport, wishing to travel from the village to Tesco's for both shopping and use of the pharmacy for prescriptions etc.

Due to changes in the bus timetable, driven by the County Council having to make economies, the number 17 is now 2 hourly and misses out the Tesco stop at Yarrow Road going into Cambridge via Coldhams Lane.

Whilst understanding due to the need for economies the hourly service may not be possible, we would ask that the Council considers once again routing the 17 bus into Cambridge via Yarrow Road, Tesco's thus giving the elderly in particular access to this facility without them having the impossible task of walking from Teversham to the Gazelle Way, roundabout to catch the number 1 bus to Tesco's and then having to do the reverse journey with shopping.

**MINUTE 615 ELY CROSSING BACKGROUND WRITTEN INFORMATION
PROVIDED AND CONSIDERED BY CABINET AT THE MEETING IN ADDITION
TO THAT PROVIDED IN THE PUBLISHED REPORT**

**ELY BY-PASS - EMAILS SENT TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES FROM RESIDENTS
RECEIVED ON 13TH SEPTEMBER**

a) My instinct is not to support the proposal for a Southern bypass, indeed any bypass. I may be burying my head in the sand, but any improvements on this scale is going to invite more traffic into the area which will have a negative knock on effect on the surrounding villages. If we have to have a bypass, please not one that spoils the view of the cathedral. The fens are not the most beautiful area in the country and it has taken me many years to get used to it, but ruining the view of one of the few iconic buildings it has, seems sacrilegious.

Sue Foulger, Little Downham.

b) I would like to add my voice to those opposing the adoption of 'Option B' at the upcoming Cabinet meeting of the County Council. I hope it will be able to be considered.

J. F. Coakley

c) this is just to add my voice to those who are urging further consideration of the options available before blundering into Option B which seems to have massive disadvantages in terms of Ely's USP as the home of the Cathedral with all the advantages going to businesses who may well not be local at all. Further work needs to be done on the origin of the lorry traffic that is causing the problem, the role of satnav in causing the excess traffic and the other, less damaging options available. It is difficult to believe that the Councillors can have available to them all the relevant information of sufficient quality if they are willing to go ahead with Option B and one must question the integrity of the process at every level if this is its conclusion. Normal for Ely maybe, but still unacceptable.

Paul Ryan. Ely resident.

d) As a resident of Ely for nearly a year, I wanted to voice my opposition of the proposed viaduct to relieve traffic in the station area. Ely is unique in that it remains a city with 'old English' charm, this is one of the reasons we moved here. It relies heavily on tourism, my husband is in the restaurant business and can confirm this, so it is essential that none of that charm is lost.

I commute to London daily and understand the pressure on the roads in the area, however, I believe that alternatives that have been suggested are much more favourable and need to be investigated. Unfortunately I am unable to make the council meeting to discuss the proposal but wanted to make my views known to you anyway, I know I am not alone in how I feel.

Robyn

e) I am writing to express my objection to the current proposal to build a raised by-pass (Route B), which will have an irreversible impact on the historic setting and landscape of Ely. I urge you to consider alternative constructive ideas suggested by the Ely Crossing action Group.

Mrs Jennifer Farndale Local resident

**Letter dated 13th September 2012 from J Beadsmore to Mr. Greg Luton
Planning Director, English Heritage East of England 24 Brooklands Avenue,
Cambridge CB2 8BU**

Cambs CC Cabinet Meeting 17/9/12
Ely Road Crossing

I have just become aware that Cambridgeshire County Council is holding a Cabinet Meeting on 17th September and that a major item for discussion will be the Ely Road Crossing.

The agenda describes the purpose of this agenda item is to “discuss options to relieve congestion on at the A142 crossing and approve the associated Compulsory Purchase, Side Road and Navigation Orders”. This is for Route B. The tabled papers include a letter from you to Cllr Bates objecting to the Council’s decision to go for Route B with the threat if that if approved “(English Heritage) would have no option but request the Secretary of State call in the application for his determination” Presumably should this happen you will be working hard to reverse the democratic decision of local Government. I am new to this understanding of how the UK planning works having seen it first hand with a Wind Farm close to Great Wilbraham. The planning application was rejected by the Parish Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council only to be approved on appeal. So what is the purpose of local Government?

Your letter is undated but whatever, it is too late for me to write to Cllr Bates hence this letter to you.

I will not go through your letter in detail but just make one fundamental point. You say the “the Cathedral is best appreciated from the south, southeast and east” Correct. Route B leaves the A142 in a SW direction, then goes W and the finally WNW, thus progressively taking the traffic (and the fumes which concern you) away from the Cathedral. The views that worry you are from the fen. I walked the area last year (both sides of the river bank) under the unsightly power lines and failed to understand your concern since most of the bypass is to the south of these walks and hence has no impact on the view.

Yours sincerely,

John Beadsmore
Cc Cllr Bates

Email from **From:** Tom Green Ely Cathedral Chapter **Sent:** 14 September 2012 15:14

To: Frost Alistair

Cc: Headland Michaela; Plant Alex

Subject: Ely Crossing - CCC Cabinet 17.09.12

Dear Alistair

I understand that the County Council Cabinet is due to consider the Ely Crossing Proposal on Monday 17th September. Further to John Harrison's email of 23rd August on behalf of Ely Cathedral Chapter, I write following today's Chapter meeting, at the request of Chapter, to re-iterate support for the construction of a bypass and to convey the additional comments below:

1. Chapter is in favour of the construction of a southern bypass for Ely.
2. Chapter acknowledges that the views of the Cathedral from the river and paths towards Barway & Stretham will be negatively affected by the new road and is supportive of all means of minimising this, however it believes that the greater good is served by the benefits to so many people arising from the alleviation of current traffic problems, together with the enhancement of the view provided to all "through traffic" road users, which the new bypass will deliver.
3. Chapter has seen the "Hidden Bypass for Ely" proposal which has been tabled by Ely Crossing Action, and comments as follows:
 - 3.1 Chapter believes that the visual impact of the new bypass, when viewed from the river towards Barway & Stretham, would be reduced by constructing the new road as close to Ely's southern developed boundary (the railway station & Angel Drove Business Park) as possible. Furthermore, to the extent that it is possible to reduce the length of elevated sections of the new road, this would also lessen the visual impact of the development.
 - 3.2 The "Hidden Bypass for Ely" proposal appears to address both of these issues (3.1) in a positive manner.
 - 3.3 If the question of the route for the bypass is to be considered, Chapter would like to see proper investigation of this option.

Yours sincerely

Tom Green

ELY CROSSING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On the 13th December 2011, Cabinet considered a report that outlined proposals to alleviate traffic congestion at the A142 level crossing in Ely. Cabinet decided to select bypass route B as their preferred option, subject to more detailed analysis, including the production of an Option Assessment Report (OAR).
- 1.2 Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members called in the decisions reached by Cabinet, and examined them at a meeting on the 12th January 2012. A majority voted in favour of not taking any further action at that point, although it was agreed that the Committee would 'overview' the OAR and submit their comments to Cabinet to inform future decisions about the scheme.

- 1.3 The Committee subsequently met on the 12th July to examine the OAR. The meeting was held at the Maltings in Ely to enable local people to observe and express their views. Twenty five people attended to observe the meeting and seven of these addressed the Committee. The following also attended to answer the Committee's questions:
- Councillor Ian Bates, Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning
 - Graham Hughes, Service Director: Strategy and Development
 - Alistair Frost, Project Manager
 - Giles Hughes, Head of Planning & Sustainable Development, East Cambridgeshire District Council
- 1.4 The minutes of the meeting, available from the Scrutiny and Improvement Officer, provide a full record of the discussion. However, there were four particular issues which the Committee agreed to bring to Cabinet's attention, which are summarised in the remainder of this report.
- 1.5 It is important to note that the findings reported below are based on the information presented to the Committee at the time of the meeting. However, a letter from English Heritage which had been sent to Officers prior to the Committee meeting was circulated to Members after the meeting. This is elaborated upon in section 2.7.

2. COMMITTEE VIEWS

Assess potential impact of options on communities around Ely

- 2.1 A member of the public (Mr Brian Burpitt) expressed concerns about the lack of analysis within the OAR about the potential knock on effects on the villages west of Ely. In particular, he suggested that building a bypass could attract higher volumes of Heavy Commercial Vehicle (HCV) traffic and negatively affect road safety and the environment in those areas.
- 2.2 Committee Members followed up on this issue by questioning Officers about the geographical scope of the information that had been presented to them, and were advised that the Ely Market Town Transport Strategy and Ely Master Plan had been taken into consideration, and that the bypass route B option was considered to be an effective approach to coping with the future growth of Ely. However, surveys and modelling around the Ely area had not been conducted as part of the OAR. Officers advised that this could be undertaken if required.
- 2.3 At this point, Members only have anecdotal evidence to suggest that building a bypass would have a negative impact on surrounding communities. However, Members believe that it is important for Cabinet to be fully aware of the full implications of each option, and therefore recommend that Cabinet commission appropriate surveying and modelling to ascertain the impact of the options on surrounding areas.

Obtain formal position statement from English Heritage

- 2.4 Committee Members questioned whether English Heritage had been involved in the options assessment process, given their role as a statutory consultee

and the acknowledgement in the report that options B and D would have an 'adverse impact on the setting of the Cathedral, City and river'.

- 2.5 Officers advised that English Heritage had been involved throughout the process and that they would continue to engage with them. They reported that English Heritage had not provided a formal opinion on the proposed option B, but they had informally indicated their opposition for that proposal due to the negative impact that they perceive that this would have on the Cathedral setting.
- 2.6 Nonetheless, Members agreed that it was important for Cabinet to seek a formal position statement from English Heritage in order to inform future decisions.
- 2.7 Following the meeting, an English Heritage employee contacted the Scrutiny and Improvement Officer to state that a letter had been sent to Council Officers on the 27th June to outline their views about the Ely crossing options, and to ask that this be circulated to Members. This letter, attached as an appendix, states that English Heritage had not received a copy of the OAR at that point. However:

'We judge that it is likely that Option B as proposed will result in substantial harm to the setting of Ely and its cathedral, in the terms set out in the NPPF. On current information, English Heritage would oppose option B and support the option for an improved underpass'.

- 2.8 The Committee Chairman has requested that Officers comment in writing in their report to Cabinet regarding:
- The reasons for the letter not being circulated to the Committee
 - Why they disagree with English Heritage's assessment of option B
 - Any other points they wish to make regarding the heritage aspects of the options

More information about how to mitigate the visual implications of option B

- 2.9 The Committee noted that the visualisations provided for each option met the British Standard and the requirements of English Heritage. The visualisations for the bypass options showed bridges in white concrete, and Members noted that this could be partially mitigated, by painting them in green to match the surrounding area, for example.
- 2.10 Members agreed that Cabinet should consider all methods of adapting whichever option is chosen so that it is sympathetic to the surrounding area.

Majority Support for Option B

- 2.11 The OAR provided an assessment against five possible options. However, the public speakers and Committee Members focussed on the bypass B and underpass improvements options during the meeting, rather than undertaking a systematic examination of each option.
- 2.12 Committee Members, Cabinet Members and Officers all acknowledged that there was a degree of subjectivity about the relative value of the options

under discussion given there were positive and negative factors for each. The view of the Cabinet Member, Officers and some Committee Members was that the adverse effects of option B on the heritage setting of the Cathedral were outweighed by the benefits in terms of value for money, relieving traffic congestion in Ely and improving the area around Ely Station. Underpass improvements would be preferable in heritage preservation terms, but would have limited traffic congestion benefits and no wider benefits. In contrast, it was clear that some members of the public and some Committee Members felt that heritage preservation should have precedence, and they disputed Officer advice regarding the value for money of underpass improvements and their ability to alleviate traffic congestion.

2.13 The Committee voted on this issue as follows:

- Support for Bypass Option B: Six Members in favour (Councillors Butcher, J Clark, Farrer, Hunt, Kenney and Read)
- Not in support of Bypass Option B: Five Members not in support (Councillors Bell, Harrison, Jenkins, van de Ven and Wilkins)

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Cabinet is recommended to:

- 1) Commission appropriate surveying and modelling to ascertain the impact of the options on surrounding areas
- 2) Obtain a formal position statement from English Heritage regarding the OAR in order to inform future decisions
- 3) Consider all methods of adapting whichever option is chosen so that it is sympathetic to the surrounding area
- 4) Proceed with Option B, subject to the above recommendations

Appendix 3

REVISED PAGE 4 ITEM 13 TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT QUARTER
ONE

7. Summary Portfolio Position

7.1 The Council's debt and investment position is shown in the table below:-

	TMSS Forecast February 2012 (as agreed by Council)		Actual as at 31 March 2012		Movement		Actual as at 31 June 2012		Revised Forecast 31 March 2013	
	£m	Rate %	£m	Rate %	Repaid £m	Raised £m	£m	Rate %	£m	Rate %
<u>Long term borrowing</u>										
PWLB	294.6	4.3	276.6	4.3	-	10.0	286.6	4.3	286.6	4.3
Market	75.5	3.9	75.5	3.7	-	-	75.5	3.7	79.5	3.7
Total	370.1	4.3	352.1	4.3	-	10.0	362.1	4.2	366.1	4.2
Short Term Borrowing	-	-	25.0	0.8	15.0	-	10.0	0.9	0.0	0.0
Total Actual Borrowing	370.1	4.3	377.1	4.0	5.0	-	372.1	4.1	366.1	4.0
<u>Investments</u>										
In-house.	-	-	46.3	0.9	168.5	174.9	52.7	0.9	20.0	1.0
External fund manager.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Actual Investments	-	-	46.3	0.9	168.5	174.9	52.7	0.9	20.0	1.0
Total Net Debt / Borrowing	370.1		330.8				319.4		346.1	

7.2 Further analysis of borrowing and investments is covered in the following two sections.

7.3 No variances are currently projected against this budget.

8. Long Term Borrowing

8.1 The Council is required to borrow in order to fund the spending for its Capital Programme for the benefit of Cambridgeshire. The amount of new borrowing required each year is determined by new capital schemes approved and included in the Capital Programme.

8.2 Long term borrowing is taken from 2 main sources:

- **Public Works Loans Board (PWLB)**

Appendix 4

CAMBRIDGE CITY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION RESPONSE - COMMENTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

- 1) **The adverse effect of development in Cambridge on other areas.** The Committee was concerned that there was no reference in the consultation to pressure put on one area such as Cambridge to allow more development and the adverse effect this could have on other areas such as East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire. As more land was released in Cambridge for development, it would be harder for the other areas to reach a standstill sustainable position. It was therefore important that the Plan took into account its impact on the whole footprint of Cambridgeshire.
- 2) **The need for the formal response to contain a strong link to the County Council Transport Strategy.** The Portfolio Holder reported that there were links with the Strategy throughout the document. However, he acknowledged the need to be more explicit. There was also a need to make reference to parking in relation to new developments. It was noted that there had been problems with County Council run parking schemes for such developments. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the problem but requested time to consider at what stage of the process this should be addressed.
- 3) **Development beyond current consents for housing.** The Committee queried whether there was anything in the Plan regarding the need to consider alternative areas for development if building took place on current consents. Members stressed the need to consider the impact of this additional development on the County Council as the strategic authority before it was accepted. There were infrastructure challenges for the Council in relation to health and employment to cope with increased development beyond the thousand of houses, which had already received consent. The Plan therefore needed to take account of what was going on.
- 4) **The reference to 20,000 new jobs in Chapter 3.** The Committee queried what these jobs would entail. The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to page 14 of the response, which alluded to what these jobs would be. She added that forthcoming census data on commuting patterns and economic activity would facilitate understanding of the Travel to Work Area of the sub-region. She acknowledged that another paragraph could be added to the response to address the Committee's comment.
- 5) **The importance of encouraging a balanced population.** The Committee was concerned that the lack of affordable housing had made it very difficult for shop workers for example to live in Cambridge. It was also too expensive for them to live in somewhere like Ely and then drive in. Members stressed that the local economy would require all levels of workers, and that the consultation response should emphasise the importance of the creation of these jobs (and how they will be created) and that new homes will be needed for all.
- 6) **The impact of sustainable development on local towns.** There was concern that housing development with all the necessary infrastructure on site would discourage people from using shops and services in nearby towns.
- 7) **The need for a similar vehicle to Cambridgeshire Horizons to manage development across the County.** One Member summarised the need to emphasise

to Cabinet the importance of jobs and their location. There was also a need to emphasise the importance of the quality of housing design, and the need for lifetime provision. It was suggested that there should be a lower expectation in relation to pocket parks unless they were maintained. The implications on public transport if no car parking was provided should also be highlighted.