

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 23rd May 2006

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.54 a.m.

Present: Councillor J E Reynolds (Chairman in the absence of Councillor Walters)

Councillors: S F Johnstone, V H Lucas, L W McGuire L J Oliver, D R Pegram J A Powley, and J M Tuck.

Also in Attendance

Councillors: G Harper*, G Kenney, A Kent, S King*, S. Normington* and J West*

* for part of the meeting only

Apologies: Councillors J K Walters and F H Yeulett

CABINET WEBCAST

The Chairman announced that the meeting would not be web-cast due to technical problems resulting in only one camera working. It was considered that there would be an unacceptable level of disruption to the meeting in asking people to come forward to the top table each time they wished to speak.

164. MINUTES 18th APRIL 2006

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 18TH April were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

165. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

166. PETITION AGAINST EXCLUDING 2 HECTARES OF LAND AT GLEBE FARM FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

A petition had been received organised by Trumpington Residents Association with 70 signatures reading:

"We the undersigned call on the Cabinet not to exclude 2 hectares of Glebe Farm from the housing development land of the southern fringe. Our community has spent three years working with both Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council on the plans for housing and community facilities in the land released from the Green

Belt around Trumpington, including the whole of Glebe Farm. Excluding a part of Glebe Farm at this late stage will mean the area can no longer be planned as a whole and the loss of housing will have to be made up in other parts of the Southern Fringe."

The spokesperson Stephen Brown spoke in support of the petition stating that:

- While they supported the County Council's aim to provide a local household waste recycling centre, local residents were objecting to an industrial facility being included in a residential area.
- The loss of housing on two hectares of land was likely to result in even greater housing densities being included in the rest of the development.
- No risk assessment inspection had been carried out on the site and they were concerned on health and safety grounds regarding toxicity levels if plastic materials in any proposed centre caught fire.
- There would be a reduction in house values in the proximity of the proposed site.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

With the agreement of the Cabinet, the Chairman agreed that having received the above petition, it was appropriate to change the order of the agenda and take item 6 "Waste Disposal Facilities and Council Land south of Cambridge" next on the agenda.

167. WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES AND COUNCIL LAND SOUTH OF CAMBRIDGE

With the agreement of the Chairman, the local member for Trumpington spoke against the report recommendations to exclude 2 hectares of Glebe Farm from an option agreement with developers. The member tabled a map of the proposed new development area to aid Cabinet's consideration of the issues involved. The member's own view was that:

- The area was an inappropriate place for a household waste recycling facility and transfer site. A household waste recycling centre placed in a residential area was to her knowledge without precedent in the County. Her view was that a decision to go ahead would be tantamount to throwing a grenade into the planning coherence of the Southern Fringe.
- Providing such a centre was an inappropriate use of housing land when there were more suitable alternatives on nearby industrial sites/brownfield sites next to the M11 motorway.
- The Area Development Framework did not identify 2 hectares of land for this use.
- The recommendation was in advance of the conclusions to be brought forward in the "Issues and Options" paper on potential waste sites.

- The recommendation did not appear to have been discussed by a Service Development Group. In response to this point, officers indicated that the development of the Minerals and Waste Plan had been the subject of reports to the Environment, Waste and Business SDG. This level of detail had not however been discussed as the SDG was considering the broader policy issues and would consider preferred options at a later date. Specific planning issues would need to be considered in due course, where appropriate, by the Development Control Committee.
- Including such a site in the middle of residential development would involve dangers to children travelling to schools in the area.

Cabinet was reminded that in September 2003 it had agreed to an option agreement being entered into with Countryside Properties at Glebe Farm, Trumpington as part of the Council's processes to generate the significant capital receipts required to contribute to the funding of the capital building programme. Continued discussions around the precise area of land to be included in the option had at that time precluded signing the agreement. More recently, the site had been suggested as one possibility for inclusion in the new Minerals and Waste Local Development Plan. It was reported that the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority was due to complete its site selection process and publish its preferred options in late 2006 with the recommendations to be the subject of further full public consultation.

The recommendation in the report to exclude 2 hectares of Glebe Farm would keep the Waste Disposal Authority's options open whilst the most appropriate sites for waste facilities in the locality were identified through the Minerals and Waste Planning Process.

In coming to a decision, it was highlighted that Cabinet were not being asked to agree to a specific site for a household waste recycling facility in the south of Cambridge and that other options were still being investigated, with officers vigorously pursuing alternative sites with partner authorities. Cabinet in considering whether to agree the officer recommendation also had to balance the following issues:

- The need for capital receipts/housing provision weighed against the requirement to ensure more waste was recycled as part of Central Government's objectives to reduce carbon emissions.
- The stated objective of the current Waste Local Plan which identified the need to provide household waste recycling facilities in close proximity to new housing developments to ensure people did not have to travel too great a distance to recycle their locally produced waste.
- The need to take into account the substantial fines that would be imposed by Government should the County Council fail to meet its stringent targets for reducing waste to landfill through increasing substantially the amount of household waste recycled.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the process for the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework currently being carried out by the Waste Planning Authority
- ii) To agree, that in order to keep all of its options open at this stage, two hectares of land in the County Council's ownership at Glebe Farm, Trumpington should be excluded from an option agreement with Countryside Properties
- iii) Agree to forgo potentially the full consideration for the disposal of up to two hectares of land at Glebe Farm.
- iv) To note the continuing efforts to identify sites to the south of Cambridge, and in the event that no more suitable sites can be identified in the immediate area, endorse the principle of locating new waste management facilities on County Council owned land at Glebe Farm.

168. CALL IN OF THE DECISION BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (ECS) ON THE HIGHWAYS SERVICES CONTRACT 2006/2016 – COMMENTS FROM THE MEETING OF THE ECS COMMITTEE HELD ON 10TH MAY 2006

This report presented to Cabinet the Environment and Community Services (ECS) Scrutiny Committee's comments following the call-in of Cabinet's decision of 18th April 2006 to approve the award of the Highway Services Contract to W S Atkins.

The scrutiny committee had called in the decision of the Cabinet stating that "This is a very significant contract, both in terms of financial value and the provision of services which are of major concern to the people of Cambridgeshire. It is in the interest of open and accountable government that the Council discloses full background information and a full explanation as to how decisions have been reached. All aspects of the contract, apart from commercially sensitive information, should be scrutinised in public. We do not believe this has been achieved by the report to Cabinet or the decision summary issued by Cabinet."

The scrutiny committee having now reviewed the decision and questioned both the relevant officers and the Cabinet member for Environment and Community Services were satisfied that their concerns with regard to the contract itself had been answered. They agreed that the contract should be the subject to a more detailed scrutiny review once it had been in operation for 12 months. The Committee accepted the assurance given that Cabinet members had

been sufficiently well informed about the facts and issues of the matter to allow them to reach a good decision at their meeting on 18th April 2006. The Committee however wished to draw Cabinet's attention to the following comments:

"In view of the size and significance of the Highways Contract, and in the interests of open and transparent government, Cabinet should have received a fuller and more detailed report on 18th April 2006. The report should have described in depth the process leading up to the proposed decision; the Council's policy background and rationale; the nature and terms of the proposed type of contract; and the risks and benefits involved. As well as benefiting Cabinet members, such a report would have allowed other members of the Council and the general public to understand the process and the issues and have confidence in Cabinet's decision. Although Cabinet members may have had prior knowledge of the matter through their involvement in earlier stages of the process, which assisted their decision-making, it would not be reasonable to assume such knowledge amongst ordinary Councillors or members of the public."

It was resolved:

To note the comments of the Committee with regard to officers providing sufficient information in reports to Cabinet when agreeing final decisions on large contracts.

169. SECTION 28 TRANSFERS

This report sought the approval from Cabinet and Council for a transfer of resources from East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Primary Care Trust (on behalf of the Primary Care Trusts across Cambridgeshire) to deliver a Single Assessment Process for older people in line with the requirements of the National Service Framework for Older People.

The County Council has been working with the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to respond to the National Service Framework for Older People, Standard 2, to implement a single assessment process, to ensure that older people experienced assessment of need and the arrangement and delivery of services as a systematic and integrated process across professions. Taking the lead on behalf of the PCTs, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland PCT had developed the proposal, to take the work forward in collaboration with the County Council. The contribution from the County Council would fund the cost of developing an interface between the Single Assessment Process tool (SAP) and the SWIFT system, which held client information and associated activity that fed the social care performance data. Negotiations were ongoing with the two IT providers to clarify the costs.

In answer to concerns raised by Members, it was reported that it was not expected that the final costs would breach the provision made within the Capital programme (£500,000) with a current estimate of the costs being at £100,000 for the Council's share of the project. Members also asked whether officers were confident that the interface would enable the two different computer systems to finally be able to communicate with each other. In reply, it was reported that whilst an absolute solution had not yet been found, the close work being undertaken with the appropriate suppliers was expected to ensure the project aims would be achieved.

Members requested that the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership should oversee and monitor progress.

It was resolved:

- i) To accept the principle of the transfer of funds under Section 28a of the National Health Service Act 1977 from East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Primary Care Trust (on behalf of the four Primary Care Trusts across Cambridgeshire) to Cambridgeshire County Council, as set out in Appendix 1 subject to confirmation from the County Council auditors that the agreement was valid and that the cost of the interface of the Single Assessment Process tool (SAP) and SWIFT, as set out in paragraph 3.2. of the officer's report would not breach the provision made within the Council's Capital Programme.
- ii) To recommend that the Council be asked to approve the transfer of funds under Section 28a of the National Health Service Act 1977 from East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Primary Care Trust (on behalf of the four Primary Care Trusts across Cambridgeshire) to Cambridgeshire County Council.
- iii) That the transfer and subsequent monitoring of the project should be overseen by the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership.
- iv) To note that the County Council's capital programme included £500,000 split over two years (£200,000 in 2006/07 and £300,000 in 2007/08) to support the integration of older people's services and that the interface between SAP and SWIFT would be prioritised from this allocation, to support this joint approach.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

With the agreement of the Cabinet, as the two local members were now present at the meeting, the Chairman agreed that it would be appropriate to change the order of the agenda and take agenda item 10 “ Response to Forty Foot Bank Petitions” as the next report on the agenda.

170. RESPONSE TO FORTY FOOT BANK PETITIONS

Following the two recent tragic incidents involving vehicles entering the Forty Foot Drain and the subsequent press campaign to gather suggestions for improving road safety on this road, two petitions had been presented to Cabinet on the 7th of February 2006. This report set out the results of ongoing investigations into a variety of potential accident remedial measures for the Forty Foot Bank, Benwick.

The local member for Ramsey supported further investigation into the feasibility of provision being made for Average Speed Cameras, as in her view speeding was clearly recognised as the major cause of accidents on this stretch of road.

The local Member for Forty Foot made the point that the stretch of road travelled for five miles without a bend and as it had recently been resurfaced and had good visibility, this encouraged drivers to travel along it at speeds well in excess of the sign posted speed limits. It was estimated that 82% of over 3700 vehicles using the road each day were exceeding the speed limit. As a result of the way the road was constructed, with a bank on one side and ditch on the other, anyone meeting a car on the wrong side of the road had no options in terms of the evasive action they could take.

It had previously been agreed that an officer study taking on board all submissions received would consider all the suggestions raised. These had been divided into 6 broad categories:

- Restraint systems i.e. Safety fencing and other types of barrier.
- Speed reduction measures - including cameras, speed humps or buildouts.
- Traffic Regulation Orders. Including weight restrictions, speed limits, or road closures.
- Unconventional measures. Including moving the road, sections of hedging, traffic signals at intervals, or central barriers.
- Warning features. Such as road signs or markings.
- Road safety education and training.

Cabinet noted that the road safety engineers were still in the process of gathering in-depth technical information on some of the engineering proposals. The road safety education officers were seeking information on similar education drives nationally and internationally, in preparation for a campaign aimed at the Fenland area.

Cabinet noted that the provision of safety barriers in any form did not provide an effective solution. The high cost of several of the proposals would also put them outside the budget limits for local safety schemes. The recommendation of the officers for average speed cameras was therefore considered the best solution for this accident danger spot. However, Cabinet attention was drawn to the fact that the current levels of funding only allowed delivery of one major scheme every 2 years, and any proposal for the Forty Foot Bank would need to be scored against other sites on the October list.

While noting the above, Cabinet members wished to see positive measures being taken to help educate road users to reduce their speed which was recognised as the major factor involved in the reported accidents. It was also requested that publicity should be made available in appropriate other languages to take account of the minority communities living and working in the area, including information on how to escape from submerged vehicles.

Officers were also asked liaise with the police in order to obtain information on police activity and the outcomes of their presence and any enforcement action taken. This could be circulated outside of the meeting. Supplementary to this officers were asked to investigate the possibility of increased police presence/enforcement action, including mobile camera enforcement on this stretch of the road. It was considered that a number of high profile prosecutions would act as a deterrent and reduce the alarming number of drivers breaking the speed limit on a daily basis.

It was resolved to:

- i) Support the further investigation into the feasibility of provision being made for Average Speed Cameras with a view to seeking funding via the medium sized traffic management and safety schemes programme (historically known as the October list).
- ii) To support a programme of road safety education targeted at the specific issues associated with fen side roads with the provision of alternative languages and formats as appropriate.
- iii) That officers be asked to pursue with the local constabulary the issue of providing higher profile policing along the most dangerous stretch of the Forty Foot bank.

171. CAMBRIDGESHIRE CHILDREN'S WORKFORCE STRATEGY - BETTER TOGETHER

At its meeting on 18 April 2006, Cabinet considered and approved the draft Children and Young People's Plan 2006-09 (CYPP), as a requirement of the Children Act 2004. A component of the overarching plan for all services affecting children and young people was a strategy to develop the workforce – *Better Together* – to deliver services outlined in the CYPP. Officers were congratulated on the excellent contents of the strategy.

Cabinet was asked to consider the draft Children's Workforce Strategy that formed part of the Children and Young People's Plan for 2006-2009. The report informed Cabinet of the process undertaken to produce the draft strategy. The children's workforce comprised all those who worked or volunteered in the statutory, private and voluntary sectors delivering services to all children, young people and their families through early years and childcare, school-based, social care, youth support and health care provision.

"Better Together" addressed the needs of the entire children's workforce, represented within the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) – safeguarding, recruitment, induction, retention, development and reorganisation – in order to improve services. Its format closely followed the national template recommended by the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC), which in turn reflected the scope of work indicated in the Government's Children's Workforce Strategy (April 2005) and its response to the national consultation (February 2006).

In response to concerns raised at the meeting regarding the key risks identified in the report, officers recognised that there were areas with being major challenges, and that those that potentially endangered performance targets would be closely monitored. A Workforce Planning Group had been established to identify pooled resources and to address priorities.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the detail of the draft Children's Workforce Strategy.
- ii) To recommend that the Council approves the Children's Workforce Strategy titled *"Better Together"* for submission, as an element of the Children and Young People's Plan.

172. REVIEW OF PRIMARY EDUCATION PROVISION IN EAST CHESTERTON – SHIRLEY COMMUNITY INFANT SCHOOL AND ST ANDREW’S CHURCH OF ENGLAND AIDED JUNIOR SCHOOL

This report provided advice on the outcome of negotiations with the Church Schools of Cambridge Trust concerning the purchase of the site of St Andrew’s Church of England Aided Junior School. Discussions with representatives of the trustees had concluded that the preferred option would be to replace the Trust’s interest in St Andrew’s school with a similar interest in another school in Cambridge. This would have the advantage of representing best consideration and maintaining the Trust’s role in education in Cambridge. The proposal would also maintain the diversity of school provision within the Cambridge area. In answer to questions raised, assurances were given that the quality of teaching would not be affected during the relocation phase, highlighting that pupils at Shirley Infants School were taught to extremely successful standards.

The agreement in principle was that in exchange for the St Andrew’s site, the Council would within a five-year period, replace the Trust’s interest in St Andrew’s school with an interest in a new primary school in Cambridge with conditions as set out in the officers’ report.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree the development of a legal agreement to be agreed by the Cabinet Member and Deputy Chief Executive CYPS reflecting the agreement in principle negotiated with representatives of the Trustees of the Church Schools of Cambridge Trust as described in the officer’s report; and
- ii) To approve the declaration of Shirley Infant Community School as surplus on vacation by the school and agree the application of the capital receipt generated as a contribution to the costs of the development of the site currently occupied by St Andrew’s Church of England Aided Junior School.

173. SECTION 31 AGREEMENT – INTERIM REVIEWS 2006/07

Cabinet received a report seeking approval of the updated Section 31 Agreements, incorporating the targets for 2006/07, which were endorsed by the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership on 3rd May.

The agreements covered:

- Integration of Health and Social Care Services for Older People and Occupational Therapy Services (original agreement agreed by Cambridgeshire Care Partnership (CCP) 31 March 2005);
- Services provided through the Cambridgeshire Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) (original agreement agreed by CCP 31 March 2005)
- Services provided through the Integrated Community Equipment Services (ICES) original agreement approved by CCP 22 June 2004).

It was noted that further substantial revisions to the agreements would need to be made and agreed in the following year once the new PCT structure was finalised for Cambridgeshire.

It was resolved:

To approve the revised Section 31 Agreements, incorporating targets for 2006/07 for:

- Older People's and Occupational Therapy Services;
- Learning Disability Services;
- Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES).

174. SHELFORD LIBRARY

Cabinet approval was sought to replace the Great Shelford Library building. The current library building was in serious need of attention, being structurally unsound, cramped and having proved impossible to be made Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant. Despite its difficulties, the library was one of the busiest of its size, being much appreciated by its community and contributing strongly to library performance figures.

A scheme has been pursued with Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association Ltd (BPHA) to replace the current building with a new ground floor library on the same site, with flats on the ground and first floor. As well as securing a bigger and better library (nearly double the floor space), the County Council hoped to benefit through securing a flat for key worker accommodation. It was also highlighted that due to the open design of the new building, should it be necessary for the library service to vacate the building in the future, the premises could revert to retail use.

There was a request to ensure that the building was designed to maximise energy efficiency. Officers indicated that the BPHA had established a strong reputation for ensuring their buildings met Housing Corporation standards and undertook to ensure that high energy efficiency specifications were included in the design build.

It was resolved:

To declare the existing Shelford Library property surplus and to dispose of the existing property to a developer and for the County Council to acquire a long leasehold interest on a new library to be built on the same site.

175. A14 ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON IMPROVEMENT – HUNTINGDON VIADUCT TECHNICAL STUDY

This report informed the Cabinet of the outcome of the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Huntingdon Viaduct Technical Study.

In September 2005, the County Council commissioned a technical study from Atkins on the implications of removing the Huntingdon viaduct. The Highways Agency, Huntingdonshire District Council, the Government Office, East of England Development Agency (EEDA), and Cambridgeshire Horizons jointly sponsored and participated in the Study. The Study had concluded that the “CHUMMS” option was viable. This entailed the provision of a new three lane dual carriageway running south of Brampton and Godmanchester with the existing A14 down graded to a local road along with the removal of the A14 viaduct and modification of the highway network in Huntingdon to the benefit of the town and surrounding area.

The Local member for Brampton and Kimbolton was unable to attend the meeting but provided detailed comments included in an appendix to these minutes.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note and welcome the conclusions of the Atkins’ A14 Huntingdon Viaduct Study. This has examined the potential of removing the existing A14 viaduct as part of the Highways Agency’s upgrade of the A14 from Ellington to Fen Ditton and has concluded that the “CHUMMS” Strategy is viable and that the highway network in Huntingdon could be modified to accommodate the removal of the A14 viaduct and provide significant benefit to traffic flows in and around Huntingdon.
- ii) Commend the study to the Secretary of State for his consideration as part of the decisions on the options for the development of the A14 improvement scheme.
- iii) Support the principles of the “CHUMMS” option strategy as presented at the Highways Agency’s Public Consultation in 2005 and urge the Secretary of State:
 - a) To further develop the detail of new highway links and junctions required as part of the “CHUMMS” option in Huntingdon; and

- b) to take forward and promote the necessary Statutory Orders for such links along with those that will be necessary for the wider A14 scheme and its associated local access roads.
- iv) Reject the suggestion of a separate junction of the new A14 with the A1198.
- v) Delegate preparation of a formal comment to the Highways Agency based on the outcome of the Viaduct Study to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive for Environment and Community Services.
- iv) Ask officers to respond to the issues raised by Councillor Downes in his commentary tabled at the meeting.

176. SUPPORTING PEOPLE OVERVIEW OF FUTURE DIRECTION AND CONFIRMATION OF CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2006/07

This report provided an overview of the work being undertaken by the Supporting People Commissioning Body to confirm the future direction of the Programme and potential future contractual arrangements, and to confirm the current contractual arrangements for 2006/7.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's (ODPM's) Supporting People programme provided funding for housing related support for over 8,000 vulnerable people in Cambridgeshire through 60 providers. In line with the requirements of the grant conditions, interim contracts had been established with the providers. The expectation of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) was that these contracts would be replaced with "steady state" contracts where appropriate, after the outcomes of the service reviews required during the first three years of the programme (April 2003 – March 2006).

Following the completion of the reviews, the Commissioning Body was currently refreshing the strategy for the Supporting People Programme. A critical part of this work was to consider the results of the reviews and make informed decisions about the best models of service delivery for the future in respect of how resources should be deployed to support the modernisation of services and to tackle specific gaps in service provision. These decisions needed to be aligned with the complementary strategic intentions of other partners working with the same service user groups, to help inform the joint commissioning requirements and future contracting arrangements. The work was being taken forward in the context of the Supporting People Grant reducing year on year, which would lead to a variety of options for future contracting arrangements.

To ensure that appropriate contractual arrangements could be put in place to ensure the successful delivery of the future Supporting People Programme, it had been necessary to extend interim contracts with the existing providers for a maximum of 12 months, from 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2007, to ensure conformity with the grant conditions. Cabinet noted that it would still be possible to give notice on contracts within this 12 months timeframe in order to support the implementation of the decisions of the Commissioning Body.

It was resolved:

- i) To support the work of the Supporting People Commissioning Body to refresh the strategy in response to the outcomes of the reviews, and through this work, clarify the future direction for the Supporting People Programme.
- ii) To endorse the approach to contractual arrangements, with the extension of interim contracts being used to comply with grant conditions prior to the more informed approach to support the future direction of the programme.

177. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Cabinet received a report on progress on issues that had been delegated to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet.

It was resolved:

To note the progress on delegations/actions to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet.

178. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN 13th JUNE 2006

Cabinet noted the following reports had been moved from the June to the July meeting:

People Strategy
Major Safety Schemes

Chairman
13th June 2006

To: CCC Cabinet
From: Peter Downes
May 22nd, 2006

A14 HUNTINGDON VIADUCT STUDY

The following comments are my first reactions and are personal and without prejudice. I am in the process of consulting Brampton Parish Council and will have the opportunity at a later date to feed in their comments.

1. In general terms, I approve of the proposals outlined. If they can be funded and if the necessary planning permissions and land purchases can be achieved, I think they will enable the CHUMMS proposals to be implemented. I consider that the new A14 to the south of Brampton and Godmanchester should be a three lane road and that the environmental advantages of removing the A14 viaduct as a through road are significant. Inevitably, there are several points of detail on which I would seek clarification and reassurances:
2. There needs to be a good connecting road to the south side of the roundabout at the 'Pathfinder Link' for the properties along Mill Common via a ground level roundabout.
3. the road under the railway bridge should be as wide as possible, 3 or preferably 4 lanes. We need to avoid traffic congestion at the Brampton Road junction which will become the focal point of the new system. This should be built into the scheme from the beginning.
4. There should therefore be a separate cycle/ footbridge across the railway, (a la Milton) as this would be helpful to the many pupils from Hinchingsbrooke School who walk and cycle into town.
5. I am concerned at the net loss of car parking at the station and suggest that the Spittals Link sub end embankment should be turned into extra car parking with a footpath link to the station. I welcome the suggestion that extra parking could be provided between railway and WOTC link.
6. The draft plans are unclear about how access will be achieved to Hinchingsbrooke School and the Performing Arts Centre. This is a very busy site with over 1800 pupils during the school week and a great deal of community activity at the weekend and in the evenings. I think Hinchingsbrooke School needs its own access or access road. Note needs to be taken of the difficulties in that area at 8.30 and 3.35 every school day. If a section of the current Hinchingsbrooke Park Road

becomes redundant as a through road, this could make a useful waiting area for cars collecting pupils.

7. The opportunity needs to be taken to improve the access to the western side Station car park. It needs to be widened. A signal control onto Brampton Road may help but synchronisation with the Brampton Road junction could be a problem and cause congestion along that short stretch of road.
8. The access road to the station and the Common Link need to be designed with great care for the trees in that area and the needs of the people living close by
9. It is not yet clear how the triangular roundabout at the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Brampton Road will function or how this will combine with the current underpass.
10. The junction of the road coming from the hospital needs to be wide enough to allow a left filter lane to encourage people to get out quickly to the Spittals Link.
11. The possibility of a direct link road from Spittals to the hospital should be investigated.
12. The main concerns of Brampton residents are probably:
 - a. that the B1514 should be less congested than it currently is
 - b. that the new main A14 should be sited further to the west than currently planned (this is not directly relevant to the present discussion but must not be overlooked)
 - c. that the access points to the new A14 should not draw traffic from Huntingdon through Brampton
13. If there is to be a working group of Members to contribute to further development of this “strategy”, I would volunteer my services to be part of such a group as I have a long-standing commitment to improving traffic and road safety in this area, dating back to my time as Head of Hinchingsbrooke School.