

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday 3rd December 2015

**Time:** 10.00a.m. to 12.35p.m.

**Present:** Councillors: I Bates (Chairman), E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), L Harford, D Harty (substitute for Councillor J Clark) R Henson, A Lay, M Mason, M McGuire, J Scutt (substitute for N Kavanagh), M Shuter, A Walsh and J Williams.

**Also present:** None.

**Apologies:** Councillors: J Clark, N Kavanagh and J Schumann.

**172. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**173. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> November were agreed as a correct record subject to noting the following comments made by Councillor Schumann on the forward agenda plan (Minute 170) at the close of the meeting:

Councillor Schumann expressed his disappointment with regard to the change of date for the December Committee meeting which he was unable to attend. He felt moving the Committee in order to accommodate members wishing to attend a carol concert was not acceptable and hoped the Committee would stick to its advertised meeting dates in future, barring a legitimate reason for having to move.

In respect of the Minute Log the following an oral update was provided on behalf of the lead officer in respect of Minute 140 'Northstowe Phase2 – Section 106 heads of terms':

"The heads of terms are being drafted with lawyers and County schedules are due to be complete by January. Other schedules associated with the district council (such as affordable housing and the civic hub) will continue to be drafted into the new year. Progress remains good and positive".

It was unanimously resolved:

To note the updates on the Minutes Action Log.

**174. PETITIONS**

One petition was received in respect of Safer Cycling and Walking to and from North

West Cambridge. The Petition was signed by over 400 individuals between 24 October and 3 November 2015 with the details as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes and was introduced by Doctor Nicola Pearson who acted as the petitioners' spokesperson.

The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to ask questions of clarification from the spokesperson.

Councillor Harford asked whether she was still expecting a response from both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City district councils as she understood that they had delegated to the County Council the responsibility for providing a co-ordinated response. She requested that she be provided with details from the spokesperson of the officers in the district councils the petition had been sent to she could arrange that the organizer received the courtesy of a reply.

In response to a question, Dr Pearson confirmed she was aware that the next stakeholders' meeting was on 9<sup>th</sup> December. In response to a further question on whether strong representations had been made at the time of the original planning consultation exercise to indicate that the designs were defective, she indicated that at the time of the original planning permission the assumption had been made that it included a junction crossing and that it was only since the University of Cambridge Primary School had opened that it had become recognised as an issue.

It was resolved:

That the petition spokesperson would receive a written response within 10 working days of the date of the meeting.

#### **175. TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION**

This report outlined the work undertaken to develop the draft transport strategy for East Cambridgeshire in order to plan for predicted levels of growth. An overview of the Strategy and the proposals for its public consultation (due to run for six weeks during February 2016) was provided.

The Plan would be to produce a report on the Public Consultation in April with the outcome of the 'A10 North Study' being undertaken as part of the 'City Deal' programme to be included in the final Strategy for adoption by this Committee in either August or September, as part of a report summarising the consultation findings and detailing any final changes.

Members noted that in relation to the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) (the main strategic transport policy document for the County) the proposed Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire provided the local context for East Cambridgeshire. The purpose of the document was to:

- Provide a detailed policy framework and programme of transport schemes for the area, addressing current problems and consistent with the policies of the LTP3.

- Support the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and take account of committed and predicted levels of growth, detailing the transport infrastructure and services necessary to deliver this growth.

The below six objectives have been developed for the Strategy to ensure that the Transport Network:

- Supports the economy and acts as a catalyst for sustainable growth
- Enhances accessibility
- Connects new and existing communities with jobs and services
- Prioritises sustainable transport alternatives and reduces impact of congestion on these modes
- Contributes to reducing transport's contribution to air quality emissions in particular NOx, PM10 and PM2.5 – the main transport related pollutants
- Encourages healthy and active travel and supports people's well-being.

Section 5 of the report set out the summary of the scoping consultation undertaken in 2014 to which 500 people had responded. It listed those elements which had received the strongest support and the common themes which had emerged with the detail set out in Appendix 2 of the draft Strategy.

The following local members written comments were received and orally reported for the record:

- **Cllr Divine local member for Littleport** had written in support of the provision of more car parking near Littleport Station and approving the draft Strategy for public consultation. He indicated that local residents were concerned that nothing had happened in the last 2 years regarding additional car parking, and that the people of Littleport simply wanted an answer, as and when something would be done. It was reported that Councillor Divine had also provided a list of questions around the issue which were passed to the report author who had provided a response in an e-mail dated 2<sup>nd</sup> December. One Member indicated that these should have been copied to the Committee members.

**Action:** officers agreed to look to circulate the questions and responses outside of the meeting.

- **Councillor Bailey local member for Ely South and West** had written in stating:

"The Action Plan at Section 7 is the most important element of the document as far as I am concerned. Whilst I think all the "problem areas" have been captured, I am worried that there seems to be an awful lot of holes in the schemes that are listed, especially those that came out of the Parish Forum meeting held at East Cambs.

Whilst the areas that need fixing are listed, there is very little detail about proposed solutions or timescales. The one that really sticks out as not being given any priority is the A10 / Little Thetford junction. I find it impossible to believe that this isn't included as a necessary site for improvement (a roundabout is desperately needed) alongside delivery of the north Ely development, which will bring increased traffic

flow to the A10 and make the situation at the Little Thetford junction worse than it already is.

I would like to see this problem being given maximum priority in the Strategy and I do think that the rest of the sites that are identified need more detail before the Strategy is signed off”.

The Chairman indicated that he had spoken to Councillor Bailey prior to the meeting and had suggested to her that the issues she had raised should be included as her response to the formal consultation. She had accepted this as the way forward.

- **Cllr Schumann** local member for **Soham and Fordham Villages** indicated that he supported the officer recommendations.

Comments by Members of the Committee included:

- One Member making reference to the comments from Councillor Divine asked whether the space for car parking provision at Littleport Station was a Network Rail responsibility. In response it was indicated that responsibility for progressing this was with East Cambridgeshire District Council who had set up a project team and that the issue leading to continued delay was around the affordability of land in the area to enable the provision to be made.
- Taking up the issue from Councillor Bailey on timescales and target dates, one Member indicated that there was no information regarding how performance would be monitored.
- Another Member sought clarification regarding the A10 / Little Thetford junction and whether this was a significant junction? To provide context it was explained that the document was shown at a high level and that to develop the detail of specific schemes was not cost effective at the current time, as funding could not be guaranteed for all schemes. The same Member queried where the consultation events were to be held. In response it was indicated that venues had not yet been finalised, but that officers would be happy to receive suggestions. To facilitate this it was suggested that the officers should contact the local members directly. The Ellesmere Centre Stetchworth (CB8 9TS) was suggested by one member as a potential venue. **Action**
- The need to ensure that Newmarket residents and the Town Council should be included as part of the wider consultation exercise. In response officers indicated that they would ensure venues were geographically spread around the district but this would need to be balanced with available officer resources.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Draft Strategy for public consultation.

## **176. CAMBRIDGE QUALITY BUS PARTNERSHIP RENEWAL**

The Committee received a report updating it on the progress made for the renewal of

the Cambridge Quality Bus Partnership Agreement (a non-binding mutual agreement between local transport authorities and bus operators, with the former committing to making infrastructure improvements and bus operators committing to service improvements) seeking its agreement to renew the partnership for ten years from December 2015.

The report detailed the current bus operators signed up to the current agreement, highlighting that the second Cambridge Bus Quality Partnership (QBP) had run for five years and was due to expire on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015 and highlighting the improvements made during the period. The principles of the draft agreement were set out in Appendix A of the report. It was explained that both the operators and the City Council considered that the new partnership should be for the maximum allowable period of ten years and should continue to focus on improvements to air quality and improving reliability.

Headline features of the revised partnership included:

- Progressive improvements in bus euro standards
- Emissions target reductions
- Permit regulated access control to the extended core area (Appendix B of the report provided a map showing the core area)

The report also detailed the significant developments taking place in vehicle drive train technology and the bid to the Government's Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) to enable zero-emission running through the core area of Cambridge and for which an announcement was expected in January 2016. (An explanation of the flywheel technology and storage of energy involved to allow buses to operate without emissions in the city centre streets was given following a request from one member).

It was highlighted that in relation to discussions with bus operators to extend equipping other city bus services with next stop visual displays and audio announcements similar to those on Busway vehicles, the proposal had been declined for the reasons detailed in the report.

The Local Member for Newnham and Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group who had requested to speak, indicated her concerns with the report proposals which only addressed air quality issues and the lack of willingness by the bus companies to fund next stop visual displays and audio announcements. She suggested that it either needed to be sent back for further consideration or that the terms of the new agreement should only be on a short term basis as a ten year agreement was far too long when a great deal could change in two years with bus providers. In response and to help clarify, it was explained that as the current agreement ran out at the end of December, there was a need to put a new Agreement in place and also from a Council perspective, to provide support to the current bid from Stagecoach to Government. Making a new agreement did not prevent further improvements being included at a later stage.

Committee Members comments included:

- Several members expressing disbelief that one of the reasons given for not equipping the rest of the bus fleet with visual displays and audio announcements was it would not work for a bus being used on different routes, as this suggested that technology could not be purchased that had the ability to be re-programmed.
- A Member commented regarding problems with the current audio announcement system on some buses where it provided incorrect information regarding which stop had been reached, which could be a real issue for people with sight difficulties.

**Action:** The Head of Major Infrastructure Delivery undertook to investigate the technological issues raised on buses currently using the technology.

- One Member expressed disappointment that the core area did not extend beyond the Cambridge City boundary. In response it was explained that this particular agreement was focussed on Cambridge City centre only. Other corridors would be the subject of separate agreements if infrastructure improvements were made as parts of the City Deal. It was also highlighted that Spokes were due to receive a report later in the month on the Government's intention to introduce a new Buses Bill during the current parliamentary session which might enable local authorities in England, outside London, to franchise their bus networks where they had agreement from Government.
- Several Members supported Councillor Nethsingha's concerns regarding the length of the Agreement which appeared to be unduly weighted against the County Council in terms of the infrastructure it was required to provide compared to what the bus companies were prepared to offer in return and took no account of future proofing / improvements in technology that were likely to occur.
- One Member highlighted the need for a bus stop at 'Mitcham's Corner' to help take congestion away from the city to cater for the demand for entertainment / eating venues in the area. As a response and again highlighting that this was not part of the current agreement core area being looked at it, it was indicated that City Deal initiatives to run more buses would help reduce congestion, but that even with providing the necessary infrastructure, the County Council could not compel bus companies to stop at them.
- One member expressed the view that the core area should be widened to include the Addenbrooke's corridor.

- One Member highlighted that in the short term the problem in Cambridge City was not so much non-compliance with European emission standards in vehicles, but the length of time buses were stationary as a result of traffic jam congestion and therefore failing to run to timetable.

From the discussion the clear consensus from the Committee was to support Stagecoach's bid. After discussion regarding the length of the new agreement, including suggestions for it being as short a period as only one or two years or that the length of the Agreement should match the current City Deal period of five years, with a review in a year, when the ambition and scope of the City Deal would be clearer, the later proposal was moved by Councillor McGuire and seconded by Councillors Cearns and having been voted on,

it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) agree the draft principles of a revised 5 year Cambridge Quality Bus Partnership agreement, and
- b) to agree to enter into a renewed Quality Bus Partnership for five years from December 2015 and to carry out a review in one year's time.

## **177. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS STRATEGY**

To date, there had not been a comprehensive document setting out the Council's approach to negotiating planning obligations, the methodology for seeking contributions and how the funding would be used. To rectify this situation the report sought approval to a draft Planning Obligations Strategy for public consultation. Following this, a further round of consultation with local planning authorities, stakeholders and the public was to be held prior to the Strategy being brought back to this Committee for final approval.

The Committee noted that the Strategy was aimed at developers, but would also be relevant and accessible to other stakeholders, local planning authorities, local communities, agencies and service providers. With increasing pressures being placed on budgets and services, it was increasingly important that new developments made a proportionate contribution towards mitigating their impacts where appropriate and reasonable to do so. In addition, in the context of a changing planning regime which does not favour planning obligations (Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire District Councils had already adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) with Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils about to follow) the main purposes of the Strategy would be to:

- Set out the Council's service areas and responsibilities where new development generated a need for additional infrastructure and service provision;
- Set out the statutory, policy or other basis for seeking a contribution;
- Providing guidance on what the Council expects developers to contribute in meeting the needs arising from new development, including relevant approaches to assessing and calculating need; and

- Identify the services or facilities which would be provided as a result of the contribution, including details of the relevant infrastructure wherever possible.

The Strategy focussed on the following service areas: Education, Libraries and Lifelong Learning, Strategic Waste, Highways and Transport, Social Care and Supportive Services and Heritage and Historic Environment. Section 2.7 of the report set out the key issues raised following consultation with the District and City Councils

The second part of the report detailed changes to charges for Section 106 monitoring as a consequence of a recent High Court decision on local authorities' ability to seek and secure new contributions towards the monitoring of planning obligations. This ruling made clear that standardised fees should be avoided and where charges were sought, they should be bespoke and with reference to the complexity of the development. Section 3.4 of the report set out the approach to be used to calculate Section 106 monitoring charges.

Members' comments included:

- One Member suggesting reference needed to be made to District Regulations 1-2-3 schedules. In response it was indicated that to include full details of each District Councils' CIL regime would be overcomplicated and confuse the objective of the Strategy. The officers undertook to review what could be included as part of the consultation exercise. **Action**
- One Member sought clarification on the triggers and the position on receiving compensation from developers on late delivery of infrastructure. It was clarified in response that interest payments were secured through Section 106 agreement for late payment of contributions (four per cent above the base rate). However late payments were now very rare due to the monitoring carried out and with larger developments having front loaded payment agreements.
- One Member highlighted the need for co-operative working and that in the past there had been a lack of trust between the County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. In response officers stated that the officers of neighbouring Councils and the County Council currently had a very good working relationship as shown by the close co-operative working on growth sites such as Ely North and Northstowe.
- In response to one Member querying why there was no reference to affordable housing, it was explained that this was outside the scope of the Strategy and being a district council function was picked up as part of the wider negotiations under specific agreements. The same Member suggested that under the public health implications paragraph there would be implications for social care if the relevant infrastructure was not secured.

It was resolved to:

- a) Consider and approve the draft Strategy for public consultation;



- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and Environment) in Consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Economy and Environment Committee to make any minor textual changes to the Strategy prior to publication for public consultation;
- c) Ask Officers to bring the final Strategy back to a future meeting of the Committee for approval, following public consultation; and
- d) Note the latest update and position regarding Section 106 monitoring.

## 178. ECONOMY TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT (ETE) RISK REGISTER UPDATE

This report provided the Committee with details of Economy and Environment Committee risks since it was last brought to the Committee in April 2015. The E&E Risk Register was presented separately for the Committee in colour on A3 as Appendix 1 illustrating that there were ten risks. Three of these were included on the Corporate Risk Register, one of which was at Green status, one at Amber status and one at Red. Of the remaining seven, one was currently at Green residual level and the remaining six were at Amber residual level.

The Committee noted that two risks had been removed from the E&E Risk Register since it was last presented to Committees (E&E 7 – Park and Ride charges; E&E 11 – Failure to secure infrastructure commensurate with growth) with one risk added (E&E 12 - Inability to fund Adult Learning services, including employability training). Details of all changes and updates made to the Risk Register were provided as Appendix 2 to the report. Appendix 3 illustrated E&E's residual risk profile in graphic form. Three of the risks (C9, C22 and C26) were also recorded on the Corporate Risk Register.

Members of the Committee's comments / discussion items included:

- Asking that in future the print size could be made larger as even blown up to A3 it was difficult to read. It was agreed this would be taken back to the report authors.**Action**
- One Member suggested E&E 8 'De-registration of commercial bus services' should be reclassified as a red risk on the basis that there would not be the money available to carry this out due to the proposed budget cut. In response it was indicated that the money had not yet been taken out and it would be wrong at this stage for officers to second guess the intentions of Members, but if the budget was taken out, then the colour would be changed.
- With reference to CRR 22 'The Cambridge Future Transport programme fails to meet its objectives within available budget' a Member asked whether it was possible to have cost centre information of payments in the year. In reply the member was reminded that officers reported on balancing the budget as part of the regular finance and performance reports to the Committee which was the appropriate place to include this information with the intention being to keep this budget within its limit.

- Councillor Mason asked how much was left of the £10m set aside to fund busway defect works. A written response would be provided outside of the meeting but highlighting that all it would be was a number. **Action**
- In response to question raised on E&E4 'Borrowing requirement for major schemes' it was clarified that the revised wording on triggers did not apply to historic shortfalls as the register was a forward looking document.
- On CR22 'The Cambridgeshire Future Transport programme fails to meet its objectives' one Member made reference to the issue of labelling and that the above name was also the same name for the current task group which created some confusion. In response it was clarified that the risk related to the existing programme which was nearly at the end of its delivery process and was therefore the appropriate title. For the Total Transport Programme going forward this would have its own new risk.
- On E& E 12 'Central Government Funding for Adult Learning is withdrawn, resulting in much reduced provision in Cambridgeshire' a question was raised on if the funding was withdrawn and the Council was unable to replace the funding should this not be shown as a red risk? In reply it was indicated that the text had been written in the way it was to show that while officers did not expect the funding to be totally obliterated, there was reduction expectation which would require a redesign of the Service.
- On CRR9 'Failing to secure funding for infrastructure' and issues raised around this risk in discussion, it was accepted that there was always a lack of funding compared to what the Council would wish to receive and to the aim was try to strike a balance on expectations and the reality of the funding that would be provided, as there was nothing to be gained from receiving less than originally sought, where developers had appealed successfully.

Having commented on its contents,

It was resolved:

To note the position in respect of the Economy and Environment Risk Register.

## **179. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2016/17 TO 2020/21**

This report provided the Committee with an updated overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue proposals for the Economy, Transport and Environment Service including the elements of that budget that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee.

Section 2 of the report provided a summary of the Draft Revenue Budget. In order to balance the budget in light of the cost increases and reduced Government funding, savings, efficiencies or additional income of £40.7m were required for 2016-17, and a total of £118m across the full five years of the Business Plan. The savings target for ETE in 2016/17 was £6,593k with further significant savings required in subsequent

years. The current expected savings requirement for the next five years was shown in Table 2.

The report updated the Committee that the November Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee and this Committee had asked officers to re-consider six savings proposals totalling £1,666k as set out in the table below.

### Proposals Revisited Following November Committee Meetings

Ref	Title	2016-17 £000
6.114	Withdraw County Council funding for school crossing patrols	202
6.116	Remove community grants	15
6.121	Withdraw funding for the four mobile libraries	55
6.124	Highways cyclic maintenance	217
6.125	Highways reactive maintenance	483
6.208	<b>Reduction in Passenger Transport Services (E and E Committee proposal)</b>	<b>694</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,666</b>

At the time of the November Committee meetings there had still been a figure of £406k of unallocated savings, for which alternatives were required if a balanced budget was to be presented to General Purposes Committee. When added to the areas Members had asked officers to review, this gave a total figure of £2,072k. To address the above, officers had considered further efficiencies or income could be generated to offset the above savings and to close the gap in unallocated savings. Those subsequently identified to be deliverable totalled £494k as set out in the table below. If taken, these offset all of the previously unallocated savings.

### New/Modified Proposals since November Committee Meetings

Ref	Title	2016-17 £000	Explanation
6.122	Reduce Community Service work	35	Bringing forward part of the saving in the Supporting Communities service to year 1. This would still leave capacity, when combined with a reduced Libraries team, to carry out the important work needed to build community resilience, one of the Council's key enablers in the Operating Model.
6.126	More local highways work to be covered by funding generated through the on	300	This would not change the amount of work undertaken but the funding source

	street parking account.		would change and would allow savings on the revenue budget.
6.203	Remove final economic development officer posts	54	Further savings can be made from expenditure on Economic Development given that the proposal is to remove all staff in April 2016. This would mean the Council had no resources going into economic development in the future.
6.212	Re-evaluation of Concessionary fare spend	60	Given the deregistration of some bus routes recently, a re-evaluation of concessionary fares showed that it was likely the spend would be reduced next year.
7.118	Review of charges across ETE	45	A further review across ETE of all charges has been undertaken and it was considered possible to raise some further income.
<b>Total</b>		<b>494</b>	

The Committee was advised that officers had also considered further the six areas of savings proposals that the two ETE Committees requested to be reviewed to see whether there were alternatives, including returning to the review of statutory minimum levels of service initially undertaken to generate the savings proposals presented at the last cycle of Committees. The officers' conclusion was that most of the difference between the presented savings and what was considered to be the statutory minimum level of service would be made up of further increases in the areas Members had asked to be reviewed. For example, the statutory minimum assessment included a complete removal of Community Transport funding and significant increases in highways maintenance (cyclic and reactive). As a result the officers' professional view was that there were no significant alternatives to the items proposed at the last cycle of meetings.

In terms of the impact of the proposed savings, officers had also considered if there are any overriding factors that should be considered in relation to any of the proposals, such as whether making the reductions would adversely affect the Council's ability to secure funding from other sources. Of the six areas identified by Members, only the proposed highway maintenance reductions had this potential as explained in more detail in the report.

The finance tables at Appendix 2 in the report built in the additional savings proposals in Tables 4 and 5 of the report. It was highlighted that at the last cycle of meetings, the unallocated savings totalled £406k and as additional savings of £494 had been identified in the current report this would allow some reduction in the areas of particular

concern raised by Members. The finance tables in Appendix 2 included a reduction in the savings against Highways Reactive Maintenance to present a balanced budget

As an oral update it was indicated that Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> December having debated the above issues had resolved to exclude the following areas from the savings proposals and putting forward an unbalanced budget to General Purposes Committee:

1. Highways Maintenance (reactive and cyclic)
2. Mobile Libraries

and to retain the following areas in the savings proposals:

3. School Crossing Patrols
4. Community Grants
5. Streetlighting.

Section 6 of the report provided a Capital Programme update in relation to the following four schemes;

- Carriageway and Footway Maintenance including Cycle Paths.
- New Community Hub / Library Service Provision Clay Farm
- Guided Busway
- Soham Station

With the agreement of the Committee the Chairman agreed to take an early vote on recommendations a) and d) in respect of the context of the Business Plan which were approved without amendment.

Members' comments / questions included:

- One Member suggested that Table 5 setting out the new modified proposals was not taking a corporate approach by only concentrating on ETE savings. The same member suggested that making substantial reductions in Passenger Transport/ Community Transport savings in the first year was the wrong approach, as with reference to the discussion in the previous report, he made the point that Cambridgeshire Future Transport had achieved £1m in savings and Cambridgeshire Total Transport could be looking at making substantial savings in year 2 of the current Business Plan, through increased integrated working with partners. He suggested that if funding was cut in year 1, the officer support resources would not be available to enable this to happen. He proposed that further discussion on the cut and the potential savings that could be achieved if delayed to future years should be the subject of discussion on the overall budget at the next General Purposes Committee.
- Another Member suggested that reducing provision of passenger transport services was a corporate issue, as it would impact on health care and inevitably have impacts on local communities. The Executive Director in response made the point that a number of services were still running with few passengers and these would be the areas where targeted efficiency savings could be made as the routes were not

commercially viable. He also noted that in his view there were opportunities through the Total Transport programme to identify more efficient ways of providing transport for people with no alternatives and so delaying by at least one year, the proposed start of cuts to Community Transport / Passenger Transport would allow transformation to develop through the Total Transport programme.

- There was still concern from several members regarding the proposal on page 13 to reduce funding on Fenland Learning Centre (which catered for 4,000 learners a year) in year 2 which one member suggested was based on wrong economic principles. Another Member suggested that this went against the corporate priority of developing the local economy for the benefit of all and would have a significant equality implication for such a disadvantaged part of the County. While it had previously been highlighted that work was being undertaken with the Director of Public Health on looking for alternative funding, this could not be guaranteed due to the implications on partnership funding following the announcement by Central Government on the ring-fencing and reductions to Public Health funding.
- One member questioned whether income from fines for unauthorised vehicles using bus lanes had been taken into account in the Budget. In response it was clarified that this was included as Budget Line B/R 7.108 'Enforce More Bus lanes over a greater time period' on page 14 of the report.
- On the Capital Programme update with reference to the Network Rail decision to defer a number of schemes nationally, and specifically on the implications for Soham Station, one Member asked whether this would free up officer resources to be allocated to other areas. In response it was indicated that Growth Deal funding was to be used from 2016/17 on initial feasibility work and therefore this deferral would have minimal impact on available officer resources.
- A number of Members were concerned regarding the removal of the final economic development posts, including the potential impact on wealth creation in the County. It was explained in response that ETE did not directly benefit from increased wealth creation and that the removal of the final two posts could be mitigated by working with District Councils and the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Economic development was mainly a district council responsibility and most Councils have some resource, as well as being the appropriate responsibility of the LEP and the Cambridgeshire Promotions Agency. The Committee's business champion accepted the rationale that leaving only one remaining economic development post would be ineffective. He asked that he be kept fully informed going forward and that if the cuts were made, the business community needed early notice. He highlighted that the post-holders carried out valuable liaison work and that any communications on business issues in the future coming directly to the County Council would need to be effectively signposted / communicated on to the Districts and the LEP.

From the discussion it was clear that the two areas of concern to the Committee were in relation to reductions to Passenger Transport Community / Transport Services and to the Fenland Learning Centre. For the former, Committee members were not prepared to sanction cuts to subsidised services without knowing in advance what cost effective alternative community transport services would replace them due to their impact on isolated rural communities / those with high levels of deprivation. Members highlighted the need for the Council to take a Council wide holistic approach around the potential of

transformation work with partners to replace subsidised routes with cost effective community transport solutions before reductions in funding occur.

Having commented on the draft revenue savings proposals and on the changes to the capital programme that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2016/17 to 2020/21,

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) note the overview and context provided for the 2016/17 to 2020/21 Business Plan proposals for the Service, updated since the last report to the Committee in November;
- b) To endorse them for the General Purposes Committee, as part of consideration of the Council's overall Business Plan with the exception of:
  - Community Transport (Referred to in the budget pages as B/R .6 208 Reduction in Passenger Transport Services)
  - Fenland Learning Centre (B/R .6 207)
- c) Endorse the changes to the capital programme that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee
- d) note the ongoing stakeholder consultation and discussions with partners and service users regarding emerging business planning proposals.

## **180. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN**

The Committee was asked to note progress in developing the Committee Training Plan with the Committee's attention drawn to the issue raised at the previous meeting where some Members questioned the accuracy of the list of Member attendance against some of the sessions. As set out in the report it was clarified that only members of Economy and Environment Committee were recorded at joint committee events, as for example, Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee members would be recorded on their own training plan report.

Members of the Committee had already been made aware, that the 'New Communities' Training session referred to in the report as being on the same day as this Committee (3<sup>rd</sup> December) had since publication of the report s been re-arranged for 2 p.m. – 3.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 20<sup>th</sup> January

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the future training sessions as listed in appendix one (as updated in the Member briefing) .
- b) to note the need to sign an attendance sheet when attending training sessions, so that their attendance is accurately recorded.

**181. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA  
PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS  
PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS AND THE HEALTH AND WELL  
BEING CHAMPION**

There were no appointments requiring decisions in the current report.

On the agenda Plan Democratic Services provided the following update to the forward plan since publication:

Non-Key decision report titled 'Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal Executive Board Delegations' to be presented to:

H&CI Committee – 12<sup>th</sup> January 2016  
E&E Committee – 19<sup>th</sup> January 2016

The Cambridge City Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan following report to be removed from the January Committee agenda as it will only need to go to Spokes for information.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the agenda plan as updated at the meeting.

**182. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10AM TUESDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2016**

Noted.

Chairman  
19<sup>TH</sup> January 2016



## Appendix 1

### **TEXT OF PETITION IN RESPECT OF SAFER CYCLING AND WALKING TO AND FROM NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE.**

To the University of Cambridge, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and Cambridgeshire County Council:

We are deeply concerned that the designs of the Eddington Avenue / Huntingdon Road junction and the Bunker's Hill / Huntingdon Road / Girton Road are not safe for pedestrians and cyclists coming and going between the North West Cambridge Development and Girton Village, including both Girton Road and Thornton Road; moreover these designs are utterly inconsistent with the stated aspirations of the University, the City Council, and the District Council, to enhance the transport connections to neighbouring communities.

We note that the University's Transport Strategy

[1] aims to give cycling and walking high priority and states an aspiration for "high quality" solutions, including "safe and convenient crossings for pedestrians and cyclists".

We note that the University's Community Strategy [2] repeatedly mentions the goal of linking to neighbouring communities through cycling and pedestrian routes.

We note that the City and District Councils' Policy [3, NW17, NW18] stipulates that pedestrian routes should be provided that are "direct, safe, and attractive", and that new and enhanced cycle links should be made, "including links to nearby villages".

The Eddington / Huntingdon junction design that is being built violates all these aspirations and commitments by singularly failing to include ANY new crossings of Huntingdon Road that are direct, safe, and attractive for people travelling from and to Girton and other destinations in the north-west.

This failure of design to conform to vision and policy is of particularly serious concern because over 100 small children need to cross Huntingdon Road every school-day to go to the University of Cambridge Primary School, and 41 of those pupils live to the North, in Girton.

Future demand from the North will only increase over the coming years: based on this year's intake, we expect that in two years' time the school will have roughly 105 pupils who live in Girton;

the adjacent nursery will surely also attract cyclists and pedestrians from the North; and all the other amenities on the North West Cambridge site will be very attractive to Girton residents.

The Bunker's Hill design is partly satisfactory (albeit not "high quality") for inbound and outbound cyclists and pedestrians heading from and to Girton College, and for confident outbound cyclists heading up Girton Road, but it provides no satisfactory route for young inbound cyclists coming from Girton Road; nor does it provide a satisfactory route for inbound or outbound pedestrians along Girton Road, because there is no safe route to get between the

end of the Girton Road footpath and Bunker's Hill. Girton Road and Huntingdon Road are both 3 lanes wide, and both are busy roads from 8am to 9am.

We have the gravest concern about the possibility of a tragic accident. Numerous near misses have already occurred.

We call on the University urgently

(1) to amend the design of the Eddington/Huntingdon junction by adding two new pedestrian and cycle crossings across Huntingdon Road, eliminating the cycle-lane pinch-point, and widening the southern footpath, and to implement these improvements with the utmost speed;

(2) to amend the design of the Bunker's Hill junction so as to ensure that all categories of pedestrian and cyclist have a direct safe and attractive route in both directions.

We ask the University of Cambridge to change the plans, and the City Council, District Council, and County Council to support and expedite the approval of the satisfactorily revised plans with utmost urgency.

## **MAIN POINTS OF PRESENTATION FROM DOCTOR NICOLA PEARSON TO COMMITTEE**

This petition received 438 signatures in 10 days and was presented to the University on the 3rd November.

We are waiting to hear from SDC and City Councils when we can present to them.

The specific requests we are making of the county council are that:

1. The Highways Department and County Council compel and permit the University to provide direct, safe and attractive toucan crossings on desire lines from Girton village to the Northwest Cambridge Development.

The crossings should allow a primary school aged pupil to make a journey to and from the Thornton Road – Huntingdon Rd junction on a bicycle safely, without having to dismount which is not possible at the moment, and their locations should encourage a disabled or frail elderly person to make the journey by being across desire lines.

2 Toucan crossings should be provided:

a. At the Huntingdon Rd East junction as recommended 5 times in the safety audit conducted on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2014 by County Safety Auditors and has not been acted on.

b. At the junction with Thornton Rd in order to allow a child to cycle safely and legally back to Girton from the NWCD site (including the Primary School)

3 Mothball the Whitehouse Lane toucan crossing, as suggested 5 times in the safety audit, as no desire line will exist here for several years.

4 Require the University to widen the pavement to the Southwest verge of Huntingdon Rd by conventional (or supported by Compulsory Purchase Order) purchase of land).

5 Require and support the University to amend the design of Bunkers Hill-Girton Corner junction so that all categories of pedestrian and cyclist have a direct, safe and attractive route in both directions. Currently they can't physically get to toucans as there is no crossing or pavement.

The safety audit accident data studied showed no deaths over the preceding 5 years, but there was a pedestrian death the following month, which was the 3<sup>rd</sup> cyclist / pedestrian death in 20 years. The defective designs that are now being built, combined with the new demand for crossing Huntingdon Road, will surely lead to more injuries and deaths. All access roads except Girton have crossings.

We are deeply concerned that the designs of the Huntingdon Rd East junction and Bunkers Hill Girton Corner are not safe for pedestrians and cyclists coming and going between the North West Cambridge Development and Girton Village, and these designs are utterly inconsistent with the stated aspirations of the University, the City Council, and the District Council, to enhance the transport connections to neighbouring communities.

We note that the City and District Councils' Policy [3, NW17, NW18] stipulates that pedestrian routes should be provided that are "direct, safe, and attractive", and that new and enhanced cycle links should be made, "including links to nearby villages".

We note that the University's Transport Strategy [1] and Community Strategy [2] state an aspiration for "high quality" solutions, including "safe and convenient crossings for pedestrians and cyclists" with the goal of linking to neighbouring communities through cycling and pedestrian routes.

The current **Huntingdon Rd East junction** design fails to ensure ANY crossings of Huntingdon Road that are direct, safe, and attractive for people traveling from and to Girton and other destinations in the north-west. The design has also introduced a dangerous cycle lane pinch-point on Huntingdon Road.

This failure of design to conform to vision and policy is of particularly serious concern because 41 of the 120 University of Cambridge Primary School pupils live to the North, in Girton. Based on this year's intake, we expect that in two years' time the school will have roughly 105 pupils who live in Girton; the adjacent nursery will surely also attract cyclists and pedestrians from the North; and all the other amenities on the North West Cambridge site will be very attractive to Girton residents.

The plans for the **Bunker's Hill cycle link at the Girton Road / Huntingdon Road intersection** are also inconsistent with the University's strategy and the City and District Councils' policies as there is no crossing over the 3 lane Girton Road and no footpath on the western verge.

The hundreds of pages of work that have been published for the North West Cambridge Transport Assessment include detailed consideration of traffic concerns in locations at some distance from the development, including for example proposals for increasing traffic calming on Oxford Road and Windsor Road to reduce rat-running problems there; but as far as I can see, no attention has been paid at all to a rat-run much closer to the site, along Thornton Road. Rat-running during the morning rush-hour often makes the road impassible to cyclists; and this is the main cycle route for children and parents cycling to the University of Cambridge Primary School from the North.

These pressing safety concerns, and proposed solutions, are explained in more detail with diagrams, five short videos, and a written document, all available from the website <http://www.inference.eng.cam.ac.uk/mackay/presentations/html/EddingtonAve.html>