

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 21st October 2014

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 1.28 p.m.

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman), R Butcher, B Chapman, J Clark, E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), D Divine, D Harty, R Henson, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, M Mason (substituting for Cllr Hipkin), T. Orgee (substituting for Cllr Shuter), M Rouse (Substituting for Cllr J Reynolds) J Williams and A Walsh

Apologies: Councillors J Hipkin, A Lay, J Reynolds, M Shuter and J Schumann

Also present: Councillors Ashwood, I Manning, M McGuire, A Taylor and J Whitehead

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Councillors declared non-statutory, disclosable interests in accordance with paragraph 10.1 of the Members' Code of Conduct:

- Cllr Jenkins in Item 5 Minute 46 as a member of Histon and Impington Parish Council who were a major beneficiary of two of the proposals. He took no part in the debate.
- Cllr Bates a Personal interest in item 7 Minute 43 as a local member
- Cllr Butcher a Personal interest in Item 10 Minute 49 as a member of FACT (Fenland Association of Community Transport)

41. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 16th September 2014 were agreed as a correct record. The action log was noted.

42. PETITIONS

A petition was received from the Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire with over 1,100 signatures opposing scheme 112 'Hartford to Godmanchester Link Road' included in the Long Term Transport Strategy which was included under item 9 of the agenda. Mr. Martin Baker the spokesperson for the petition highlighted the strength of local and wider opposition to the proposal, indicating that any such road would ruin the local environment which was a peaceful, tranquil area of countryside which included lakes, woods and meadows which would be irreparably damaged by running a link road through the middle of it. He suggested that the environmental damage could not be limited by any mitigation measures. He also highlighted that within it was the site of an important Neolithic temple and that consideration was being given to making the area a country park. He concluded by stating that this was a case where the environmental issues should outweigh development consideration issues.

In his presentation he made reference to a map which highlighted areas of Special Scientific interest, the location of the floodplain meadows and landscape and the site of the nature reserve, which he agreed he would provide for copying following the meeting. **Action: Democratic Services to circulate.**

43. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) DEVELOPMENT AND CONSULTATION

In order to enable the petitioners to hear the debate in relation to the above report, of which one section related to their petition's concerns, the Chairman with the consent of the meeting agreed to take the report titled 'Local Transport Plan (LTP) Development And Consultation' next in the order of business.

This report was presented to the Committee to enable it to consider the Strategy development work and public consultation that had been undertaken to:

- Refresh the LTP: Policies and Strategy document
- Develop a new LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS)
- Develop new Huntingdon & Godmanchester and Wisbech Market Town Transport Strategies
- To consider the issues around the proposal to include a link road between Wyton Airfield and the A14 (Hartford to Godmanchester link road) contained within the Long Term Transport Strategy Document.

It was highlighted that the new documents:

- Supported the new and emerging Local Plans for the districts of Cambridgeshire and the road infrastructure seen as necessary to support the substantial housing growth within them.
- Reflected the adoption of and content within the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
- Reflected changes to the national programmes of road and rail improvements that impact on the County, including:
 - Highways Agency (HA) Route Strategies.
 - HA proposals to improve the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon.
 - Rail investment plans to 2019 and the Rail Prospectus for East Anglia.
- Reflected changes to the local transport funding environment, including:
 - The Greater Cambridge City Deal.
 - The Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Strategic Economic Plan.
 - Cuts to LTP capital funding and to Council revenue funding by Central Government.
- Reflected progress since 2011 and ensured that LTP3 remained current.

In addition, the Market Town Transport Strategies (MTSS) had formed part of the LTP suite of documents since 2002. The first strategies for Wisbech and for Huntingdon and Godmanchester were both adopted in June 2003, and this was their first review. The Wisbech MTSS had received strong support with the Huntingdon and Godmanchester MTSS also receiving good support.

In relation to transport infrastructure requirements for developments at Wyton Airfield and Alconbury Weald there were no easy solutions. Officers explained that the proposal

for a link road between Wyton Airfield and the A14 (Hartford to Godmanchester link road) was to avoid overloading St Ives and the A1096 and B1514 Hartford Road with officers having looked at various options east, west and north of St Ives. With reference to the possibility of a St Ives Northern Bypass and onward link to the A14, it was explained that this had issues in relation to getting across the flood plain and would require a considerable amount of demolition, with the environmental issues being just as acute as the suggested proposal. It was highlighted that at the current time there was not a specified route for the link road and this would be the subject of further consultation with recommendation c) only asking that it should be included in the LTTS. It was explained that this did not commit the County Council to its delivery, but would allow officers to look at alternative proposals for the link road.

Speakers included:

- Graham Campbell representing 'Godmanchester in Bloom' and who was also the Chairman of the Huntingdon Business Improvement District (BID) who suggested that putting the link road across the area proposed was the equivalent of putting a road across Grantchester Meadows. He suggested that new developments were required to be sustainable and those that impacted adversely on wildlife clearly failed in this respect. He stated that the Neolithic site was the most important site of its type in Western Europe. He believed that the link road was purely a proposal to reduce car travel times and that officers needed to look at more sustainable forms of transport to minimise car travel to the new developments.
- Councillor Shellens Local Member for Godmanchester and Huntingdon East recognised the need for a link road to the A14 due to the size of the development proposed at Wyton. He highlighted that currently the people of Godmanchester felt betrayed by the current officer plan and by previous consultations which had not taken account of their views (reference was made to the Bears Croft residential development) His alternative proposal ruled out a Hartford to Cows Lane Link Road as the additional traffic would channel through Hartford and also onto the medieval bridge both of which were unacceptable. Councillor Shellens with reference to a map proposed a revised route for the link road which would bring it further east, bypassing Godmanchester and avoiding heavy goods vehicles having to go through Hartford. **Action: It was agreed that the map the Member referred to should be circulated to Members and officers outside of the meeting.**

Reference was made to two representations received by the Committee in advance of the meeting with copies being made available on the day from Councillor Graham Wilson the other local member for Godmanchester and Huntingdon East who was unable to attend and from Godmanchester Town Council. (These have been included as appendices A and B to these minutes).

Councillor Wilson did not support the continued inclusion of a link road between Wyton Airfield and the A14 in the LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy, and suggested that instead, there should be further analysis of options to ensure the travel needs from new development at RAF Wyton could be accommodated in a sustainable way before the County indicated its support for the development. He suggested references to the link road should be removed and Huntingdonshire District Council told to review its

development proposals if the County Council could not identify alternative, viable sustainable solutions.

Godmanchester Town Council's submission indicated that while they broadly supported the LTP and the MTSS, they also raised very strong concerns over the Hartford to Godmanchester link road on behalf of local residents and did not believe Cow Lane should be considered as a potential route due to the massive environmental impact on the important nature reserve there. They believed any proposed routes involving Cow Lane or the nature reserve should be removed and more viable and sustainable alternatives investigated. They also believed any alignment that connects directly with the existing A1198/A14 junction would have a serious detrimental effect on Godmanchester. A letter was also received from Huntingdon and Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy Member Steering Group also requested that the proposed 'Hartford to Godmanchester' link road was removed from the LTTS and MTTS, and replaced with a commitment to identify where various traffic options could be tested in more detail than had been undertaken so far.

In line with the representation and proposal from Councillor Wilson, the Vice Chairman Councillor Cearns moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Williams to delete the current officer recommendation c) reading "Support the continued inclusion of a link road between Wyton Airfield and the A14 in the LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy, and clarify that a route for the link road has not been identified" and to replace it with a new recommendation c) reading:

"c) Support further analysis of options to ensure the travel needs from new development at RAF Wyton can be accommodated in a sustainable way before the County indicate its support for the development".

In discussion Members made the following comments;

- Concern was expressed by one Member supporting the amendment, regarding new housing developments not creating local jobs, due to their being insufficient mixed development, resulting in them having to travel to Cambridge and further afield to secure employment.
- Many people already in the towns required improved infrastructure to be able to access work where it was locally not available.
- Members opposed to the amendment supported the need for additional housing to increase supply and help lower prices, highlighting that the original officer recommendation at the current time did not rule anything in or out in terms of exploring options.
- It was confirmed in answer to a question that the alternative proposal tabled by Councillor Shellens would be looked at further by officers as an option going forward.
- Referring to the damage to the Ouse Valley suggested by the Petition spokesman and other earlier speakers, one Member was concerned that the report in its current form made no reference to the environmental impact of the link road proposal.

- Other members while recognising the need for additional houses, suggested that officers needed to investigate further measures to minimise the environmental impact of any link road proposal coming forward.

Officers asked to respond to the issue of looking at more environmentally sustainable modes of transport replied that even if there was a significant step change to public transport, walking and cycling, there would still be very significant traffic impacts due to growth in the area. The amendment proposed a huge additional piece of work in addition to the initial proposals which had already been undertaken and it was highlighted that officers did not have the opportunity to revisit district council Local Plans.

Following the debate, the amendment being put to the vote was lost. There was then a vote on the original recommendations and

It was resolved:

- a) to note and comment on the results of the public consultation on the LTP: Policies and Strategy, LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy and the Wisbech and Huntingdon & Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategies.
- b) to note the level of public concern over the impact of a proposed link road between Hartford and Godmanchester (linking the planned new settlement at Wyton Airfield to the A14) to the east of Huntingdon.
- c) to support the continued inclusion of a link road between Wyton Airfield and the A14 in the LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy, and to clarify that a route for the link road had not been identified.
- d) to note that the inclusion of schemes in a strategy did not formally commit the Council to their delivery.
- e) to note that further work to develop the package of LTP: Long Term Transport Strategy measures in the Huntingdon / St Ives area was planned for 2015.
- f) to note that Member Steering Groups guiding the development of the Market Town Strategies had considered the consultation responses, and had endorsed the strategies for adoption by the Council.

44. LIGHTING THE GUIDED BUSWAY MAINTENANCE TRACK

This report, which had been deferred at the July meeting following the concerns raised by Members about the cost increase of the southern section from that originally approved by Cabinet in December 2012, followed from a further review to identify the scope for cost reduction. The report was now re-submitted to consider allocating Section 106 Funding for the installation and operating costs of lighting columns along sections of the Busway maintenance track in consultation with the Cambridge South

Area Committee.

It was explained that the southern section consisted of a main line running from the railway station to Trumpington Park and Ride with a link that branched off the main line and crossed the railway to Addenbrooke's Hospital. There has been considerable development next to the Busway at Addenbrooke's with the MRC building and more was due to come forward with the Papworth relocation and from Astra Zeneca. As there would be more ambient light on this link than on the main line, it was proposed to omit the Addenbrooke's Link from the proposals which would reduce the cost of the southern section from £300,000 to £225,000.

A further option looked at was to reduce the number of lighting columns and increase the spacing. Reducing the number of columns by 25% had been looked at and would reduce the cost of the scheme by a further £25,000 but would reduce the overall level of lighting.

The following speakers spoke in support of the report recommendations:

- Jim Chisholm Cambridge Cycling Campaign
- Local member for Queen Edith's Councillor Amanda Taylor
- Local member for Trumpington Councillor Barbara Ashwood.

The Committee in discussion recognised the need for lighting in what was a major traffic route and also that the addition of the lighting would help encourage more people to switch from cars to using bikes if they felt safer, especially the more vulnerable including young people and women.

It was resolved:

to approve an additional £275k (£225k capital cost and £50k commuted payment for maintenance over 10 years) for the lighting of the unlit urban sections of the Busway maintenance track from developer contributions in the Cambridge Area Transport Corridor Funds.

45. CHESTERTON – ABBEY BRIDGE - TO REPORT CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND SEEK APPROVAL TO PROCEED

The Chairman with the consent of the meeting agreed to take the above report next in the running order due to the number of speakers for the item.

The report advised the Committee of the consultation responses, outlined the current risks with the delivery of the bridge and sought approval to agree recommendations b) and c) as set out in the report to progress the project to approve the development and submission of a planning application based on Option One - a truss type bridge placed as close to the existing rail bridge as possible on the east side - and to continue negotiations with landowners. It was clarified in response to questions raised that the bridge was to be funded from Section 106 contributions including monies from the Chesterton Sidings development, Marshall Wing Development and Northern area corridor monies.

Speakers included the following with some of their main comments being as follows:

- Jim Chisholm from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign supporting the report recommendations, having supported a proposed bridge since 1998, on the basis that it would reduce pollution, by encouraging more people to cycle and would open up green areas of the city to other residents to access and enjoy.
- Laurice Suess who made the point that residents of Ditton Fields were not asking that the bridge should not be built, but that the Committee delay its building, in order to have a more cost effective integrated approach through further consultation with local residents. She suggested that the consultation findings as reported were not accurate, as no reference was made to 300 critical comments received, with the report only making reference to the 136 positive comments received. She also questioned how much consideration had been given by officers to siting the proposed bridge to the west of the existing rail bridge, which would have a less detrimental impact on Ditton Meadows and suggested a final decision should be based on sound data, with full consideration of all the options for Members to consider.
- Sarah Beeson suggested that the consultation did not demonstrate the need for a bridge. She believed the travel time saving for commuters did not justify the cost or the environmental damage that would be caused to Ditton Meadows. She suggested that there was only a five minute saving and that this would only benefit 150 people during the busiest time of the year at a cost of £4.5million and suggested there were better ways to spend the money.
- Michael Bond suggested the south side of Chesterton Station as being a more obvious route for the Chisolm Trail and that the original design line being suggested was not achievable for engineering reasons, in the light of the Skanska Feasibility Study. He suggested that the line needed to be completely re-thought and also highlighted that the current bridge design had access which involved sharp lines which in itself created hazards. He also suggested that recent changes of land ownership meant that access from Cowley Road was now a possibility.

In addition, reference was made to comments received from the Parish Clerk for Fen Ditton Parish Council clarifying as a correction that they had not distributed a leaflet as stated in paragraph 3.6 of the officer report. The Clerk indicated that the topic of the proposed Chesterton – Abbey bridge had been on the front page of the Summer edition of the Council's Newsletter, available at www.fenditton-pc.org.uk. It was further clarified that the thrust of that article was that the proposals needed to be examined further and to encourage Fen Ditton residents to attend the exhibition. Fen Ditton Parish Council's position remained as detailed in their formal response, document dated 28 July, 2014, that the data and the way the survey was worded did not give confidence of the projected demand, or that Fen Ditton residents supported the proposals in sufficient numbers for the Council to support the proposal.

The local member for East Chesterton highlighted that he fully supported the construction of a bridge, but suggested an amendment to the recommendation which he hoped would be taken up by the Committee for further consultation to be undertaken

in relation to its design, siting and construction, taking into account the high level of opposition that was evident from the number of speakers opposed to the current, proposed scheme. He suggested that the consultation had been undertaken too early in relation to narrowing the options as there were still substantial areas of uncertainty in relation to land ownership issues. He identified May 2016 as being the key deadline date and suggested that it was important to convince as many stakeholders as possible, including local residents groups of the benefits of a bridge and why it was necessary and where its best location should be.

In discussion Members of the Committee's views included:

- That the results of the consultation, even as set out in the report, did not provide a clear and overwhelming majority in favour of the Officer recommendations.
- No background information had been provided on the modelling carried out.
- Questioning that if the cycle path was not to be lit at night, what was its benefit during winter months.
- That as Cambridge was already gridlocked, there should be no delay in providing a bridge in order to get people out of cars.
- Reference was made that Fen Ditton was not the only area affected and that there was no mention in the discussions of Abbey division residents' views.
- In terms of the visual appearance of the bridge, one Member reminded those present that they were talking about Cambridge, which had a proven record for being able to build "pretty bridges".
- For reference purposes future reports should include a strategic cycle route map including showing the Chiselm Trail.

On balance, the Committee considered it was too early to make a final decision on the proposals set out in the report. While the Committee members recognised that a bridge was required and there was continued support for the Chisholm Trail and its strategic importance to transport plans in Cambridge going forward, it was too early to include a proposal at a planning process stage, due to the current level of opposition, which if pursued, was likely to result in significant challenge.

Councillor Williams moved as an amendment seconded by Councillor Jenkins to replace the current recommendation b) reading "approve the development and submission of a planning application based on Option One (a truss type bridge) placed as close to the existing rail bridge as possible on the east side and..." That it should be replaced with the following to read: "b) Agree that a further consultations be conducted with all stakeholders with regards to the bridge's role in the Strategic Transport Plan and the detail of its design, siting, approaches and construction in recognition of the significant level of opposition to it and by doing so ensure that the option that is submitted as a planning application meets the needs of the widest range of stakeholders".

The Chairman made the point that he could not support any amendment that would involve alternate proposals coming forward which breached the current financial envelope of £4.5 million.

The officers were asked to comment on the views expressed during the debate and to pick up on further queries raised. The Executive Director ETE made the point that the Chisholm bridge was in both the City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, in the County Transport Plan and also in the City Deal. All the documents had been consulted on and the strategic need for a bridge in the location was recognised. Officers considered that they had sufficient mandate from these documents to go out to consultation on the bridge and that 72% had responded that they wished the bridge to be constructed near to the existing railway bridge, with 49% favouring a particular style of bridge but at this stage there were no proposals in relation to the detailed design, which officers agreed should be the subject of further consultation. It was confirmed that even if the bridge was agreed as set out in the current report it could not be completed until 2017 at the earliest and with the amendment proposed, this would lead to a delay until 2018.

Following the discussion, the amendment was voted on and carried by a majority. The recommendations as amended were then voted on and agreed by a majority and

It was resolved:

- a) to note the consultation response and the current project risks;
- b) to agree that further consultation be conducted with all stakeholders with regard to the Bridge's role in the Strategic Transport Plan and the detail of its design, siting, approaches and construction, in recognition of the significant level of opposition to it and by doing so, ensure that the option that is submitted as a planning application meets the needs of the widest range of stakeholders, and
- c) to approve continuing negotiations with landowners.

46. ALLOCATION OF SECTION 106 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS TO TRANSPORT SCHEMES IN CAMBRIDGE CITY AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

This report sought approval to allocate the Section 106 contributions to schemes with the detail on the spend to each area corridor of the County as outlined in section 2.1 of the report recommending a total of £4,764,726 of spend on schemes. This would enable the proposals to come forward for detailed work as part of the Council's Capital Programme. It was highlighted that subsequent approvals for scheme delivery might still be required, including relevant consultations on scheme specifics and would then need to be programmed for delivery in the future as part of the Transport Delivery Plan.

Local Members who had requested to speak included:

- The Local member for Abbey who was concerned that at a meeting of the East

Area Committee the impression had been given that they had allocated money towards a bus trial from Newmarket Road Park and Ride site to Addenbrooke's Hospital to help serve the Barnwell area. She explained the bus was badly needed, being an area with a considerable amount of social housing and had expected it to be included in the current report. It was explained in response that it was not that the service would not be trialled and the money remained for the match funding proposal, but that it was matter of timing and was more appropriate when the Wing Development was built. Another Member explained that there had been a previous orbital service along the lines she had mentioned several years ago but this had been withdrawn after three months due to the lack of passenger numbers. **Action: The Chairman offered to meet with Councillor Whitehead and officers to explore what action could be undertaken in the meantime.**

- The Local member for Queen Edith's fully supported the schemes proposed for the South Area, while requesting that the detail of the schemes should be the subject of full local consultation with residents.
- Robin Hydon from Cambridge Cycling Campaign fully supported the schemes set out in all the recommendations, setting out reasons - often on safety grounds - why it was important that they were approved.
- Tim Moore spoke in support of Queen Edith's cycling improvements proposals.
- Liz Buchholz queried the spend of £1,500,000 on the Chisholm Trail Bridge, suggesting the money would be better spent on developing other segregated cycle schemes in Cambridge.
- The Local Member for East Chesterton spoke in support of the junction improvements proposed at the Green, Histon.

In discussion Members raised the following issues:

- As referred to earlier in the meeting Members requested that in future where there were reports on proposed cycling ways improvements, a map showing strategic provision in and around Cambridge should be included.
- One Member highlighted that recommendation j) currently reading 'Cherry Hinton Cycle Improvements' required to be amended to read 'Cherry Hinton **Road** Cycle Improvements' for accuracy.
- Councillor Walsh requested details regarding progress with proposals for Mill Road and Tenison Road, **Action: Bob Menzies to find out and write to him following the meeting.**

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve the allocation of Section 106 funding contributions to the following schemes:

- a) Entrance to Stourbridge Common (£50,000)
- b) The Chisholm Trail Bridge (£1,550,000)

- c) Midsummer Common Cyclepaths works (£156,874)
- d) Improvements on the B1049 southbound to the A14 (£100,000)
- e) Improvements to Junction at the Green, Histon (£150,000)
- f) Widening cycleway north of the Jane Coston Bridge over A14 (£50,000)
- g) Water Street and Fen Road Cycling Improvements (£50,000)
- h) Feasibility studies for cycle ways on Green End Rd linking to Science Park Station and along Histon Rd (£20,000)

£2,317,842 towards the following 3 schemes;

- i) Queen Edith's Way Cycle Improvements
- j) Cherry Hinton Road Cycle improvements
- k) Robin Hood Junction Signals improvements

47. NORTH ELY SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

This report provided details of the Section 106 measures required to make the North Ely Developments acceptable in the context of current viability negotiations.

It was explained that outline planning applications had been submitted by Endurance Estates and the Church Commissioners for up to 1,300 and 800 dwellings respectively. Both planning applications and emerging Section 106 packages had been considered by the County Council Cabinet on 4th March 2014. At that time, the full details of the respective packages or the implications on viability for both sites were not known. East Cambridgeshire's Planning Committee agreed on 28th March 2014 to grant outline planning permissions for both sites, subject to the subsequent signing of section 106 agreements.

It was highlighted that the greatest risk to the County Council was the potential financial impact for the funding and delivery of the two primary schools. The matter had been considered by the Children and Young Person (CYP) Committee on 29th July 2014 and their decisions were detailed in paragraph 1.7 of the report.

An update supplementary sheet on the latest position on the ongoing negotiations was tabled at the meeting and the full details are set out in an appendix C to these minutes. The main headline changes being as follows:

For the Church Commissioners

An additional £318,337 had been added to the primary school contribution. The shortfall in funding to be recovered through the review had now reduced by £318,337 to £1,691,678.

For Endurance Estates

The County Council was forward funding the first phase of the Cam Drive primary school which included approximately £3,000,000 infrastructure. These infrastructure costs would be recovered through a separate agreement with Endurance Estates.

A10/A142 Roundabout

An allowance of £750K (£375,000 per applicant) across both developments had been made for improvements to this junction. A preliminary scheme designed by the applicants was costed at £550K. This cost was yet to be reviewed by officers and therefore it was recommended that the higher level of allowance should remain, until the scheme cost was verified. The Committee agreed that any variation to this sum following the review should be approved in accordance with the delegation set out in recommendation C) of the report.

Viability Review

The Share of uplift had now been agreed as 55% to Church Commissioners and 45% to the local authorities. The County Council would receive 100% of LA uplift up to £1,300,000, thereafter it would be shared equally until the balance due was paid.

The Vice Chairman in the ensuing discussion indicated that he could not support the recommendations, as agreeing to them sent out the wrong message to other developers who might wish to renegotiate lower affordable housing targets (the level of affordable housing had been reduced from 30% - the policy position of East Cambridgeshire District Council - to 15% following a viability assessment).

Following a vote it was resolved:

- a) To approve the draft Section 106 package as set out in the amended version of Section 3 of the report tabled at the meeting;
- b) to approve the principle of a Section 106 review mechanism to capture uplift in development value as set out in Section 4 of this report; and
- c) to delegate to the Executive Director for Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make changes to the Section 106 agreements prior to signing.

48. YAXLEY TO FARCET CYCLE ROUTE

This report requested that the Committee consider the use of Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers to secure the land needed to construct a cycle track to enable a safe cycle route between the villages of Yaxley and Farcet and which had received overwhelming local support, following a consultation exercise.

It was highlighted that the scheme could not be built within the existing highway boundary because of a lack of space, unfavourable levels, and a belt of trees. The process to acquire the final stretch of the route to be sited on agricultural land had commenced in early summer 2012. After lengthy negotiations, agents working on behalf of the County Council managed to secure agreements with the agents of both landowners for both land purchase and the necessary accommodation works. However, since that time it had proved impossible to complete the sale due to legal delays, and the apparent inability of being able to engagement with the solicitor for one

of the vendors. It was made clear that the County had gone to great lengths to satisfy the requirements of both landowners as detailed in the report.

Councillor McGuire one of the local members for Norman Cross who had requested to speak, indicated that he fully supported the proposed action and hoped that the report, if agreed, would be sufficient to re-activate negotiations without the need for a CPO. The other local Member for Norman Cross who was on the Committee also spoke in support of the report recommendation and explained the exact location of the land, and that it currently had no development on it, which could change in the future, and would make it far more difficult and costly to obtain.

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve exercising Compulsory Purchase Order powers to secure the land needed to construct the scheme.

49. ADDITIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT FUNDING IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE

This report asked the Committee to consider options for spending additional funding for public and community transport in Cambridgeshire that had been developed in discussion with the Cross Party Member Working Group established by Council to consider the expenditure of this new funding.

The Committee was reminded that at Full Council in February 2014, an additional £500,000 per year was agreed as a new fund to invest in transport services in Cambridgeshire to 'Support initiatives to provide transport for communities in Cambridgeshire'. This increased funding needed to be seen against the backdrop of already committed budget reductions for community transport funding that are in place for 2014/15 and beyond. For brevity, only the options that received support from the Cross Party Member Working Group were included in the report and were detailed under section 2 of the report under the headings:

- Reinstatement or reconfigure the grant funding to community transport operators in Cambridgeshire.
- Extend selected bus routes to help stimulate the night-time economy.
- Cambridgeshire Future Transport.
- Travel Bursaries for Apprentices and Vocational Students

The Committee was however reminded of the significant budget pressures being considered for 2015/16 including reductions in spending on Community Transport and Cambridgeshire Future Transport, which it was proposed to combine into a single budget in future. For 2016/7 onwards there were significant savings still to be found. In this context, despite the suggestions made by the Member group, officers felt that it would be inappropriate to commence new initiatives when there must be serious doubt that they could be sustained given the budget cuts and recommended that the additional £500,000 funding per annum was not allocated to specific new initiatives at this stage. Instead, it was suggested that there should be a review of the value achieved from the current arrangements which could be broadened to be a Member led

review of Cambridgeshire Future Transport to improve integration across public transport, home to school transport and non-emergency hospital transport.

Councillor Williams proposed an amendment seconded by Councillor Cearns to refer back to Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Group the current report to seek their views regarding whether the existing budget could be used to accommodate some of the projects in order to obtain best value and to report back their recommendations to this Committee. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

The substantive recommendations set out in the officers report were then put to the vote and

It was resolved by a majority:

- a) to consider the potential options for the additional funding, noting the initial work that had been undertaken.
- b) to consider the increased budget pressure on this area of funding.
- c) To agree not to spend the £500 000 additional funding this financial year and use it to offset potential budget reductions indicated in this service area in the emerging Business Plan for 2015/16

50. BUSINESS PLAN REVENUE PROPOSALS 2015-20

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for the Economy, Transport and Environment Directorate.

As an update the Executive Director drew attention to the fact that the Cash Limits had changed since the publication of the report and that for 2015/16 ETE was required to find a further £58K of savings and a further £1.496m extra in 2016/17 from those already shown.

Section 4 of the report detailed new pressures of which for ETE there were two new pressures separate to the proposals for savings and income generation in relation to:

- City Deal Adult Learning Skills - £200k - needed to fund the training and the development of skills required to enable growth as part of the City Deal.
- Waste PFI - £480k.

Section 5 of the report set out details of the Revenue Proposals and section 6 the timetable setting out the activity to be undertaken in the coming months to build the Business Plan.

It was explained that ETE's overall approach was to transform place and community services across Cambridgeshire to deliver jobs, housing and new infrastructure, whilst supporting Cambridgeshire's residents and businesses by looking after infrastructure, investing in skills and encouraging active communities. However as financial resources would reduce substantially over the plan period, ETE would be working with public

sector partners and communities to re-design services and, where appropriate, reduce dependency on council funding. Increasingly limited funds would be targeted where they could be most effective and, by working with communities and businesses as detailed in the report including the principles which had been developed to help shape the proposed Business Plan for ETE.

To develop the proposals for 2015/16 and beyond, officers had considered service areas where a fundamental review of provision was possible and could contribute significant savings and a range of smaller incremental changes to other parts of the Directorate. The following four major service reviews had been identified to contribute a significant proportion of the revenue savings required.

- Winter Maintenance (the gritting of roads in icy conditions)
- Street Lighting Energy
- Waste Management and Recycling
- Library Service

In discussion attention was drawn to the proposed cut in 2016-17 of £178k for additional support for Fenland Learning Centre (Reference B/R 6.209) which currently supplemented a grant targeted at learners who were hard to reach and unemployed and who required support to progress to gaining skills and qualifications. This cut was seen as being diametrically opposed to the commitment made by Full Council to meet the needs of North Fenland. The suggestion fully supported by the Committee was that officers should look to identify the saving of £178k from other areas of the budget in order to protect this area.

In addition, the Vice Chairman making reference to the Community Impact Assessment reference B/R 6.211 titled 'Review of effectiveness of Community Transport and Cambridgeshire Future Transport (CFT) and reduce funding to CFT and Community Transport' was concerned of the knock-on effect on social care services as an area which pushed costs into another Committee area. He suggested joint working required to be undertaken with officers from Adult Services. The Executive Director agreed that his officers would look into the implications, but cautioned that it would not be possible to undertake a very detailed study due to resource limitations.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2015-20 Revenue Proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment.
- b) To agree to provide comments on the draft proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment's 2015-20 revenue budgets to allow further development prior to presentation to Committee again in November.
- c) To ask officers to review the proposed cut in 2016-17 of £178k for additional support for Fenland Learning Centre in order to protect this expenditure and identify savings in other areas.

- d) To ask officers to undertake a joint review with CFA to identify the potential social care impact of the proposal to review the effectiveness of Community Transport and Cambridgeshire Future Transport.

51. SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

Additions orally reported included:

11th November meeting addition:

Appointment of Business Champion

21st April 2015

The current two listed reports on the A14 in relation to 'Statement of Common Ground' and the 'Formal consultation response the Development Consent Order' were to be combined into one report.

The report listed to the June meeting titled A14 Local Impact Report had been deleted.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To note the Agenda Plan.
- b) To agree that an updated Plan should be circulated to the Committee Members after the meeting.

52. DATE OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. 11th NOVEMBER 2014

Noted

Chairman
11th November 2014

Appendix C Relating to Minute 47

NORTH ELY SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS: UPDATE ON FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Negotiations between the applicants, East Cambridgeshire District Council and the County Council have been ongoing. The following amendments have been made to the respective Section 106 packages for each applicant:

Church Commissioners

Paragraph 3.1 – An additional £318,337 has been added to the primary school contribution

• Primary School	£4,635,029
• A10/A142/Witchford Road	£200,000
• Off Site cycle/pedestrian routes	£150,000
• Passenger Transport	£170,000
• Bus shelter maintenance	£20,000
• Bus Real Time Passenger Information	£28,800
• Lynn Road crossing	£15,000
• Total	£5,218,829

Paragraph 3.4 – The shortfall in funding to be recovered through the review is reduced by £318,337 to £1,691,678.

Endurance Estates

Paragraph 3.5 – The County Council is forward funding the first phase of the Cam Drive primary school which includes approximately £3,000,000 infrastructure. This will be recovered through a separate agreement with Endurance Estates.

A10/A142 Roundabout

An allowance of £750K (£375,000 per applicant) across both developments has been made for improvements to this junction. A preliminary scheme has been designed by the applicants and costed at £550K. This cost is yet to be reviewed by officers and therefore the higher level of allowance should remain until the scheme cost is verified. Any variation to this sum following the review should be approved in accordance with the delegation set out in recommendation C) of this report.

Viability Review

Paragraph 4.5 – Share of uplift agreed as 55% to Church Commissioners and 45% to the local authorities

Paragraph 4.7 – The County Council will receive 100% of LA uplift up to £1,300,000.