

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Friday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2016

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

**Present:** Councillors: P Ashcroft (substituting for Councillor Lay), I Bates (Chairman), J Clark, E Cearns (Vice-Chairman), L Harford, R Henson, , N Kavanagh, M. Mason, M McGuire, L Nethsingha (substituting for D Jenkins) J Schumann, M Shuter, and J Williams

**Apologies:** Councillors: D Jenkins and A Lay

**Also present:** Councillors: S Criswell, L Dupre, and B Hunt.

**270. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Ashcroft, Harford and Mason declared a statutory, disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Item 5, Abbey Chesterton Bridge as being Members of the Planning Committee which was due to consider the planning application for the Bridge in the new year. The three Members withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the item and as a consequence, took no part in the debate or in the decisions reached.

**271. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

**272. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The Minute Action Log update was noted.

**273. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

**274. ABBEY CHESTERTON BRIDGE - APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT**

Councillors Ashcroft, Harford and Mason left the room before consideration of this report.

This report sought approval to progress the Abbey-Chesterton bridge scheme to the construction phase, subject to planning approval in the New Year. It was highlighted that the Bridge will form an important part of The Chisholm Trail to provide a high quality strategic foot and cycle link between the existing and new railway stations in Cambridge, and a link at each end to the Busway cycle route. It will also support a strategic link between the Science and Business Parks to the north of the river Cam,

and link to retail areas and business hubs to the south, and residential areas to the east. The new bridge will provide a direct convenient link between employment, residential and educational establishments on each side of the river. The location of the proposed bridge, and The Chisholm Trail were shown on Plan 1 of the report.

As part of the planning process the revised hybrid bridge design, including segregation for users and the provision of seating was presented to the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel who were impressed, describing the design as 'beautiful'. Artist drawings of the bridge design were tabled at the meeting.

The Project's progress was set out in section 3 of the report with the processes to procure a contractor involving a mini tender of six companies detailed in section 4. Section 5 set out details of the consultation exercise undertaken with the Cycling Project Team, who, having engaged widely, were confident that the main issues previously raised had been addressed by the revised bridge design. Members of the Committee were given details of the wording of an electronic petition opposing the scheme which did not believe the cycling benefits of the scheme outweighed the environmental, social and landscape impacts.

Jim Chisolm a resident and Matt Danish representing Cam Cycle having given prior notice, both spoke in support of the scheme. Their submissions are included as Appendix 1 to the minutes.

In respect of bridge naming, it was recommended that the Local Liaison Forum (LLF) should compile a list of possible names for the bridge, with the detail set out in section 6 of the report.

Members of the Committee's comments / questions included:

- Congratulating the officers for taking on board the comments made at public meetings and coming back with a vastly improved scheme that would be sensitive to the area as a valued green space.
- Other Members supported the ease of access that would be provided to Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows so that more people could enjoy its natural amenities, as well as highlighting the benefits the access would provide for future generations.
- In response to a question on how the bridge was to be funded, this would be from a combination of Department of Transport Cycling City Ambition Grant monies and Section 106 contributions, totalling £4.5 million.

On being put to the vote the Members of the Committee present for the item, unanimously resolved to:

- a) Note the scheme progress being made in terms of planning approval, land procurement and stakeholder engagement;
- b) Give approval to construct the scheme, subject to gaining planning permission;

- c) Delegate powers to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee to approve the construction contract and selection of the contractor;
- d) Support the continuation of land negotiations; and,
- e) Approve the proposal for a bridge naming process.

## **275. TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

The Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) is the main strategic transport policy document for the County with the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire (TSEC) providing the local context for LTP3 setting out:

- the Strategy basis for transport improvements in East Cambridgeshire;
- existing transport-related issues, together with consideration of the implications of wider employment and housing growth planned for the District;
- transport objectives and policies; and an action plan.

This report outlined the work in developing the Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire and included a summary of initial development of the Strategy, the methodology and results from the 2016 Consultation (which at the meeting it was clarified had started in February rather than April as originally stated in the report) and details of the alterations proposed, having taken into account feedback from the Consultation. It was highlighted that the draft Strategy objectives and application of the policies were supported by the majority of residents with the most supported scheme being the Ely Southern Bypass. There was also support for A10 dualling at Ely, the Ely North Rail Junction, a Railway Station for Soham and improvements to the A10/ A14 Milton interchange.

The purpose of the Transport Strategy is to:

- Provide a detailed policy framework and programme of transport schemes for the area, addressing current problems and consistent with the policies of the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-31 (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.
- Create a live action plan of transport schemes to address the existing and future transport issues in the district.

Councillor Criswell speaking in his capacity as the Liaison Member with the Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCV) Action Group spoke in support of the proposals to work with freight operators to persuade HCV's to use strategic routes to avoid villages and to transfer more freight onto the rail network, as referred to on page 91 and 92 of the agenda. This would be especially important following the construction of the Ely Bypass. He suggested the use of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) to ensure that HCV's kept to recognised strategic routes. In the section on air pollution on page 70, he

suggested that this should be expanded to make reference to noise / vibration, for which the Action Group had provided relevant information. He welcomed the input to be provided by Public Health on the impact of road traffic on people's health.

With reference to pages 193 and 194 section on 'Freight Movements and Heavy Goods vehicles' and the reference to the diamond area he suggested that Earith needed to be included in the HCV Strategy, as the traffic around the village had long been a problem.

Councillor Dupre spoke as a local member and echoed comments made by the Chairman earlier in the meeting praising the work undertaken by the HCV Group. She also expressed her gratitude to Councillor Criswell for highlighting the issues of noise and vibration as the other significant sources of pollution from HCV's. She also welcomed the appointment of Iain Green as the health representative. Her presentation (the full text is set out as a separate Appendix 2 to the minutes) highlighted that the 'diamond area' had been incorrectly referred to on page 44 of the document as the Sutton-Earith-Aldreth-Wilburton diamond area and requested that it was amended, as it was the diamond formed by the A14, A141, and A142 bisected by the A10, as set out in the County's Strategic Freight Route Map.

She challenged the assertion of the Strategy that it was seeking to solve was HCV movements in the 'diamond villages' as a result of the construction of the Ely Southern Bypass, when the issue was the current intolerable level of HCV traffic and noise pollution through the villages. She suggested no modelling had been undertaken of the effect of the Ely Southern Bypass on the villages (which included Sutton, Haddenham, Earith, Bluntisham, Hilton, Wilberton and Cottenham) to show that it would reduce the amount of HCV traffic passing through them.

In respect of particulates air pollution, she highlighted that no measurements whatsoever had been carried out in East Cambridgeshire (clarified in subsequent questioning as being in the last 12 -24 months) so there was no current data to inform a view about air quality in the villages other than those collected by the Joint Parishes HCV Group'. Councillor Schumann in response to this point highlighted that East Cambridgeshire District Council had undertaken work 3-4 years ago around the Ely Station area and in villages. Another Member suggested that if air quality studies had been undertaken, reference to them should be included in the document.

Councillor Hunt, a local member, spoke in support the Ely Bypass construction which he believed would be of benefit to the surrounding villages. With reference to page 201 Appendix B and the text regarding Little Thetford reading "Investigate possible safety and access improvements to the A10 / The Wyches junction. Investigate improvements to the junction to improve the safety of right turning traffic towards Ely)" he fully supported the proposal. He stated that this was currently a very dangerous junction as traffic turning to Ely had no choice but to cross two lanes of traffic and supported the need to install traffic lights to allow the safe entry and exit to the village. He highlighted that a child had recently been seriously hurt at the junction and urged that the works should be treated as a priority and suggested that as a short term measure there was the need to re-paint the speed limit white warning signs / lines.

Issue raised in the debate included:

- One Member suggesting the need to continue to press Network Rail with regard to the Soham and Ely upgrades to enable more freight to move to rail. Officers in response gave an assurance that they were in regular contact with Network Rail on the issues raised, while also recognising that the latter tended to work to long time frames.
- A question was raised on what had happened to proposals to redevelop Ely Station? It was explained that this had been delayed as a result of Tesco's having decided against moving location. Further work was being undertaken to ascertain what improvements could now be made.
- There was discussion regarding Dullingham Station, including reference to the length of the platform, which could only take four carriages. A Member highlighted that the main issue currently was that trains often only arrived with two carriages, which was completely inadequate for the number of people waiting to board the train. It was suggested that reference to issues with the Station should be included in the Strategy as they could be referred to in negotiations with the franchise operators.
- The Committee agreed there was a need to identify locations particularly affected by air pollution, possibly through the use of mobile monitoring units, as with this data, it would help influence future Government Policy regarding restricting the use of diesel engines, now recognised as one of the major air polluters.
- The need to recognise the suppressed demand for more people to switch to walking / cycling and to encourage this wherever possible through investing in cycle ways / bikeability schemes.

The Chairman suggested a further recommendation was required to delegate to the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman the authority to make minor additions / modifications to take account of the issues raised. Councillor Nethsingha wished to see a recommendation to replace the current report recommendation to specifically pick up some of the main issues highlighted and therefore moved the following which was seconded by Councillor Williams:

“that the Committee should approve the Strategy but required further work to be undertaken to tackle air pollution and noise and vibration issues in villages along the A1123”.

There was then discussion on the amendment which included some Members expressing the view that this level of detail was not necessary, as agreeing to the Strategy included agreeing the seven objectives which encompassed many of the issues being highlighted. On being put to the vote the proposed amendment to the recommendation was lost.

Councillor Bates moved the following as an additional recommendation which was duly seconded, reading:

“To delegate to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make textual changes to the Strategy to incorporate reference to noise, pollution and vibration and the need to address these issues across the Strategy area”.

On being put to the vote the recommendation was carried by a clear majority and becoming part of the substantive motion,

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) To approve the Strategy for adoption.
- b) To delegate to the Executive Director of Economy, Transport and the Environment in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make textual changes to the Strategy to incorporate reference to noise, pollution and vibration and the need to address these issues across the Strategy area”.

## 276. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT BLOCK (ITB) FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

This Report sought Members’ comments and support for the proposed projects to receive ITB Delivering Transport Strategy Aims funding for the rolling 3-year period from 2017/18 with the proposed allocations of the £3.19M ITB funding outlined in the table below.

| <b>Budget Category</b>            | <b>Proposed allocation 2017/18 (£'000s)</b> | <b>Description</b>   |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality Monitoring            | 23  | Funding towards supporting air quality monitoring work in relation to the road network across the work with local authority partners.  |
| Major Scheme Development          | 200   | Resources to support the development of major schemes.   |
| Local Infrastructure Improvements | 682   | Include the provision of the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) Initiative across the County (£607K); accessibility works such as disabled parking bays; and improvements to the Public Rights of Way network (£75K). |

| <b>Budget Category</b>                                | <b>Proposed allocation 2017/18 (£'000s)</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|---|---|---|
| Strategy Development and Integrated Transport Schemes | 345   | Resources to support Transport Infrastructure strategy and related work across the County, including Long term Strategies, District Transport Strategies as well as funding towards scheme development work.                                    |
| Road safety schemes                                   | 594   | Investment in road safety engineering work at locations where there is strong evidence of a significantly high risk of injury crashes.  |
| Delivering Transport Strategy Aims                    | 1,346                                       | Supporting the delivery of proposals included in Countywide and area transport strategies to improve accessibility, mitigate the impacts of growth, and support sustainable transport improvements. Proposed projects are listed in Appendix 1. |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>3,190</b>                                |   |

In view of the small annual budgets and cost of schemes, a rolling 3-year funding period had been prepared to ensure that some larger schemes which potentially had greater benefits were not ruled out from the outset due to limited funding availability.

It was highlighted that two schemes had experienced delay, (a) Norwood Road cycle improvement to the route along Norwood Road corridor, March and (b) Cycle Route 12 (St Ives to Bluntisham) due to issues revealed during detailed design, and therefore these required funding to be carried forward to 2017/18 to complete the work.

The following six schemes had cross-year funding earmarked for 2017/18 and 2018/19. which left £801k to be allocated to prioritised projects.

| Location   | Scheme  | 17/18        | 18/19<br>19/20 |   |
|--|---|--------------|----------------|---|
| Ely  | Cycle route between Ely and Stuntney                          | -            | TBC            | Feasibility will be completed within the £12K budget approved for 2016/17. No budget is proposed for 17/18 because scheme delivery needs to link to Ely Southern Bypass i.e. not before 2018. |
| March  | Cycle route from Southwest March to town centre               | £175K        | -              | Full cost £250K, of which £75K budget was approved for 2016/17 and will be spent as planned   |
| St Ives  | Cycle Route 3 St Ives East-West route across town along A1123 | £230K        | £200K          | Proposed budget £430K is for delivery in 2017/18 and 2018/19. (2016/17 budget funded feasibility and initial design).   |
| Cambridge  | Barton Road cycle route improvement                           | £100K        | -              | Full cost £200K, of which £100K budget was approved for 2016/17 and will be spent as planned  |
| Countywide   | Minor walking cycling improvements                            | £35K         | £35K per annum | Proposed to increase budget per annum from £25K to reflect demand   |
| Countywide   | Small scale bus stop facility improvements                    | £5K          | £5K per annum  | Low cost improvements that bring good value for money   |
| <b>Budget committed</b>                                |   | <b>£545K</b> | <b>TBC</b>     |   |
| <b>Total budget less committed<br/>£1,346K - £545K</b> |   | <b>£801K</b> | <b>TBC</b>     |   |

Section 3.3 of the report set out the Prioritisation Methodology used to score eligible schemes which were defined as being:

- Deliverable within 5 years
- Local non-major schemes with funding gaps under £500K
- Not City Deal specific schemes (which should be funded by City Deal and matched by Section 106 developer contributions).

Eligible schemes for allocation of ITB funding for the rolling 3-year period from 2017/18. were assessed and prioritised, using criteria based on the Department for Transport's Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report. The schemes, together with the committed schemes were listed in Appendix 1 to the report.



It was highlighted that Cambridge scheme, reference number 7 in Appendix 1, Huntingdon Road outbound cycleway improvement between Victoria Road/Castle Street and Girton was proposed to be forward funded by ITB funding with S106 funding for these being required from NIAB (Darwin Green 1), Darwin Green 2, Darwin Green 3, Cambridge North West and Girton College. Eligible schemes assessed but not proposed for funding allocations in 2017/18 would remain in the Transport Investment Plan to be considered for other appropriate funding sources or for the next round of ITB funding. These schemes were listed in Appendix 3 of the report.

Councillor Hunt speaking as both a local member as well as making representations on behalf of the Parish Council, tabled a map for information in support of the Haddenham scheme on page 219 for the installation of a traffic lights controlled pedestrian crossing at the top of the High Street (A1123 –A1421 junction). With the aid of the map he explained how the A1123 completely divided Haddenham in half, with the school and play area in the south and the pub and main centre in the north, highlighting that there had already been two deaths on the A1123 in Haddenham in the current year. Later one Member questioned the cost compared to other proposed crossings costed at half the price. It was explained that this was a particularly difficult location as it was a staggered junction and therefore the proposed solution was more costly.

Issues raised by Members included:

- Councillor Williams queried whether Item 74 in the Transport Investment Plan (TIP) ‘Solar Light shared path Fulbourn and Cherry Hinton’ was still in the programme **(Action: Elsa Evans to check and confirm position outside of the meeting)**
- A question was asked on how schemes would be brought forward for the TIP and who made the assessment on which schemes were eligible under the criteria. In reply it was indicated that schemes were drawn from the TIP approved by Members in November, with officers making the assessments, using the criteria as set out in the report. The same Member suggested there needed to be a process to involve members to be able to provide (political and local knowledge) guidance on priorities.
- A Member expressed concern that there were a great many Fenland cycling / footway schemes in Appendix 3 (Schemes not proposed for funding) and questioned the commitment to such schemes outside Cambridge. In reply on why not many schemes were included for Fenland, it was explained that some would not have yet been fully developed, which would result in a low deliverability score, while others would score lower on the scale of impact due to the number of people who would benefit, compared to a more densely populated area like Cambridge. A number of Members supported the need for a fairer system with revised criteria to allocate resources to ensure schemes were progressed in Fenland and other recognised disadvantaged areas of the County. The Vice Chairman suggested that this would need to also involve local Members working more closely with officers on proposed schemes.

- Making reference to scheme 503 in Appendix 3 'Lode Pedestrian cycle improvement' a local member on the Committee asked how often the list was checked, as this particular scheme had been proposed and agreed for funding and suggested that there might be other spurious entries, with other schemes having completed. The report author indicated that the TIP was the subject of regular updates, but accepted that there might be out of date information currently included.
- **Regarding the Cambridge to Barton improvement, Councillor Nethsingha requested that she receive more detail, including the exact location and whether it was just a junction improvement or if it was part of a wider scheme along Barton Road. It was agreed this would be provided in a written reply following the meeting. Action: Elsa Evans**
- In future more account should be taken of health benefits in the criteria to be used as part of the assessment process.
- One Member suggested future reports should not provide details of the estimated cost of schemes in a public report, as his experience was that contractors used these as the guide for their tender price and it seemed too much of a coincidence how often the tender prices came in very close, if not at the estimate given.

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) support the allocation to the ITB budget elements
- b) approve the proposed projects in Appendix 1 of the report for allocation of ITB funding in 2017/18 and earmarked for 2018/19 and 2019/20, and
- c) support the proposed projects in Appendix 1 of the report for inclusion in the Transport Delivery Plan.

## **277. CAMBOURNE WEST PLANNING APPLICATION - DRAFT SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS**

This report asked the Committee to consider the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms for Cambourne West and approve the draft prior to determination of the planning application by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC).

This Committee at its meeting in April 2015 had broadly supported the proposals contained in the original planning application subject to the conclusion of an appropriate s106 agreement. In the response to SCDC, the County Council sought the provision of infrastructure and services to be secured through planning obligations as detailed in paragraph 1.6 of the report. The Committee in April 2015 also endorsed two holding objections relating to transport and archaeology which were subject to the applicant submitting further information, assessment and providing details of mitigation for the potential impacts.

The applicant submitted an amended application in November 2015 with Officers providing a further response to these amendments. In parallel to the amended planning

application, negotiations on the Section 106 Heads of Terms, together with a viability assessment, had been undertaken jointly between the applicant, SCDC and the County Council. Modelling had indicated that the Section 106 package of measures was unviable which had been verified by consultants acting on behalf of the local authorities. As a result, the applicant and SCDC had negotiated a reduction of affordable housing provision from 40% to 30%, along with a revised s106 package of measures. Infrastructure provided or facilitated by the County Council had, however, remained largely unchanged. Based on the agreement reached between the parties, Table 1 of the report highlighted the main County Council infrastructure items where a direct contribution would be received. (included as Appendix 3 to these Minutes). In addition, as a result of the mitigation measures agreed as detailed in paragraphs 2.9 and 2.10 of the report, the two holding objections had been withdrawn.

In discussion Members raised issues include the following:

- Whether with reference to Appendix 2 on 'Transport infrastructure' there was an inconsistency between item 9 'Bus services' and Item 14 the 'Broadway Bus link' as the latter was to be delivered prior to commencement, while the bus service payments were not due till the third phase of development. It was explained that as a physical feature, the Broadway was required to be completed in advance, while the contribution for bus services was delayed some time into the development to ensure greater patronage.
- Whether as a result of a High Court ruling it was still appropriate to ask the developer to make contributions towards monitoring planning obligations. It was explained that it depended on the complexity of the work and that due to the number of obligations, this particular case justified a contribution.
- In discussion on the 40% affordable housing figure a Member pointed out that the South Cambridgeshire District Council Policy on affordable housing was 40% "subject to viability".
- On a question regarding the household waste recycling centre it was explained that Cambourne fell within the St Neots catchment area and consequently the request for a contribution complied with the regulations regarding the pooling of planning obligations.
- The Vice-Chairman expressed his frustration that it was not permissible to receive details of the consultants' viability report or the percentage figure of the developer's expected profit.
- In response to a question it was clarified that as a result of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations it was not possible to collect any new contributions towards Area Corridor Transport Action Plan monies.

Having received an update on the outline planning application progress,

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the draft S106 Heads of Terms set out in appendix 2 of the report; and

- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and the Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the draft Heads of Terms.

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

The Committee noted that the ETE Risk Register was last brought to Committee in May 2016 and was reviewed on a quarterly basis by the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Strategic Risk Group. It was a comprehensive expression of the main risks that fell within the Committee's remit, with mitigations either in place, or in the process of being developed, to ensure that each risk was appropriately managed.

The current report provided the Committee with the latest details of the Economy and Environment Committee risks showing that there were ten risks. Three risks, CR 9 – 'Failure to secure funding for infrastructure', CR 22 – 'The Total Transport project fails to identify and implement affordable solutions that allow service levels to be maintained' and CR26 – 'Increasing manifestation of Busway defects' are included in the Corporate Risk Register. Details of all changes and updates made to the Risk Register were set out in Appendix 2 to the report.

It was highlighted that ETE Management Team had requested a full review of the ETE Directorate and Service risk registers to coincide with the introduction of GRACE, the new system for recording risks corporately. Training on this system for officers was being undertaken in December and a full review by the ETE Strategic Risk Group would take place following this.

Members expressed concern that the text to Appendix 1 (the ETE Risk Register) was too small even when blown up to A3 and required it to be presented in a revised format for future meetings.

It was resolved to:

- a) To note the position in respect of the Economy and Environment Risk Register.
- b) To ask the report author in future to produce the text in the ETE Risk Register (Appendix 1) in a larger, more reader friendly print font.

## **279. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT TO OCTOBER 2016**

This report provided the financial position for the whole of the ETE Service up to the end of October 2016. The headlines set out in the covering report were as follows:

**Revenue:** There were no significant variances and ETE was showing a £161k forecast underspend.

**Capital:** The capital programme was forecast to be on target and £5.7m of the estimated £10.5m Capital Programme Variation has been met. King's Dyke had a forecast variance of -£3.3m due to land access issues and Connecting Cambridgeshire

was forecasting a -£1.1m variance as the planned expenditure had been re-profiled.

Of the fourteen performance indicators, two were currently red, two amber and ten were green. The indicators that were currently red were:

- Local bus journeys originating in the authority area.
- The average journey per mile during the morning peak of the most congested routes.

At year-end, the current forecast was that one performance indicator would be red (local bus journeys originating in the authority area), eight would be amber and five green.

Comments on the report were in respect of bus provision and the expectation that bus passenger numbers would increase with Councillor Williams wishing to place on record his appreciation to Paul Nelson and his team for providing a replacement for the withdrawn Number 17 service.

The Executive Director ETE sought a steer from the Committee in respect of the Ely bypass in terms of an underpass option for cyclists. It was explained that when the original bypass scheme had been developed, no underpass option was included and the original design provided the basis for the tender with the scheme cost of up to £36m having already been agreed by the Department of Transport. To install an underpass as part of the scheme would require an amendment to the planning consent. Further investigation had also identified that an underpass would be partially below the ground water level and would result in significant works being required to ensure a watertight structure and ongoing maintenance with pumps to keep it watertight. Based on the early design work undertaken, this could add an additional cost estimated at around £1.4m - £1.5m which would result in a scheme beyond the original financial delegation, requiring a further report to Committee. Currently the estimate was that 20 cyclists per day were likely to use it, although this would inevitably increase if the facility was built. It was indicated that the scheme could still be considered at a later date after the road had been built, although construction would be much more difficult and costly.

The subsequent discussion included the following issues:

- it was established that the underpass would be away from the main road and would require cyclists to deviate from their route to be able to use it which one Member suggested would make it less likely to be used by experienced cyclists.
- One Member suggested that promoting cycling as a health activity was negated if they had to cycle through a damp tunnel.
- Others supported such a scheme, even at the increased cost, as the facility would be used by non-confident cyclists, especially when the Council was seeking to reduce congestion by encouraging more people to switch from cars to cycling.
- One member suggested that a light controlled crossing could be installed as an initial measure, before any decision was taken regarding the construction of an underpass.

- More information was required regarding the proposed route.

Having reviewed and commented on the report:

It was resolved;

To note the report.

## **280. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS 2017-18 TO 2021-22**

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan revenue and capital proposals for Economy Transport and Environment (ETE) that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee. It was explained that the current report had not changed since the one provided to the Committee in October. The original date for the Committee had been changed from early December so that should further Service savings have been required as a result of the General Purposes Committee held on 29<sup>th</sup> November, these could have been included. However as no changes were required, the report would be considered alongside those from the other service committees at the General Purposes Committee in early January.

The report explained that the draft capital programme had been reviewed in September and subsequently reviewed in its entirety, along with the prioritisation of schemes, by General Purposes Committee in October. No changes were made as a result of these reviews, though work was ongoing to revise and update the programme in light of continuing review by the Capital Programme Board, changes to overall funding or to specific circumstances surrounding individual schemes. The full Capital Programme was shown in appendix 1 of the report as part of the finance tables. It was highlighted that since the Capital Programme was presented to the September Committee, there had been a change to B/C.3.101 Development of Archives centre premises. (Increased from £4.2m to £5.06m as agreed by Highways and Community Infrastructure (H&CI) Committee in October 2016).

The report explained that the Council was still awaiting funding announcements, expected during December/January, regarding various capital grants. In addition, as the capital programme was continually changing, Services would continue to make any necessary updates in the lead up to the January GPC meeting which would consider the finalised Business Plan.

In respect of the revenue budget the full table of savings proposals were set out at appendix 1 and the associated Community Impact Assessments (CIAs) contained in appendix 2. Any proposals added to the table at appendix 1 since Committees in October were summarised at appendix 3, along with the proposals rejected at October Committees' for completeness. Proposals were still subject to change pending Full Council in February 2016 when agreed proposals would then become the Council's Business Plan.

Economy Transport and Environment fees and charges were contained within two schedules which were updated throughout the year: a schedule of discretionary charges

and a schedule of statutory charges. These schedules were set out in appendices 4 and 5 to the report.

Comments from Members included:

- The Vice-Chairman welcomed the outcome focussed method to Business Planning and that some original ETE savings proposals were not now being pursued. He also welcomed the Transformation agenda although highlighting that this would involve losing a third of staff and had concerns that the most talented / those with detailed knowledge could leave and suggested that there appeared to be “no plan B.”
- With reference to the concessionary fares budget line on page 298 of the agenda, one Councillor reiterated the concerns raised at the December Council meeting on the potential adverse effect on this budget as a result of changes to journeys at one of the park and ride sites where concessionary fare holders were having their tickets stamped twice.
- Councillor Mason highlighted that he was still not satisfied with answers he had received regarding the plan for the future maintenance of the Guided Busway and the way it was shown in both revenue and the capital accounts and believed that better planning for its ongoing maintenance was required.

Having reviewed and commented on the report:

It was resolved to:

- a) note the overview and context provided for the 2017/18 to 2021/22 Business Plan revenue proposals for the Service, updated since the last report to the Committee in October.
- b) Note the draft revenue savings proposals that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2017/18 to 2021/22, and endorse them to the General Purposes Committee as part of consideration for the Council’s overall Business Plan.
- c) Note the changes to the Capital Programme that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee and endorse them.
- d) Note and agree the proposed fees and charges for those Economy, Transport and Environment services that are within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2017/18.

## **281 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MEMBER LED REVIEW OF CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE**

At the Economy & Environment Committee on 1st September it was proposed that a member-led review of completed cycle schemes should be conducted to establish any lessons that could be learnt for future schemes going forward and to establish best

practice. The report set out the Terms of Reference proposed following an initial meeting of the Review Group.

Nominations had been sought from the political groups and following discussions at Spokes, the membership proposed was as follows:

Cllr Henson  
Cllr Noel Kavanagh  
Cllr Ian Manning  
Cllr Tony Orgee  
Cllr Mandy Smith  
Cllr Amanda Taylor  
Cllr Susan van de Ven  
Substitute: Cllr Ed Cearns (substitute)

During the course of correspondence around the Terms of Reference, Cllr Mandy Smith volunteered to be the Chairwoman and her nomination was endorsed by the members of the Review Group. As an update, Councillor Harford indicated that she had also volunteered and would wish to be added to the Membership.

In addition, the Chairman of the Committee had provided late comments suggesting that the number of schemes proposed for review set out in the draft terms of reference was unmanageable. He suggested that consideration should be given to restricting the number of schemes to possibly one from each district in the County. Spokes had provided a suggested revised list as follows:

Cambridge City: Hills Road and Huntingdon Road (treated as one scheme)  
East Cambridgeshire: Lisle Lane, Ely  
Fenland: Wimblington Road, March  
Huntingdonshire: Needingworth to Bluntisham extension  
South Cambridgeshire: A10 Cycling Scheme (treated as one scheme)

Niki Marrian a Hills Road resident had provided an assessment form using criteria agreed for cycling schemes by the Cambridge Environment and Traffic Management Joint Area Committee, augmented with additional questions, plus criteria for good street design from Scottish Government guides. This had been sent by e-mail to the membership of the Review Group and provided to the full Committee membership as Appendix 3 to the Committee Running Order (background briefing note).

In discussion it was agreed that the final number of schemes to be the subject of further review, should be decided by the Member Group.

It was resolved:

- a) to agree the Terms of Reference with any subsequent changes to be made by the Review Group.
- b) To formally approve the membership of the Review Group, with the addition of Councillor Harford, and to the Chairwoman being Councillor Smith.



## **282. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT (E&E) COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN UPDATE**

Further to a previous request for a training session on aspects of the Capital Programme, the Committee was advised that an E&E Committee Member Training Session training session on the Capital Programme had now been arranged for 2<sup>nd</sup> February to commence at 2 pm in the KV Room, Shire Hall, with the details as set out in the report.

Councillor Schumann who had requested the session, highlighted that it should not be a general session on the Capital Programme, but should focus on issues regarding its funding and some of the main issues that could arise, highlighting incidents of mistakes made in the past, and what lessons had been learnt to ensure they were not repeated.

**The Vice Chairman raised the issue of the need for ETE to arrange a still outstanding Member seminar on the implications of the Neighbourhood Planning Bill 2016-17. Another Member suggested that it would be useful to have a session on Transport Issues for those with Special Educational Needs. Action: Executive Director ETE.**

It was resolved to:

- a) note the upcoming training session date of 2.00 p.m. 2nd February in the KV Room, Shire Hall on aspects of the Capital Programme.
- b) That the session should focus on the Capital Programme funding process, identifying examples of past problem areas and identifying anything that could be / had been changed to ensure they were not repeated.
- c) Agree that the invitation to the session be extended to all Members of the Council.
- d) Note the need to sign an attendance sheet when attending training sessions, so that Members' attendance is accurately recorded.
- e) Request for ETE officers to look to arranging a training session on Special Educational Needs Transport Issues.
- f) For ETE to progress the outstanding request for an item to be included on an early 2017 Member seminar on the implications of the Neighbourhood Planning Bill 2016-17.

## **283. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE SERVICES AGENDA PLAN**

It was explained that as the main decision reports for the January Economy and Environment Committee meeting had been re-allocated to either the current meeting or the February Committee meeting, the intention was to cancel the 12<sup>th</sup> January Committee which had the support of spokes.

It was resolved:

to note the agenda plan as set out, and to agree to the cancellation of the January 2017 Economy and Environment Committee Meeting.

Chairman  
9<sup>th</sup> February 2016



## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Abbey-Chesterton Foot and Cycle Bridge**

#### **Submission from Jim Chisolm**

Councillors, Officers, and members of the public. The last 20 years has been a bit of a bumpy ride for the route I originally proposed, and the ironic thing is that the bit I thought most difficult, that of getting under Hills Road was achieved early, courtesy of the Guided Bus, as were the sections outside Cambridge. I hope today's decision is purely 'technical', but we cannot yet congratulate ourselves. We have the central section (this is sounding a bit like the East West Rail...) which I in my naivety, and the days of RailTrack, I thought was easy. That will come.

More importantly, Officers and Councillors will know that some determined opposition is making progress difficult, both for this bridge and Phase One.

The Cycling Campaign, and others, can be critical when we think you could 'do better'..., but as part of our Charitable objective is 'for Better, safer and more cycling in and around Cambridge' we must be effective in supporting projects that will give such huge benefits to those in and around Cambridge. We will do all we can to expose the flaws in the arguments of those who oppose this route, as well as supporting officers of the City and County through these rather unexpected difficulties.

Improving travel choice and improving sustainable access for work, education and leisure is now accepted as a way to make a happier place. It is almost certainly the cheapest way to reduce the amount of private car travel.

#### **Submission from Matt Danish representing Camcycle**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Camcycle calls on this Committee to back the officer's recommendation that spending be approved to start construction on the Abbey-Chesterton Bridge subject to planning permission being granted.

This bridge will transform travel in the north and east of Cambridge. It will directly link the Abbey area and Fen Ditton village to the new Cambridge North station, putting them within a short walk of this transport hub and new employment centres. It will create a short, convenient cycle link to the major employment sites at the Business Park and Science Park, avoiding a dogleg via the steep, narrow and congested Green Dragon Bridge. The new bridge built to modern standards and regulations will create a much-needed fully accessible connection for all people who would like to walk or cycle across the river.

The location and design have been refined to deliver the most sensitive bridge possible. It will not despoil any view; from across the common it will be almost unseen against the existing railway bridge.

This project has been subjected to an incredible level of scrutiny, including being delayed by almost a year to address design concerns and mitigation. This has now resulted in plans for a well-designed bridge situated in the optimum location that is sensible for its setting, next to the existing steel truss bridge carrying a railway with overhead electrification.

Opponents of the scheme have questioned the inclusion of public health improvements in the benefits-cost analysis. But it has been well-established through government guidelines that public health improvements are a valid benefit. The encouragement of everyday physical activity, reduction of air pollution, and improved access to our greenways and Commons will improve the health of many people and bring real savings to the NHS.

Even when delayed this project has enjoyed broad support from across the local political spectrum. We obtained signatures on a petition last year that showed that many more people support the bridge than oppose it. We request that you please approve the spending to get this bridge built as soon as possible.

## **Appendix 2**

**Councillor Dupre submission to item 6 – Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire**

**Provided separately.**

| <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Appendix 3</b></p> <p><b>Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms Cambourne West – County Council Contributions</b></p> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Item</b>  | <b>Contribution</b>                            |
| 2 x 2 Form of Entry Primary Schools (420 places each)  | (£8,630,000 per primary school)<br>£17,260,000 |
| Primary school revenue   | £80,000  |
| Secondary school   | (based on £26,013 per place)<br>£14,809,852    |
| Special Education Needs  | £1,988,000                                     |
| Children's Centre  | £115,000                                       |
| Library Contribution   | £388,930                                       |
| Bus service revenue support  | £1,200,000                                     |
| A428 Madingley Road Bus Priority (contribution to City Deal scheme)  | £8,700,000                                     |
| Walking/cycle links within Cambourne   | £610,000                                       |
| Bus link to Broadway   | £305,000                                       |
| Travel Plan coordinator and monitoring   | £237,500                                       |
| Travel Plan measures   | £470,000                                       |
| Household Waste Recycling Centre   | £425,350                                       |
| Community health and development workers and CFA services  | £666,880                                       |

In addition there will also be a range of transport mitigations included in the Section 106 that the developer will provide as works in kind. These include:

- Sheepfold Lane and A1198 access works; and
- Off-site access mitigation.

The policy requirement for affordable housing is 40%. However as a consequence of the viability and the scale of other planning obligations necessary to make the development acceptable the affordable housing requirement has been reduced to 30%.