

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 23rd May 2019

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 11.15 a.m.

Present: Councillors: D Ambrose Smith H Batchelor, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, L Harford (substituting for Cllr Fuller), S Hoy (substituting for T Wotherspoon), Cllr N Kavanagh S Tierney and, J Williams

Apologies: R Fuller and T Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman)

230. NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

It was noted that at the Annual Council meeting on 14th May, Councillor Bates and Councillor Wotherspoon had been re-appointed respectively as the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee for the Municipal Year 2019-20.

231. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

232. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th March 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

233. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The following oral update was provided since the agenda publication:

Minute 105 – Ely Southern Bypass – Cost and additional Funding Requirement

The above report had now moved from the 28th May to the 29th July Audit and Accounts Committee.

With the above update, the Minutes Action Log was noted.

234. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received by the deadline.

One petition titled “Newmarket Road” was received by the deadline with over 400 signatures asking that Cambridgeshire County Council “instruct its officers to maintain holding objections to all developments on or close to Newmarket Road from Elizabeth Way roundabout to the Wadloes/ Barnwell Road roundabout unless the applicant can demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt using transportation and junction modelling that the proposal will neither worsen congestion nor generate any road safety problems”

The Chairman invited Al Hanagan the petition organiser to present the petition, the main points of which are included as **Appendix 1** to these minutes with copies made available to the Committee by the organiser at the meeting. Main points included in the oral presentation included:

- drawing attention to the already worsening air quality / environmental / pollution, congestion and safety issues on Newmarket Road which would only be exacerbated by more development.
- Highlighting that in the current year approval had been given to two new supermarkets and a budget hotel which he believed could not be accommodated within the existing layout of the Road in terms of the traffic congestion that they would generate.
- Suggesting that no planning applications ever appeared to be refused in the area.
- Suggesting that the traffic survey undertaken had been mathematically incorrect and highlighted that the latest hotel was looking to establish guest drop off points on the main road in areas where there were double yellow lines.
- That while sympathetic to the fact that staff were under severe work pressure suggesting that the Transport Assessment Team were currently failing Cambridge in terms of allowing so many additional developments. .
- That current mitigations proposed were inadequate and unenforceable
- Proposing that:
 - A detailed transportation model should be undertaken describing the current situation of Newmarket Road and its junctions
 - That until a developer using the model could demonstrate that traffic from their application would not worsen the current situation, a holding objection should be maintained.
 - That to help with future decision making, an independent road safety engineer should review recent decisions on developments along Newmarket Road to see if best practice had been followed and to look at what had gone wrong and what mitigation measures could be looked at.

Following the presentation the Chairman invited the Committee to ask any questions of clarification. None were raised.

As there was no appropriate report on the agenda, the Chairman informed the lead petitioner that he would receive a formal written response within 10 working days from the date of the meeting. **Action: Andy Preston / Juliet Richardson / Chairman**

235. THE CAMBRIDGE CORRIDOR STUDY

The Cambridgeshire Corridor Study' (CCS) forms part of Network Rail's Continuous Modular Strategic Planning funded 50% by the Department for Transport, with the other 50% split equally between the County Council, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) . Its purpose is to forecast housing and economic growth in 2033 and to 2043 and against these projections, consider the rail infrastructure and services needed to provide for the demand of that growth on rail routes into Cambridge to ensure there were no gaps in provision or capacity.

The study looked at services into Cambridge and therefore did not consider the East Coast Main Line, services to Huntingdon and St Neots, or a new station at Alconbury, as these were within Network Rail's East Coast Route area.

The CCS assumed Cambridge South Station and four tracking between Cambridge Station and the Shepreth Branch junction would be in place. It did not specifically consider the infrastructure needed for the East West Rail (EWR) Central Section between Cambridge and the Bedford area, or enhancements needed in the Ely Area, as these were already being worked on separately. It did however assume that the EWR Central Section and the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements projects would enable additional and longer trains to run into the Cambridge area.

The CCS considered two growth scenarios:

- Scenario 1: A baseline growth scenario that was consistent with Treasury Green Book guidance.
- Scenario 2: A higher growth scenario consistent with levels of housing and economic growth seen over the past decade in Greater Cambridge and the surrounding area.

Having looked at the growth assumptions, the CCS then considered:

- the additional train services needed to cater for that growth;
- the infrastructure required for those additional services; and
- the stabling needed to house the additional trains.

The above were all detailed in the report with the CCS concluding with the following recommendations for future development work in priority order:

1. Interim train stabling solutions.
2. Joint workstream:
 - Cambridge Station enhancements.
 - Overall train stabling requirements to 2043.
3. Newmarket Line capacity.

The above required to be integrated with work on Cambridge South, East West Rail and the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements. As Network Rail were planning to produce a Strategic Outline Business Case for the Cambridge Station Enhancements in the next twelve months, the CPCA would ensure that work on the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) was considered in conjunction with this work.

For the reasons set out in the report officers highlighted that:

- It was critically important that as the CPCA Non-Statutory Spatial Plan and reviews of the City and District Council Local Plans moved forward, a review or update of the CCS was undertaken to ensure that it addressed local and national plans for growth. Further clarity on District Councils growth plans might require even higher growth scenarios than were currently being forecast).
- There was an opportunity for improvements to the East West Rail (EWR) Eastern section - Cambridge to Newmarket Line between Cambridge and Ipswich to be delivered ahead at or at the same time as the EWR Central Section, as a first

stage of Eastern Section works, and as an opportunity to see early commencement of EWR services to Ipswich.

- There was an opportunity for the early commencement of EWR services to Norwich, (although this depended on delivery of the Ely Area Capacity Enhancements and the allocation of new train paths in the Ely area).
- While the identification of improvements to Cambridge station in the CCS was focussed on capacity for trains an equally important issue was the capacity of the platforms and station buildings to cope with future passenger numbers. This needed to be considered in future work. The opportunity to deliver the eastern access to Cambridge Station and potentially more cycle parking on the eastern side of the station should also be explored as part of that work.
- The Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) proposals showed a branch to Mildenhall. If significant development took place at Mildenhall, consideration might be given as to whether a rail extension from Newmarket or the Soham area would be appropriate instead of or complementary to CAM, in the context of an additional four services an hour from Cambridge towards Newmarket in growth Scenario 2.

Questions / issues raised and responses provided included:

- With reference to paragraph 3.5 and the Ipswich Line, while welcoming the proposed doubling of the lines, concern was expressed that the County Council Local Transport Plan had always included reference to local stations at Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn. As there was no reference to them in the current document was it the intention of the Combined Authority to remove these two local stations?
- With reference to the length of time taken to deal with level crossing issues e.g. Foxton and Ely and with very recent announcement of the plan for Marshall to move location and potentially 12,000 more houses to be built on the site, there was a need to consider measures to alleviate traffic crossing the Eastern Line. A suggestion made was that early consideration should be given to providing an underpass and further to this, a question was raised whether such costs had been considered in the cost scenarios currently provided? In reply the high costs being estimated included a high cost assumption to help remedy level crossing issues.
- Why was Liverpool Street Station not mentioned in the current report? **As a result of this query the Chairman asked that the report be passed to Lord Alan Hazelhurst who sat on the West Anglia Task Force to ensure he was aware of the issues. Action Jeremy Smith.** This group and the London Stansted Consortium would pick up issues in relation to London Liverpool Street. Officers explained that there were major constraints regarding expansion in respect of the Tottenham area of the London Liverpool Street line. The current study was for 12 carriage trains to Liverpool Street and an assumption that these could deal with the growth scenarios in the report. This would not make them more frequent, but would deal with capacity issues.
- **There was also a request that the report should also be sent to the appropriate Suffolk councils. Action Jeremy Smith.**
- In reply to a request for details of the timeframe for the Study, it was explained that Network Rail were looking at the next stage later in the financial year or

early next year.

- Asking what the cost of the study would be. At this stage a figure could not be given as Transport was now the responsibility of the Combined Authority and they would look at what was an appropriate figure.
- Why was there no reference to Kings Lynn to Littleport line. This was not referenced as they were being looked at by the Ely Enhancement Study. The County Council was not a funding partner for the study or at a stage to report back to the Committee. Officers could make reference to these queries in their response. **Action: Jeremy Smith**
- With reference to the earlier petition there was a plea to ensure that the Study was undertaken in as timely a manner as possible, as attention had already been drawn to the fast changing situation in Cambridge e.g. the recent Marshall announcement.
- There was no mention of the March to Wisbech line it was explained that the Ely Enhancement Study was looking at trains from the north of the County. The assumption was that trains would be coming from the North. The issue in the current study was whether Cambridge Station could cope.

In summing up the Chairman requested that officers include in their response reference to issues raised regarding the Littleport to Kings Lynn and Wisbech to March lines.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Welcome the Cambridgeshire Corridor Study.
- b) Highlight to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), Local Planning Authorities, the Department for Transport (DfT) and Network Rail:
 - i the need for investment in Business Case development for the improvements needed in the Cambridge Station area as part of DfT's Rail Network Enhancement Pipeline (RNEP) process.
 - ii the need to ensure that emerging growth plans contained in the CPCA's Non-Statutory Spatial Plan or new Local Plans was assessed in an update to the study at the appropriate time.
 - iii the opportunity to deliver the eastern access to Cambridge station as part of the capacity enhancement works at Cambridge station.
 - iv the need to consider the opportunities presented by enhancements to the rail network in the Cambridge area for the CPCA's transport strategy, and for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) and the wider public transport network.

236. TRANSPORT SCHEME DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

In 2018/19 a budget of £1 million was set aside for transport scheme development as part of the Capital Budget in the Council's Business Plan, with the intention of bringing schemes to the point where they could be submitted for funding and the development costs reclaimed. On 8th February 2018 this Committee approved a list of transport schemes to be developed in 2018/19 and also approved a process for sifting and prioritising transport schemes from 2019/2020 onwards, to be developed and designed ready to be implemented when funding opportunities arise. The previously agreed criteria was set out in Appendix 1. The schemes approved for development using this

budget allocation were detailed in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 of the report.

The Committee was reminded that on 6th December 2018 it had received a progress update on the projects and after discussion, asked the officers to update the sifting criteria to include safety and air quality and to also review other criteria such as scheme location.

This report updated the Committee on the review of the sifting criteria and set out proposed updated criteria included in Appendix 2 to the report.

The following changes were proposed to the Stage 1 sift in order to produce a long list of schemes:

- to remove the former sift 3, which sifted out schemes in Cambridge City. This would ensure that schemes across the entire County could be considered provided that they did not form part of a wider committed scheme, such as those included in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Greater Cambridge Partnership, Highways England or Network Rail programmes.
- to update the former sift 6, so that schemes without a direct impact on congestion, or safety would be removed. With regard to road safety, it was proposed that schemes that addressed existing accident cluster sites would meet this criteria.
- that Stages 2 and 3 of the sifting process remained unchanged. For Stage 2, this involved using the National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) congestion criteria to produce a shortlist of schemes. Stage 3 would involve using full NPIF criteria to produce a prioritised list of schemes for Member endorsement, as previously agreed.

Regarding the request that Officers investigate whether Air Quality could be included in the sifting criteria the feasibility had been discussed with Environmental Health colleagues in the District Councils and for the reasons set out in the report was not recommended to be included.

For the next batch of work under this programme, the report proposed to invest a further £60,000 in the development of the A10 / A142 as part of a jointly funded approach with partners and £65,000 to cover the costs of initial data collection, analysis, and scoping to assess traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements and patterns in the 'diamond' area between A141, A142, and the A10; and to collect evidence to support the analysis of traffic and HGV movements on the B1040. This would bring the total commitment to £545,000.

The report also proposed that a Member Steering Group should be set up to oversee the HGV Diamond Area work and endorse the outcome and recommendations over the way forward. Due to the size of the area, it was proposed that five County Councillors should be nominated with the ability for Members to nominate their own substitute, should they not be available for particular meetings. The Chairman and terms of reference were to be agreed at the first meeting.

Issues raised in discussion included:

- Concerns raised by several Members regarding air quality not being included in the sifting process as it was such an important issue and there was a need to ensure that new schemes did not have a negative air quality impact. Further to this there was a request for an explanation of paragraph 2.6 of the report and in particular the word 'subjective' which stated that while it might be possible "to include some qualitative assessment of a scheme from Air Quality specialists, this would be a much more subjective exercise than the sifting focussed on congestion and safety elements already included". In reply, the size of the schemes likely to come forward from the Scheme Development work were localised schemes and focussed on particular junctions and hot spots. The consensus from discussions with district officer colleagues was that the size and nature of the schemes would not be conducive to improving air quality, on an individual basis. Large, strategic schemes were more effective for tackling areas of poor air quality. Whilst it would be possible to include a criteria in the sifting process it would be very difficult to monitor any tangible benefit in a quantitative way and therefore very difficult to rule any potential scheme in or out on Air Quality grounds.
- In reply to a question querying a difference between the text and the diagram, it was confirmed that it was not the intention to sift out accident cluster sites.
- One Member queried why there was no mention of the B1049 in the report as this carried large amounts of traffic, citing the time in the rush hour it took to get out of Wilburton.
- Page 52 NPIF Scoring Criteria – why in the column reading 'Management case - early delivery' many of them were referenced to commencing in 2018-19. It was explained that this was at the time of the first sift. The second sift had not yet been carried out. Each time the sift was undertaken, the information would be updated.

In making reference to the Diamond area encompassing 11 County Councillor electoral divisions, the Chairman proposed (seconded by Councillor Harford) that the following five councillors serve as the main representatives on the proposed Group:

- Councillor Steve Criswell
- Councillor Kevin Reynolds
- Councillor Bill Hunt,
- Councillor Tim Wotherspoon
- and himself Councillor Ian Bates.

Before the meeting Councillor Batchelor had raised the possibility of one of the members being Councillor Dupre who had expressed an interest in being nominated for the group, given that she resided in one of the 'diamond villages' as well as having good links with the local parish HGV group. Councillor Dupre's nomination was also supported by Councillor Williams at the meeting as it would also ensure that there was an opposition member on the Group.

Councillor Bates explained that he had responded to Councillor Batchelor by e-mail the previous day but re-iterated at the meeting the reasons for the choice of nominations. Councillor Steve Criswell who had been chairing a group of villages regarding the A1123 for some years now and HGVs on that road went from Huntingdon right through to Councillor Bates and Councillor Hunt's divisions. Before receipt of the request from Councillor Batchelor, the Chairman had already received requests from other Members,

including Councillors Criswell, Hunt, Reynolds and Connor. In reply to a further query regarding why Councillor Wotherspoon had been nominated, this was as he was the Vice Chairman and to ensure that there was South Cambridgeshire representation to cover the diamond area which included Cottenham, Histon and Impington. Councillor Harford highlighted that there was the opportunity for other Members to put themselves forward as substitute Members.

As two members did not agree with all five places going to Conservative members of the Committee, there was a vote on the recommendations.

Following the vote, the recommendations were carried by eight votes to two and it was resolved to:

- a) approve the updated Transport Scheme Development Sifting Criteria.
- b) approve the additional £125,000 in funding allocations identified in section 2.7 of the report.
- c) appoint the following five County Councillors to the HGV Diamond Area Steering Group and agree that appointed Members may nominate their own substitutes:

Councillor Bates
Councillor Criswell
Councillor Hunt
Councillor Reynolds
Councillor Wotherspoon

237. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN 2018-2019

The Committee received the 2018-19 Outturn report for Place and Economy Services (P&E) in order to provide an opportunity to comment on the final outturn position.

The main issues highlighted were:

Revenue: At year-end, P&E was underspent by £288K at the bottom line. The Service incurred two significant pressures for Coroners Services and Waste. Several service areas managed to achieve additional income in the last part of the financial year and this allowed the service to fund some pressures within Highways Maintenance Capital from revenue rather than borrowing. The services which underspent (offsetting the Coroners, Waste and borrowing costs) were Traffic Management (-£152K), Street Lighting (-£360K), Parking Enforcement (-£519K), Libraries (-£180k), Concessionary Fares (-£582K), and Highways Development Management (-£651K).

Capital: Appendix 6 of the report detailed the in-year variances to profile of the capital schemes. The Capital Programme Variation, (the budgeted level of slippage), was £15m, while the actual level of slippage across all the schemes was £16m.

Performance: Of the seven performance indicators at year-end two were red, two amber and three green. The two red were:-

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

The two amber were:-

- % of Freedom of Information requests answered within 20 days.
- % of Complaints responded to within 10 days.

The Local Highways Improvement (LHI) Data, the tree data and the vacancy data was all within appendix A of the report.

In discussion the following issues were raised:

- Page 64 Freedom of information requests (FOIs) - with regard to the text reading "Heads of Service are working with colleagues in the information and Records Service to embed a new response process following a business support restructure in late 2018" - a question was raised on whether this involved either recruiting additional staff or new processes. The reply was that it was new processes with a change from dealing with FOI's centrally to them now being dealt with at a local level. While performance had initially dropped as a result of the change, now that the change was embedded, performance had significantly improved.
- Page 69 – In response to a query whether the underspend shown on street lighting would be channelled back into streetlighting, the reply was no, as it had been needed to help the bottom line for Place and Economy and the Council in terms of the overspend in other areas. Councillor Sanderson to be contacted outside of the meeting on any issues he had with regard to street lighting. **Action Graham Hughes / Richard Lumley**
- Page 85 - Cambridge City Work Programme – Cllr Kavanagh requested an update on progress regarding MVAS (Mobile Vehicle Activated signs) in Coleridge Road as it had been over a year since the money had been put aside. **Action: The Executive Director Graham Hughes would speak to him outside of the meeting.**
- Councillor Williams requested a briefing outside of the meeting on the latest position on Busway defects. **Action: Andy Preston to arrange.**
- Page 95 with reference to Fenland Tree Works - Councillor Hoy drew attention on the entry for "Southwell Road reading - "SN to chase Cllr Hoy. Steve e-mailed Cllr Hoy 19/10/18" - clarifying that she had responded to the officers, informing them that it was not her division but Councillor Steve Tierney's. The entry made it look like she had ignored the correspondence. The Executive Director apologised for the wrong data being shown.

Having reviewed and commented on the report it was unanimously resolved to:

note the report.

238. **ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY BODIES**

This report reviewed the Committee's agenda and training plans and appointments to outside bodies, internal advisory groups and panels. Attention was drawn to the following:

Appendix 1 Agenda Plan:

This set out the current agenda plan. As there were no reports that had been identified requiring to go to the Reserve meeting in June it was proposed to cancel it.

Appendix 2 - Training Plan is for information

The current Training Programme had been completed. Members were invited to consider whether the Committee has any further training requirements. There were no further suggestions.

Appendix 3

This Appendix provided the full list of outside bodies appointments previously agreed by the Committee, including the current representative (s). The report invited the Committee to re-appoint those listed with the following changes:

- **Huntingdonshire Growth and Infrastructure Group.** The need for a replacement for Councillor Fuller. The Chairman proposed that Councillor Gardener should be his replacement and this was accepted by the Committee without debate.
- **Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Partnership** - It was recommended that Councillor Mandy Smith should be formally endorsed to attend as an observer as she was already a Council representative on the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee and had attended in the past partnership meetings for interest purposes.
- **The list included in paragraph 2.1** was those outside organisations currently appointed to which it was proposed could be deleted from making future appointments with the reasons provided.
- With reference to the note against St Neots Master Plan Steering Group on whether it was still required now that the Master Plan had been completed, Councillor Bates orally reported that he had now spoken to Councillor Wells who confirmed there was a need for the Steering Group to continue to meet for the foreseeable future.

Appendix 4

This detailed the internal advisory groups and panels where appointments had previously been agreed by the Committee with the current representative(s) listed. It was proposed that the Committee should agree to reappoint them subject to the deletion of those groups listed in paragraph 2.2 of the report with reasons for their deletion also provided.

Having reviewed the plans and current appointments:

It was resolved unanimously:

- i) to note the agenda plan attached at Appendix 1 to the report and agree to the cancellation of the reserve date in June;
- (ii) to note the training plan attached at Appendix 2 to the report;
- (iii) to agree the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report (included as appendix 2 to these minutes) and to confirm that the following organisations / groups no longer require appointments to be made and should be deleted:
 - A47 Corridor Feasibility Study: Stakeholder Reference Group
 - Ely Southern Bypass Project Board
 - Enterprise Zone Steering Group
 - European Metal Recycling Liaison Group (Snailwell)
 - Greater Cambridge Partnership Housing Development Agency
 - Growth Delivery Joint East Cambridgeshire District Council/Cambridgeshire County Council Member Liaison Group
 - Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group
 - Ouse Washes Strategic Group
 - Woodhatch Farm Waste Recycling Site Liaison Group (Ellington)
 - WREN [Waste Recycling Environmental]
- iv) To appoint Councillor Gardener as a replacement for Councillor Fuller on the Huntingdonshire Growth and Infrastructure Group.
- (v) To agree that Councillor Mandy Smith be appointed as an observer to the Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Partnership.
- vi) Agree the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report 9 included as Appendix 3 to these Minutes) and to confirm that the following advisory groups no longer require appointments to be made and should be deleted:
 - Chesterton Station Interchange (Cambridge North).
 - Joint East Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Member and Officer Steering Group for Planning and Transport.
 - Total Transport Policy Member Steering Group.

239. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 11th JULY 2019

**Chairman:
11th July 2019**

