

Item: 3**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE****Minutes - Action Log**

This is the updated minutes action log as at 3rd July 2019 and captures the actions arising from the most recent Economy and Environment Committee meetings and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

ACTIONS FROM THE 12TH APRIL 2018 COMMITTEE

MINUTE NO.	REPORT TITLE	ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY	ACTION	COMMENTS	STATUS
105.	ELY SOUTHERN BYPASS – COST AND ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT	Rob Sanderson Democratic Services / Mairead Claydon Internal Audit	a) To inform Internal Audit of the Committee’s requirement that it should review the costs of the project and what lessons could be learnt and that their conclusions should be shared with this Committee.	The most recent update is that the report is now scheduled to go to the 29 th July 2019 meeting of Audit and Accounts Committee.	ACTION ONGOING

ACTIONS FROM 14TH MARCH COMMITTEE MEETING

	Not Spot Lists	Noelle Godfrey / Jane Sneesby	Officers to prepare a list of SFBB ‘Not Spots’ and timetable for their rectification to be circulated to county councillors and district councillors and their relevant officers.	An update from Communications was sent to all County and District Members on 22 nd May.	ACTION COMPLETED
--	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--	-------------------------

ACTIONS FROM 23RD MAY 2019 COMMITTEE MEETING

<p>234.</p>	<p>PETITION – NEWMARKET ROAD</p> <p>Petition with over 400 signatures asking that the 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”</p>	<p>Andy Preston / Juliet Richardson / Chairman</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>A response in the name of the Chairman was sent to the Petition spokesperson on 31st May 2019 and is included at Appendix 1 to this Minute Action Log</p>	<p>ACTION COMPLETED</p>
<p>235.</p>	<p>THE CAMBRIDGE CORRIDOR STUDY</p>	<p>Jeremy Smith</p>	<p>a) Report be passed to Lord Alan Hazelhurst on the West Anglia Task Force (WATF) and the appropriate Suffolk Councils</p>	<p>The County Council drew WATF/Lord Hazelhurst’s attention to the Cambridge Corridor Study on 05 June</p>	<p>COMPLETED</p>

			b) Chairman requested that officers include in their response reference to issues raised regarding the Littleport to Kings Lynn and Wisbech to March lines.	Confirmed that commentary on issues as requested by the Chairman was added to the response sent to Department for Transport and funding partners on 06 June.	COMPLETED
237.	FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN 2018-2019				
	A) Street Lighting	Graham Hughes / Richard Lumley	a) Councillor Sanderson to be contacted outside of the meeting on any issues he had with regard to street lighting.	Email sent on 04 June. There was no outcome.	COMPLETED
	B) Mobile Vehicle Activated signs) in Coleridge Road	Graham Hughes	b) 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.	Graham Hughes confirmed he has spoken with Cllr Kavanagh.	COMPLETED

	c) Bus Defects	Action: Andy Preston	c) Councillor Williams requested a briefing outside of the meeting on the latest position on Busway defects.	The briefing which was arranged was cancelled. This needs to be re-arranged.	ACTION ONGOING
--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	--	--	-----------------------

APPENDIX 1

Response to Newmarket Road Petition

Dear Al Hanagan,

Thank you for submitting your petition and views on the Newmarket Road area. As you have presented the petition the response has been sent to you rather than Mr Evans the petition organiser.

With reference to the petition and presentation 'Traffic on Newmarket Road causing severe harm' to Economy and Environment Committee on 23rd May 2019, it is recognised that this is a busy part of the Cambridge transport network, with a number of active development frontages as well as some recent change of use applications and live development proposals.

Firstly the transport functions at Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) must have regard to The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This sets out the requirements of new developments in terms of demonstrating whether or not a development could be brought forward in a sustainable way. Indeed the emphasis of the NPPF is for a *presumption in favour of sustainable development*. The NPPF is also clear that developments should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if the residual cumulative development impacts on the road network or road safety would be severe.

CCC as Highway Authority is a statutory consultee in the planning process and does not issue planning consents, with the Local Planning Authority (Cambridge City Council in the case of the Newmarket Road / Elizabeth Way area) being the ultimate decision maker on any planning application. It is the duty of the County to respond to the Local Planning Authority as to whether or not the proposals in question satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. It is the Local Planning Authority that will ultimately weigh the balance of consenting a development, or not, considering all material considerations.

CCC considers each application on its own merit, mindful of cumulative development impacts and takes a view accordingly. In line with CCC Transport Assessment Guidance we require developers to consider cumulative impacts. The responses then communicated by CCC are carefully considered and all responses are given adequate resource to ensure they are technically sound and correct.

It should be noted that a number of the recent applications have been on sites that are already allocated as land uses and planning use classes that are considered relatively high trip generators.

CCC cannot recommend an objection to any proposal without first (i) reviewing the specific transport evidence associated with development proposals on an application by application basis, and (ii) clearly identifying a severe cumulative residual impact. The scope of the transport evidence associated with any application is determined through pre-application scoping, and this can include junction assessments where appropriate – the need for junction assessments is informed by likely trip distribution and flows. CCC specifies the evidence requirement based on the proposals to ensure that cumulative development impacts can be adequately understood.

The Greater Cambridge Partnership is also consulted on applications so is mindful of the potential land use changes and the potential implications/opportunities for their schemes. If an unreasonable constraint is identified then the GCP would raise this.

Whilst we appreciate your concerns, CCC cannot issue blanket refusal recommendations within the context of national planning legislation, rather we must continue to review applications on a site by site basis, as statutory consultees, mindful of the potential impacts of development and our remit to mitigate these where the evidence demonstrates severe impact, or to recommend refusal where the proposals demonstrate severe impacts that aren't suitably mitigated.

Your presentation included local concerns about the proposed budget hotel transport evidence and drop off arrangements. Although the CCC Transport Assessment team raised a holding objection based on the evidence initially presented, the developer has subsequently provided additional information to satisfy these concerns. This has included the utilisation of the nationally recognised TRICS database. The CCC Highways Team has reviewed the proposed drop off arrangements, mindful of the potential demand and considers that there is no reasonable basis to object. These positions are reflected in our respective recommendations to the LPA, which indeed set out the recommended mitigation package.

CCC shall continue to work with the LPA to ensure planning submissions are suitably scoped reviewed and shall continue to assess sites in line with our guidance, which ensures that cumulative impacts are appropriately considered.

I hope this explanation helps in understanding the County Council role in determination of applications and the policies, legislation and decision making within which we work.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Bates

Councillor for Fenstanton, Hemingford Abbots, Houghton & Wyton, Hemingford Grey, Hilton

Chairman

Economy & Environment C'tee

Cambridgeshire County Council

Executive Board Member Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership