

## Special Highways and Transport Committee: Minutes

Date: 4 October 2024

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Venue: Red Kite Room, New Shire Hall

Present: Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, David Connor, Steve Count, Steve Criswell, Stephen Ferguson, Ros Hathorn, Anne Hay, Bill Hunt, Sebastian Kindersley, Keith Prentice, Cathie Rae, Philippa Slatter and Graham Wilson

In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, it was proposed by Councillor Bradnam, seconded by Councillor Slatter and agreed by majority, to elect Councillor Batchelor as the Chair of the meeting.

### 240. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

It was noted that in order to ensure that the Members sitting on the committee had not taken part in previous decisions relating to the matter on the agenda, some changes had been made to the committee's membership and a significant number of substitutes were in attendance. It was reported that Councillor Count had replaced Councillor French as a committee member, while Councillors Bradnam and Kindersley had replaced Councillors Gough and Whelan as substitutes respectively.

Apologies for absence were received from:

- Councillor Beckett (substituted by Councillor Batchelor);
- Councillor Bird (substituted by Councillor Rae);
- Councillor Coutts (substituted by Councillor Hathorn);
- Councillor Daunton (substituted by Councillor Wilson);
- Councillor Dupré (substituted by Councillor Slatter);
- Councillor King (substituted by Councillor Criswell);
- Councillor McDonald (substituted by Councillor Bradnam);
- Councillor Nethsingha (substituted by Councillor Kindersley);
- Councillor Sanderson (substituted by Councillor Ferguson);
- Councillor Shailer (substituted by Councillor Prentice); and
- Councillor Sharp (substituted by Councillor Connor).

There were no declarations of interest.

### 241. Petitions and Public Questions

The Committee was informed that twenty-one public questions had been accepted in relation to Agenda Item 3 (Mill Road Bridge, Cambridge, Traffic Regulation Order).

## 242. Mill Road Bridge, Cambridge, Traffic Regulation Order

The committee received a report which proposed the installation of a modal filter on the Mill Road bridge in Cambridge. The proposal would restrict traffic over the bridge by motor vehicles, except local buses, taxis, private hire vehicles, blue badge holders' registered vehicles, and other authorised vehicles, while access would be maintained for cyclists and pedestrians. A summary of the representations made in the notice period following the publication of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was attached at Appendix 3 of the report.

Daniel Fulton was invited to address the committee. Highlighting the Council's statutory duty to make reasonable adjustments to prevent disability from putting someone at a disadvantage, Mr Fulton suggested that the wording in the report differed from the wording in the proposed TRO, and expressed concern about reasonable adjustments for disability being restricted to two exempt vehicles identified by a blue badge holder, arguing that a person could have substantial disadvantage due to disability without qualifying for a blue badge. He requested that the Council amend its public facing statements to reflect that additions to the designated vehicles list for reasons related to disability would be made on a discretionary basis. It was clarified that the proposed TRO, as advertised and as detailed in Paragraph 3.5 of the report, would restrict vehicular traffic over the railway bridge, with exemptions for local buses, cyclists, pedestrians, taxis (being both hackney carriages and private hire vehicles), and authorised vehicles, which included vehicles in a disabled tax class, NHS tax-exempt vehicles, and vehicles on the Council's Permitted Vehicles List for the Mill Road bus gate, which was determined on a case by case basis at the Council's discretion, in circumstances where the Council's intention was generally to permit blue badge holders to register up to two vehicles which might be either their own vehicle or a vehicle belonging to a carer. In response to a query from a Member, it was confirmed that the TRO could not be amended from that already published without further statutory processes.

Martin Lucas-Smith was invited to address the committee. Outlining two contrasting visions for Mill Road, Mr Lucas-Smith drew attention to the high number of collisions and injuries on the road and the significant congestion that caused delays to private and public transport, arguing that various consultations and elections had demonstrated local support for the proposals. Suggesting that other bus gates around the city had benefitted nearby businesses, while various businesses had opened while a previous Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) had been implemented on Mill Road bridge, he drew attention to wider strategies promoting active travel and public transport. He also argued that data collected during the previous ETRO suggested that displacement of traffic to surrounding roads had not occurred on a significant level.

Councillor Katy Thornburrow, the Cambridge City Councillor for the Petersfield ward, was invited to address the committee. Highlighting the need to reduce traffic levels on Mill Road to improve the health and safety of local residents, Councillor Thornburrow nonetheless questioned whether the proposals would achieve their desired outcomes and expressed concern about the potential impacts on local businesses and the flow of traffic around the city. Emphasising how the proposals had divided the local community and arguing that further engagement and data was required before a decision could be made, she drew attention to alternative proposals to improve the public realm in the

area. She suggested that implementation of any modal filter should be delayed until baseline data had been collated and published, and requested that the Council run an open, transparent and budgeted process about wider improvements to the local realm. She also requested that if the proposals were approved, a review of their impact be carried out after six months, with a look to amend the TRO if the review recommended such action. It was confirmed that monitoring would take place if the proposals were implemented, with the resulting data being published alongside baseline data, and that the proposals would create opportunities for wider improvements to the public realm. While it was acknowledged that subsequent changes could be made to the scheme, it was emphasised that such changes might be subject to further statutory processes and consultation.

Andy Kennedy was invited to address the committee on behalf of Mill Road 4 People. Highlighting that improving Mill Road had been an objective for local residents for over fifty years and continued to draw majority support in the area, Mr Kennedy argued that the road had not originally been designed to carry such high levels of traffic and drew attention to the narrow pavements and carriageways that contributed to it being the street with the most road traffic collisions in the city. He suggested that benefits of a modal filter would include making Mill Road more attractive to visitors, strengthening the sense of community, improving the reliability of public transport, and increasing public health as a result of more active travel. He drew attention to evidence that traffic had increased on Mill Road without a corresponding drop in traffic levels on boundary roads when the previous ETRO was removed, which he suggested was a demonstration that the modal filter reduced vehicle journeys rather than displaced them.

Matthew Winter-Holt was invited to address the committee. Noting that he had previously opposed restrictions on Mill Road Bridge, Mr Winter-Holt informed Members that the experience of a calmer, safer and cleaner environment during the period of the previous ETRO had changed his opinion and he confirmed that he now supported the proposals. Suggesting that the ETRO brought more life to the roads and surrounding area while also encouraging active travel, he acknowledged that the modal filter would inconvenience him sometimes, but he argued that the wider benefits for the community outweighed such concerns. He also welcomed that people with disabilities who required access would still be able to use the bridge as a result of the exemptions included in the proposals.

Janet Fox was invited to address the committee on behalf of herself and Andrew Smith. As the owners of businesses on Mill Road with most of their customers being people who walked or cycled past, Ms Fox emphasised their support for any measures that would reduce traffic noise and pollution, improve access for active travel and make the area a place that people would want to visit and spend time in, particularly given the ongoing development of large retail sites elsewhere in the city. She argued that restricting the traffic flow across Mill Road bridge was the best way to begin the process of achieving such goals.

Anna Williams was invited to address the committee on behalf of Camcycle. Highlighting the cycling campaign organisation's longstanding support for improvements to Mill Road, Ms Williams drew attention to the potential benefits of the proposals and the widespread local support for a people-orientated street with lower volumes of traffic. Noting the number of injuries and collisions that had occurred since the previous ETRO

was removed in 2021, as well as the impact of poor air quality and particulate pollution, particularly for older and younger people and those with heart and lung conditions, she argued that active travel would improve and increase along Mill Road if a modal filter was installed, while public transport would also become more reliable. Suggesting that greater consideration should be given to the high number of local residents that did not have a car, rather than to people using the road as a through route, she argued that the policies of the Council and other local organisations supported such measures to improve active transport, public health and the wider climate.

Tina Riches was invited to address the committee. Informing Members that she had asthma and that her symptoms worsened significantly whenever she was on or around Mill Road, Mrs Riches drew attention to the pollution caused by idle cars in traffic jams on the narrow road, which exacerbated the suffering of people with asthma and other medical conditions. Drawing attention to the benefits of the previous ETRO that was in place, including for active travel, the natural environment and people's health, she argued that such improvements also supported local businesses by making them more attractive to visit, and suggested that people often needed to be pushed to make behavioural changes such as how they travelled.

Charlotte de Blois was invited to address the committee. Drawing attention to the increasing issues faced by people with disabilities due to the city's continuous growth and resulting increase in traffic, Ms De Blois emphasised the residential nature of Mill Road and expressed concern about the number of vehicles that used it as a through route. Noting that the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 recommended a minimum walkway width of 1.5 metres, while the Department for Transport (DfT) recommended a minimum width of 2 metres, she drew attention to the narrow pavements on Mill Road, which were less than 1 metre in many places, that she argued were unusable for people using some mobility aids. It was emphasised that while the report referenced potential future improvements to the public realm, such as wider pavements, such improvements were not part of the proposed TRO and therefore should not have an impact on the committee's decision.

Elisabeth Whitebread was invited to address the committee on behalf of Cambridgeshire Families for Sustainable Travel. Expressing concern about the level of traffic and poor air quality on Mill Road, Ms Whitebread drew attention to their negative impacts on active travel, public transport and the natural environment. Stating her support for the proposals, she related some statements from local children to the committee, which emphasised the fear that they experienced due to safety concerns.

Elisabeth Whitebread was also invited to address the committee on behalf of Stephen Large. Highlighting the increasing challenges travelling down Mill Road as a cyclist, on a scooter, by car, bus or truck or as a pedestrian, which were exacerbated by recent and planned developments in the area, Mr Large noted that it was the road with most traffic collisions in the city. Drawing attention to studies and guidance on the impact of air pollution on health, he noted that nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter levels in Cambridge had all been measured above recommended levels. Mr Large acknowledged the proposals' potential impacts on local businesses and the wider traffic flow but argued that such considerations were outweighed by the number of accidents and deteriorating air quality.

Councillor Elliot Tong, the Cambridge City Councillor for the Abbey ward, was invited to address the committee. Highlighting longstanding local support for measures that encouraged active travel, which had been reinforced during the consultations on the proposed TRO, Councillor Tong suggested there was a democratic mandate to implement such measures. He acknowledged there were concerns about aspects of the proposals but argued that they would benefit the local community and businesses in the long term.

Thomas Preud'homme was invited to address the committee. Suggesting that Mill Road was one of the most accident prone roads in the country, Mr Preud'homme expressed concern over the safety of cycling on the road with his son due to the high level of traffic and lack of space for cyclist segregation. Indicating his support for the proposals, he argued that local businesses had thrived in the vicinity of modal filters that had been installed elsewhere in the city.

Sarah Hughes was invited to address the committee on behalf of Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance. Highlighting the potential local benefits of the proposed bus gate on the Mill Road bridge, including faster, more reliable and more frequent bus services, as well as safer and more pleasant access along pavements, Ms Hughes emphasised the wider benefits for the city resulting from increased bus travel and fewer private vehicles. While acknowledging the important role of bus gates in improving bus reliability, she queried how the Council would support and encourage bus passengers on a wider level across the Cambridge area.

Councillor Mark Ashton, the Cambridge City Councillor for the Cherry Hinton ward, was invited to address the committee. Highlighting the importance of Mill Road as an arterial road used by many Cambridge residents beyond its surrounding area, particularly as an access point to the eastern side of the city, Councillor Ashton expressed concern that displacement of traffic could exacerbate traffic issues and resultant air pollution on other roads, such as Coldhams Lane and Hills Road. He argued that alternative side roads were unsuited to large vehicles and that congestion would be worsened by the installation of a modal filter, drawing attention to alternative proposals, such as traffic lights on Mill Road bridge. He questioned the validity of data collated while the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic were significantly affecting travel behaviour and suggested further data on air quality was required. It was clarified that Mill Road was an unclassified road, and that although it linked the ring road with the city centre it was not part of the full radial route. It was also noted that the previous ETRO had not led to discernible air quality impacts, and that if the TRO was approved, the Council would work with Cambridge City Council and Connecting Cambridgeshire to ensure air quality sensors were in place to collect data on nitrogen dioxide, carbon dioxide and fine particles, as set out in the report.

Neil Mackay was invited to address the committee. Expressing concerns about the TRO consultation form, including when it became publicly available and how it was laid out, Mr Mackay suggested that the organisation whose system was used for the consultation was inappropriate, and he sought clarification on why it was chosen, how much it had been paid, and whether the full data set from which results had been extracted would be published. Drawing attention to a letter from the DfT to the Chief Executive of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), which referenced the reinstatement of a bus gate on Mill Road in connection with the receipt

of grant funding for bus improvements, he sought clarity on why the CPCA was deemed to have such authority and whether the grant funding would be repaid to the government if the bus gate was not reinstated. In response to questions from Members, Mr Mackay clarified that he owned a business in Cambridge that had been in existence since 1912 and which employed twenty people. He informed Members that he was relocating his business to a new site outside Cambridge, although he acknowledged that this was due to wider concerns than the proposed TRO on Mill Road bridge. It was clarified that the Council set the consultation's questions and that the consultation portal did not provide any analysis of the responses that had been received. It was also clarified that the County Council, as the highways authority, was responsible for deciding whether to implement the TRO, rather than the CPCA, and it was confirmed that there had been no commitment from the Council to the DfT, or to the CPCA, regarding any funding being linked to the decision.

William Bannell was invited to address the committee. Expressing concern about the tight time schedule in which the TRO process had been carried out and questioning the origins of policies driving active travel strategies, Mr Bannell observed that any information that was not currently in the public domain would be required to be published if requested as part of legal proceedings. Challenging some of the statements in the report, Mr Bannell suggested there had been procedural irregularities in the Council's TRO process and that it had not been transparent, noting that the committee had not been presented with a petition that had been submitted which opposed the proposed TRO. Drawing attention to the Magill test, he asked Members whether they thought a fair-minded, honest, impartial observer, considering all the facts, would say there was a chance of predetermination or bias in the committee's decision. It was clarified that the decision to undertake the consultation on the TRO had been made by officers under existing delegated authority, and it was reiterated that the large number of substitutes attending the meeting was to make it clear that the decision would be taken by Councillors who had not been party to the previous decision. It was confirmed that all standard procedures had been carried out with respect to the proposed TRO, and that all the information presented to the committee had come from the results of the statutory process. Members were informed that petitions relating to TROs were dealt with separately from the Council's petition scheme, to ensure they were treated the same as any other objection or support expressed in the TRO process. The petition was nonetheless published on the Council's website and it was confirmed that the petitioner would receive a response from officers following the meeting. Members were also informed that the first sentence of the officer response to the economic impact of the proposals on businesses on Page 34 of the agenda pack should be disregarded, as it mistakenly stated that a 2019 survey had been carried out during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Matt Day was invited to address the committee. Noting that traffic restrictions on the bus gate would be enforced by Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras, Mr Day argued that such systems were limited and could be easily exploited. Drawing attention to information he had been provided in response to a Freedom of Information request, he informed Members that no two-wheeled vehicles or off-duty taxis had been fined for passing through the Emmanuel Street bus gate in Cambridge, despite being prohibited from doing so. He suggested that the Council should therefore exempt two-wheeled vehicles and off-duty taxis from the restrictions on Mill Road bridge, and include appropriately clear signage, rather than tolerating non-compliance. Arguing that

law-abiding motorcyclists were not a greater cause of congestion than cargo bikes, while electric motorcycles were no more pollutive than electric bicycles, Mr Day suggested they should be exempt from bus gates across the city. However, Members were informed that motorcycles were still traffic and contributed to issues in the area, which was why no exemptions had been included in the proposed TRO, in line with other bus gates in the city, and it was noted that advice from Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London (PATROL) suggested that bus gates should be consistent to assist motorists' understanding.

Margaret Collins was invited to address the committee. Informing Members that she lived on one side of Mill Road bridge while her disabled son who required 24/7 care lived in supported living on the other side of the bridge, Miss Collins emphasised how challenging and time-consuming it was to be a family carer. Highlighting previous issues she had experienced with carers being incorrectly fined, she expressed concern about the additional problems she and other people in similar situations could face due to only being allowed two vehicles to be registered to support her son, noting that the system would not support quick change over of care staff due to the registering process taking up to three working days. Highlighting problems with obtaining and renewing blue badges, with many people not qualifying for a badge despite having disabilities, Miss Collins questioned whether the Council would have the resources to consider exemption requests on a case by case basis.

Shapour Meftah was invited to address the committee on behalf of Mill Road Traders Association. Noting that he owned a business next to Mill Road bridge, Mr Meftah informed Members that a recent survey he carried out of 90 local traders representing over 200 employees had resulted in 85 responses opposing the proposed TRO because of the potential impact on their businesses, with some of them suggesting they would relocate if the modal filter was implemented. Arguing that restricting traffic across Mill Road bridge would not itself improve the local environment, he suggested there was insufficient data to support the measures and that bicycles were responsible for a large proportion of accidents on Mill Road, while he also questioned whether there was an electoral mandate to implement the proposals. In response to Members' questions, Mr Meftah confirmed that not all of the respondents to the survey he had carried out were members of Mill Road Traders Association, of which there were 45 paying members. He also clarified that the majority of his business's customers came from beyond the surrounding area, and that they needed a car to visit his business in order to transport equipment. It was acknowledged that they would still be able to visit by car if the modal filter was implemented.

It was noted that a further request to speak had been received but that the member of public had not joined the meeting.

Councillor Richard Howitt, the local Member for the Petersfield division, was invited to address the committee. Drawing attention to the extensive public engagement, including workshops and questionnaires, that had formed part of the consultation on the TRO, Councillor Howitt acknowledged that the community had been divided by the issue, although he observed that the data in the report indicated that a majority of the local community supported the implementation of a modal filter, and he also expressed his support for the proposals. Emphasising the importance of additional measures to improve the public realm beyond the proposed bus gate, he expressed concern about

the financial cost of the previous TRO and subsequent legal process, suggesting that there should be an investigation into what went wrong, to provide transparency and accountability. Councillor Howitt also drew attention to a representation that had been submitted from a resident in his division who had carried out nitrogen oxide tests on Tenison Road, and it was confirmed to Members that the response that had been submitted was valid and had been considered alongside other information that the Council held. Members were also informed that the Council reviewed all its decisions as part of an open and transparent approach to learning from past experience, and it was clarified that although the Council was exploring opportunities and funding for potential further improvements to the public realm, they were not related to the proposed TRO on Mill Road bridge.

Councillor Neil Shailer, the local Member for the Romsey division, was invited to address the committee. Highlighting the multiple uses of Mill Road and the fact that the local community had argued for many years that it was unsuitable as a through route due to its narrow width, Councillor Shailer emphasised the Council's commitment to supporting similar objectives of communities across the county, such as through the work of the March Area Transport Study.

While discussing the report, individual Members:

- Paid tribute to members of the public for their extensive participation in the consultations and the meeting, noting the wide variety of comments that had been contributed. It was acknowledged that Mill Road was used for multiple different reasons by both the local community and those who travelled along it, and Members highlighted the importance of legal processes that allowed people to challenge decisions made by the Council.
- Emphasised that there were a wide range of disabilities and illnesses that could limit a person's mobility and require them to use a car for transport, and welcomed the fact that the TRO acknowledged and accommodated such needs, as did the majority of people that supported the proposals. Notwithstanding, Members were keen to ensure that the engagement process had not identified large cohorts of people that should additionally be considered for exemptions, and it was noted that the Equality Impact Assessment, attached at Appendix 4 to the report, provided clarity on such matters.
- Sought clarification on how people could register their vehicles on the permitted vehicles list. Members were informed that an online system that had been set up for the previous TRO would be reestablished, with registered vehicles being exempt from fines otherwise issued by the modal filter's ANPR monitoring system. The Council would publicise the system widely and would engage with disability groups and individuals to ensure there was understanding on how the scheme and registration process worked. The Council would also provide advice and guidance for applying for a blue badge, although it was emphasised that this was a separate process to registering for the permitted vehicles list.
- Suggested that the discretion used when considering applications for the permitted vehicles list should take into account the Council's wider health policies, without restricting it strictly to the blue badge criteria. It was clarified that the proposed



reasonable adjustments set out in the TRO, the report, and the Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 4 of the report, included exemptions for vehicles registered by blue badge holders and other authorised vehicles. While it was not the Council's intention to unduly penalise people who needed to travel, it was emphasised that a balance had to be found to ensure there were not so many exemptions as to undermine the TRO's objectives and benefits.

- Argued that using Mill Road as a through route was not a parking issue and therefore questioned whether the blue badge system, which was specifically designed for parking management, was the most appropriate means to identify exemptions. Members were informed that the blue badge system had been chosen because it was a clear and well understood scheme which had already identified people that were likely to qualify for reasonable adjustments.
- Queried whether vehicles registered by blue badge holders would still be exempt when the blue badge holder was not in the vehicle, including when a carer whose vehicle was registered by a service user was travelling to provide care. It was clarified that the ANPR monitoring system would issue fines based on the permitted vehicles list, rather than on the display of a blue badge in a vehicle, which meant that as long as a vehicle was registered on the list, it would always be exempt, regardless of whether there was a blue badge holder in the vehicle or not. Some Members expressed concern about such an approach, which could effectively be perceived as condoning non-compliance, although it was emphasised that compliance related to registration on the permitted vehicles list, rather than the correct use of a blue badge.
- Confirmed that while blue badge holders could register up to two vehicles on the permitted list, organisations such as care homes, social service providers and community transport schemes could also apply themselves, and it was suggested that the Council should generally adopt a trusting and flexible approach when considering such applications. It was acknowledged that Council policy stated that it was unlikely that taxi or private hire operators and community transport operators would be eligible for an organisational blue badge as they were not usually concerned with the care of disabled people who would meet one or more of the eligibility criteria for a badge, but it was reiterated that the proposal included discretion for the Council to consider applications on a case by case basis. It was also noted that vehicles with more than nine seats, such as minibuses, were classified as buses and were therefore already exempt.
- Confirmed that ambulances and other emergency vehicles would continue to be able to cross Mill Road bridge, although it was clarified that a private vehicle transporting a passenger to hospital in an emergency situation was not classified as an ambulance and therefore would not be exempt by default. One Member suggested that motorcycles could also receive exemptions on the proposed Mill Road bus gate, along with the other bus gates within Cambridge.
- Expressed concern that the care sector would be disproportionately affected by the proposed modal filter, particularly given the regular need to change at short notice the carer that provided a service or the vehicle they used to reach a service user. While such difficulties were acknowledged, it was emphasised that the proposed

gate would not completely isolate anyone and that all residents' properties would continue to be accessible by cars, albeit via a potentially slightly longer route. Nonetheless, Members were informed that the Council maintained the right to exercise discretion in such situations, and that it would seek to support care agencies by avoiding their cars being registered multiple times by different service users. Reassurance was also provided that if the modal filter was installed, this particular issue would be reviewed once applications had started to be made, the system had begun to operate and the impact on the care sector could be identified through engagement with agencies, in order to assess whether the registration criteria needed to be amended.

- Requested a review of the scheme, if it was implemented, to be presented to the committee after two years, to include traffic level and air quality data, as well information on the impacts to local businesses and any other issues raised by members of the public and the local community. **Action required**
- Queried whether any monitoring carried out after the potential installation of the modal filter would include traffic levels on boundary roads, and whether it would be compared to baseline data. It was confirmed that such monitoring would be carried out and attention was drawn to paragraph 3.34 of the report, which identified the specific streets where such monitoring would be conducted. Members were also informed that the data would be analysed as it emerged, which could lead to future changes to the TRO or other measures, such as additional traffic calming or signage.
- Noted that the Equality Impact Assessment stated that nitrogen dioxide levels were well below objective levels, arguing that they would reduce even further as a result of the increasing number of electric vehicles, and expressed concern that the scheme's objective to reduce air quality was therefore unnecessary and too focused on the short term. One Member suggested that particulate pollution increased exponentially according to a vehicle's size and weight, which meant that an electric bus was of the most pollutant in this regard, although this was challenged by another Member. It was argued that traffic reduction measures such as the proposed modal filter also led to reductions in traffic levels on surrounding and boundary roads, resulting in a reduction of nitrogen dioxide and particulate emissions.
- Expressed concern that the report contained a limited amount of data on air pollution, traffic levels and traffic flow, suggesting that such proposals should be supported by substantial empirical evidence. One Member noted that a solicitor had claimed the TRO could potentially be challenged because of such a lack of data, and it was requested that Members be provided with any data that had been provided in the response to the solicitor. It was confirmed that all the relevant information had been included in the report, but it was agreed to provide Members with the requested information. **Action required**
- Agreed that a reduction in congestion would generally lead to more reliable bus services and a quieter and calmer environment for local residents, although one Member expressed concern that the proposed modal filter would restrict the freedom of movement for many people, including those travelling to Cambridge

Central Mosque on Mill Road and would merely displace congestion to other parts of the city. It was also observed that congestion issues were mainly restricted to peak hours, and it was suggested that greater consideration should have been given to a bus gate that only operated during peak hours, or even a tidal flow system along the Mill Road. One Member argued that Mill Road bridge was originally built to ease the traffic flow around Cambridge and for vehicles travelling in from outside the city, rather than to serve the local community.

- Drew attention to the widespread support for additional improvements to the public realm on Mill Road and the surrounding area, and suggested that the committee could consider such proposals in the future, although it was acknowledged that such potential measures were unrelated to the TRO. Notwithstanding, one Member drew attention to the narrow width of the pavements and carriageway on Mill Road and argued that there was insufficient space for measures such as the introduction of cycle lanes or widening of pavements.
- Clarified that financial information related to the proposed TRO was set out in Paragraph 6.1 of the report.
- Noted that a petition relating to a TRO had been presented at the meeting of the committee on 1 October 2024, and queried why two petitions relating to the proposed modal filter on Mill Road bridge, containing 1652 signatures and 1006 signatures, had not been presented to the committee. It was clarified that the petition presented on 1 October 2024 related to a TRO that had already been determined and implemented, with the statutory process having been completed, whereas the petitions that had been submitted relating to the Mill Road bridge related to an undetermined and unimplemented TRO that was still going through its statutory process.
- Clarified that the report recommendations were moved by officers, rather than Members. It was also noted that proposed amendments needed to be submitted to Democratic Services in advance of the meeting, and it was confirmed that no proposed amendments had been submitted.

It was requested and agreed to take a recorded vote.

It was resolved to:

- a) Determine the formal objections;
- b) For the reasons set out in the Statement of Reasons and in this report, approve the proposed modal filter on Mill Road bridge, as advertised; and
- c) Authorise officers to inform the objectors accordingly, as well as those that made representations.

[Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Stephen Ferguson, Ros Hathorn, Sebastian Kindersley, Keith Prentice, Cathie Rae, Philippa Slatter and Graham Wilson in favour; Councillors David Connor, Steve Count, Steve Criswell, Anne Hay and Bill Hunt against]

Chair  
3 December 2024