

ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 19th September 2019

Time: 10.00 a.m. to 11.35 a.m.

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

Apologies: Councillors: D Ambrose Smith, N Kavanagh and T Sanderson

260. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Non-disclosable declarations of interest were received in respect of item 6 Bourn Airport Supplementary Planning document from:

- Councillor Williams as a Councillor and Cabinet member on South Cambridgeshire District Council and Greater Cambridge Partnership Assembly
- Councillor Batchelor a member on South Cambridgeshire District Council and a substitute on their planning committee.

261. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th August 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

262. MINUTE ACTION LOG

The Minutes Action Log was noted.

263. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions or petitions were received by the deadline.

264. COMBINED AUTHORITY CONSULTATION ON NEW LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) now has taken over the statutory responsibility to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP) covering the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area detailing the vision, goals and objectives (which would define the strategic approach up to 2050) as well as the policies designed to deliver the objectives. A new draft LTP produced had been the subject of consultation between 17 June and 27 September 2019 and the report sought comments on and approval to the County Council's proposed response attached to the report.

The consultation set out the plans and strategies for maintaining and improving all aspects of the local transport system. This included a programme of transport schemes to deliver the plans objectives. The draft Vision, aims and objectives contained within

the LTP were generally supported, with some good alignment to key economic evidence base documents. Officers however highlighted the following areas where improvements could be made:

- The Vision could be strengthened by adding the Government's Net Zero carbon emissions target of 2050 and the Government's Clean Growth Strategy into the objective on 'sustainable growth'.
- Within the Plan there was frequently a lack of detail beneath the strategic level. For the LTPs' objectives to be fully achieved, future reviews of the LTP would need to be flexible to reflect changing transport needs, build on the policies contained within the Plan. These reviews would need to integrate more fully with planned growth to deliver innovative transport schemes, whilst reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2050.
- The LTP contained a number of major scheme priorities. It was important to reflect on the identified priorities in the context of recent Climate Change Emergencies declared by Cambridgeshire County Council and other Local Authorities. On road building it was vitally important that multimodal approaches to solving identified capacity issues on key routes were better reflected in the LTP.
- As Transport was the largest contributor to carbon emissions in Cambridgeshire, major road building proposals needed to be considered as part of an integrated strategy that managed demand, reduced carbon emissions and avoided feeding additional traffic into urban areas.
- There were a number of areas throughout the LTP where the role and importance of cycling and walking as a mode could be strengthened, especially with the opportunity of electric bikes.
- Whilst the LTP set out the high level strategy for the CPCA region, and there was a stated intention to develop a Transport Delivery Plan in order to help with delivery of the schemes identified, it did not cover more detailed strategy and operational documents that fell under the umbrella of the LTP as detailed in paragraph 2.10. Clarity was needed on how the CPCA would address this, as there was currently a gap in governance as set out in paragraph 2.11.

More certainty was required on delivery timescales and targets throughout the LTP, including for Climate Change and emission reductions, including targets in line with National and Local Policy.

- The Plan should include a defined plan to achieve the carbon targets.
- Detail on how transport emissions targets would be met, and how the major interventions planned would contribute (positively or negatively) to the meeting of emissions targets and objectives.

The officer response supported the following:

- the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM), the major capacity improvements to the A10, A47 and A428, and the programme of schemes being developed and delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- The strong focus in the Plan on rail and rail capacity increases, in line with CCC priorities and the Cambridgeshire Capacity Study as detailed in paragraph 2.7.
- The positive objectives and policies on walking and cycling and the aim to improve these as modes across the region.

The report's proposed response was very much welcomed. Questions / issues raised and responses provided included:

- A need to strengthen the response for more detail on targets / milestones, including those to encourage modal shift. Officers explained that they were currently awaiting the Transport Delivery Plan which was not included as part of the current consultation document, as this would provide the greater level of detail, with the 'child' documents vital for taking forward the strategic objectives. Until officers saw those, they could not comment further.
- Suggesting there was far too much emphasis in the Plan on investing and expanding road capacity without addressing how it would achieve the zero carbon objective by 2050. This should include the more efficient use of existing infrastructure and public transport. Another Member referenced a study by Cambridge University students highlighting the need to achieve a target in Cambridge of 60% of journeys being undertaken, by public transport which would require a significant shift away from car usage. From the current draft Plan, there was no sense that the Combined Authority recognised the urgency around climate change.
- One Member took a counter view that the response was fine as it was currently drafted and did not require strengthening. From his Fenland perspective he wished to encourage more cars and free parking in Fenland towns to help encourage more people to visit. He suggested this reflected a divide between the two ends of the County.
- More detail on the Girton Interchange, A428 and connectivity of the M11.
- One Member commented that there did not appear to be any change from the document produced in 2013 with the Plan not offering solutions to congestion and the key problems of cars coming into and out of Cambridge and the market towns. It was suggested more "sticks" / preventative measures were required to get people out of their cars and onto more sustainable forms of transport. The Member suggested that this should be through eliminating all free parking and increasing residential / controlled parking zones in urban areas.
- The work proposed to be undertaken needed to be aligned with that being undertaken by other bodies.
- The need to identify who would be responsible for looking after the projects once

built, with concern expressed by one Member, of the County Council's ability to carry out maintenance out on a day to day basis along with all its other commitments.

- There was no reference made to the A1307, especially since the Combined Authority had pledged involvement to the proposed Haverhill Business Park.
- Reference was made to the excellent Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy which had been a guiding document for the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the hope that there would be a successor to the document. The need also to update Huntingdonshire, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland area plans.
- Reference was made to the inadequacy of the on-line consultation questionnaire which limited participation to expressing views on only 10 objectives considering how much variation there was across the County.
- A number of misspellings were highlighted including a source name that should be rectified in the final version.
- There was very little reference to harnessing the use of technology considering the duration of the Plan.

Having commented on the proposed draft response:

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the County Council's proposed response to the consultation on the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan.
- b) Include the Committee's comments as part of the final response.

265. BOURN AIRFIELD SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (CONSULTATION DRAFT JUNE 2019)

This report provided details of the response already sent in respect of to the South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) draft Bourn Airfield New Village Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that had been the subject of public consultation from 17th June to 29th July 2019.

Officers were satisfied that the consultation document reflected the key policy implications, with County Council officers having worked closely with their counterparts in the District. The report sought retrospective Committee endorsement of the officer response which had already been sent, in order to meet the deadline.

The Council was generally in support of the proposals in the SPD with Appendix 1 to the report containing the full response with the key issues set out in the cover report under the headings:

- Transport assessment

- Education
- County Planning Mineral and waste
- Historic environment Local Lead Flood Authority
- Public Health.

In the officer introduction the following key issues were highlighted.

On the transport assessment:

- The Council's preferred route option for High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) was the corridor along the north of the site near the A428 as this would offer fast and reliable services. The route as shown on the draft SPD met the needs of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) with a requirement that land must be safeguarded in the SPD and that the planning application should allow for future development of HQPT.
- Supporting in the SPD the site would be served by two accesses, one at the east off Highfields Road and one to the West of the Broadway. The Broadway access would be a right turn out and a left turn in only to prevent rat running. Other accesses off the Broadway would continue to serve existing employment sites and at no point would these be opened up as general accesses.

In respect of education provision:

- the proposals for two primary schools (up to seven forms of entry) and a secondary school (six forms of entry), met the County Council's requirements and was therefore supported. Whilst the Council supported integration between schools and communities they served, for example shared use of sports facilities, this was conditional on access agreements with the school operator. As there had been noise and air quality issues previously regarding the location of the primary and secondary schools, there had been a review of the environment statement.
- South Cambridgeshire officers advised that the environmental statement did not raise air quality issues in respect of the school locations, although as a precaution were recommending conditions requiring noise monitoring prior to commencement of the development in respect to noise, the County Council response sought to ensure adequate mitigation along the northern boundary of the site provided.

The Council was supportive of the Sustainable Drainage methods that had been proposed.

On Public Health, the SPD had been reviewed against themes set out in the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire to identify where potential impacts on health could be addressed through SPD policies. The six Strategic Objectives were supported, particularly the inclusion of a strategic objective on "Healthy, Active and Resilient" as detailed.

Following the officer introduction, Councillor Des O'Brien representing Bourn Parish Council who had applied to speak was invited to make his submission which has been included at appendix 1 to the minutes.

In response to the Chairman asking if any Committee Members had questions of clarification, the following issues were raised:

- Querying the disparity between local surveys and the figures presented in the Bourn Transport Assessment the Member asking this highlighted that as Cambourne was not linked to a high quality transport link it appeared that the Councillor was suggesting that no one would be using this latter feature from the Bourn airfield site. In reply Councillor O'Brien was requesting a clear indication of target numbers as Bourn Parish Council believed that if the developer was estimating only 960 would leave the Bourn Airfield development, a 1000 people would need to get onto the public transport system and he was asking how this was to be achieved, as there was currently no evidence to support this. If 2,200 people were travelling out of Bourn Airfield each day and 900 were using cars, this would mean 1200 would need to use the bus services.
- Another Councillor challenged the assertion that there had been no public debate about access to the A428 highlighting that the Committee at its February Committee meeting had discussed the issue and at that time there had been considerable support for a separate access to the A428. In reply Councillor O'Brien stated that public debate in a committee meeting was not the same as undertaking appropriate consultation on the option for direct access to the A428, of which there had been none. This was the reason he was requesting that a proper consultation exercise was undertaken.

Councillor Howell the local member for Bourne had been unable to attend but had provided a written statement on the morning of the Committee that had been circulated to members and was read out at the meeting. This is included at Appendix 2 to these minutes,

In reply to the issues raised by the Parish Councillor regarding how many trips were expected to be generated from the new site, the planning application was still live and while officers could look at local data from the parish council, their responsibility was to review the local developer surveys carried out by an independent traffic surveyor, which was an acceptable and industry standard approach. In terms of a successful modal switch away from cars to other forms of sustainable transport, it was confirmed this required the High Quality Public Transport solution.

Regarding the link to the A428, various options had been looked at by officers. It was Highways England who were responsible for the A428 saying that it would not be desirable on either policy or engineering terms, due to the physical, operational and safety constraints and its unacceptably high costs. There was no easy fit location for such a link, with Highways England stating that such a link would compromise their wider road network.

In debate, issues raised included:

- A Member of the Committee who was on South Cambridgeshire District Council highlighted that a separate access was not included in the current South Cambridgeshire Local Plan as no one had originally asked for it and the SPD had to conform to the Local Plan. He made the point that the Parish councillor had been a district Councillor at the time consultation was undertaken on the original Local Plan and it was not now appropriate to consult on something that was contrary to the Local Plan.
- Another Member, while sympathetic to the views of local people, highlighted that the issue was not a decision in the gift of the County Council or the District Council but with Highways England, as the A428 was their road.
- The point was made that it was not appropriate to second guess the planning application which was currently going through the process and therefore the officer proposals should be supported as set out.
- Another Member asked whether there were any plans to attract industry / employment in the Bourn area and as she had not seen any reference in the document, was making the assumption that the development was for commuters.
- One Member still had concerns regarding the location of the schools, especially the primary school being so near the A428 as there was a proven link to pollution and health problems in younger children. With reference to the siting of a bank on one side of the school she did not see that this would help in terms of the air pollution issue. She also made the point that children did not remain in the classrooms for the whole day. Her view was that both schools should be moved further away from the A428 and stated that the response in this area needed to be a far stronger citing the text in paragraph 3.9. of the cover report which spoke of assurances needing to be sought. The Chairman also expressed his and other Members continued concerns regarding the current schools location stating that the issues highlighted, needed to be fully understood before the development saw further progression.
- There was discussion linked to the above regarding natural ventilation and whether windows would be able to be opened due to the air quality issues. In response the officers highlighted that the issue of noise and air pollution needed to be separated as their cause might be from the same source, but their effects were different. On noise this was more an issue for the secondary school as it was nearer to the road. Currently as sited the secondary school outdoor area and some indoor areas would be beyond acceptable noise levels. The only way to mitigate this would be with a sealed building with mechanical ventilation (Air conditioning). County Council Officers would be proposing that the design and positioning of the school should be such as to allow natural ventilation and not increase noise levels. On air quality, as stated in the report, on the assessments they had carried out, South Cambridgeshire Environmental Officers had no substantial concerns to object to the school site or the planning application.

Having considered the officer's response,

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the County Council's response to the consultation draft SPD as set out in section 3 of the report; and
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director, Place and Economy in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

266. GREATER CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN INCEPTION AND JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP

This report informed Members regarding the inception of a new Joint Greater Cambridge Local Plan by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Also included were terms of reference for a proposed new joint Local Planning Advisory Group. The Group would help facilitate a shared policy position, co-ordinate /integrate the new Plan with existing transport policy, and provide a forum for discussion of other key planning policy documents within the Greater Cambridge area.

The terms of reference proposed three Members from both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council while the County Council as a signatory stakeholder, was being asked to nominate one Member.

In discussion the Vice Chairman expressed his disappointment that the County Council was only being asked to nominate one representative. The proposed new Group which had no decision making powers was one which had existed in earlier forms for many years with the County Council always previously having the same number of councillors as both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the report.
- b) Appoint Councillor Wotherspoon to sit on the Local Plan Advisory Group and for Councillor Lynda Harford to be the nominated substitute.

267. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REGIONAL AND LOCAL CONSULTATIONS

This report was presented to make the Committee aware of two recent Environment Agency consultations and their links to the County Council's work. The Chairman considered that it was useful for the Committee to see the detail of the responses as a large area in the North of the County was below sea level.

- 1) **The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy Consultation on a new draft National Strategy** – regarding this the Council had submitted a response by the deadline of 4th July in consultation with the Chairman and the County Council Members on the Anglian Central RFCC (Councillor Tim Wotherspoon and Councillor Mandy Smith). This new draft National Strategy which set a vision to 2100 was in line with the Climate Emergency declared by Parliament and the County Council, with its ambitions being set out in the following three themes:

- a) Climate resilient places,
- b) Growth and infrastructure and
- c) A nation of climate champions

2) National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy Consultation

This sixty four page strategic document set out objectives for the future management of flood risk to which the Council, as a Lead Local Flood Authority, was required to have due regard to in all its work. The Consultation set out thirty four questions on specific objectives and measures.

The Council in its response supported the aims of the strategy, recognising that significant increases in resources, improved cross-government working, national policy changes and much greater community engagement and awareness would all be needed to make the country resilient to flooding and climate change. The report highlighted the key issues that could affect Cambridgeshire and/or the council. The consultation also proposed changes to the constitution and the name of the Anglian Central Regional Flood and Coastal Committee which would make the number of Members more aligned to levy paid by each council. This option, which was supported, would see the number of Cambridgeshire members increase from two to three from April 2020.

In discussion:

- Officers explained that the approach going forward on flood management was an increasing emphasis on resilience / adaptive measures (explained in detail in the report) as opposed to just increased protection, in line with the latest Met Office assessment that there was a 10% risk of unprecedented rainfall / flooding anywhere in the Country.
- Officers were seeking clarification on whether the County Council would have input into the appropriate detailed action plans which, disappointingly for the Vice Chairman, were not currently available.
- The Vice Chairman explained that a managed retreat included that where houses regularly flooded they should be rebuild in a different way.
- One of the Members raised the issue of why, when there was a policy of not submitting reports for information, this report had come forward at all, as there were no decisions to be made. Officers in response stated that as the County Council had a national role in flood prevention, the detail of the consultations had been brought forward for any comments which they would then ensure were fed back.
- One Member with reference to page 62 - increased flooding from urban creep (from people paving over gardens with impermeable materials) - highlighted the need for

an education programme regarding the dangers from this, as she believed many people were unaware and she had seen for herself the effects locally after a cloud burst.

It was resolved unanimously to note:

- a) The outcome from the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee consultation and the need to allocate a new Member to this Board from April 2020.
- b) The consultation response submitted to the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy consultation.
- c) The future need for the Strategy's outcomes and principles to be incorporated into the forthcoming Environment & Climate Change Strategy (in line with the Council's Climate Emergency declaration) and future reviews of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.

268. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – END OF JULY 2019

The Committee received the above report in order to have the opportunity to comment on the current budget position for Place and Economy as it affected those areas within the Committee's remit. The report was in a new format as performance indicators were no longer included but were presented in a separate report on the agenda (Tree and Local Highway Improvement Funding (LHI) activity would still reported in this report).

The main issues highlighted were:

Revenue - Place and Economy as a whole was forecasting a bottom line underspend of £2.4m mainly due to either underspends or overachievement of income in Street Lighting, Bus Lane Enforcement, Waste Management and Highways Development Management as detailed in the report. Any variations in the forecast would be reported as they become known.

Capital - The revised Capital Budget for 2019/20 reflected the carry-forwards of funding from 2018/19 and the re-phasing of schemes with more detail set out in Appendix 7 of the report. The forecast now showed slippage of £16.7m on Kings Dyke to reflect the re-procurement exercise now underway. It was highlighted that the bottom line slippage had now been exceeded.

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

note the report.

269. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 1

This new style, separate performance report provided information on the status of performance indicators the Committee had selected to monitor to help understand

performance of the services the Committee oversaw. The report covered the period up to the end of June 2019.

It contained information on:

- Current and previous performance and projected linear trend
- Current and previous targets (not all indicators currently had targets as some were being developed or due to the indicator i being monitored for context)
- Red / Amber / Green (RAG) status
- Direction for improvement (this showed whether an increase or decrease was positive)
- Change in performance (this shows whether performance was improving (up) or deteriorating (down))
- Statistical neighbour performance (only available where a standard national definition of indicator was being used)
- Indicator description
- Commentary on the indicator

The following RAG statuses were being used which included a new category 'very green':

- Red – current performance was 10% or more from target
- Amber – current performance was off target by less than 10%
- Green – current performance was on target or better by up to 4%
- Very Green – current performance was better than target by 5% or more

Current performance of indicators monitored by the Committee was as follows:

Status	Number of indicators	Percentage of total indicators with target
Red (Indicator 34 'The average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes')	1	20%
Amber	1	20%
Green	3	60%
Very Green	0	
No target	5	

In discussion the following issues were raised:

- Indicator 30 – 'Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area' - with reference to the last line of the indicator reading "We no longer report this information to the DfT....." one Member asked how the DfT was able to claim that nationally bus passenger numbers had declined if local authorities were no longer providing the information? **Action required – e-mail Committee outside of the meeting - Matthew Tullett Senior Business Intelligence Analyst.**
- It was confirmed in reply to a question that the large drop in bus passenger numbers locally in 2016-17 which then picked up in 2017-18 was the result of re-instating free car parking at the Council's park and ride sites.

- Explanation required on the dramatically large increase in numbers for Indicator 147 'Changes in traffic flows entering market towns – motor vehicle counts for market towns in Cambridgeshire' from previous years. **Action required – e-mail Committee outside of the meeting - Matthew Tullett**
- A request that the current graphical information was very difficult to read in hard copy format due to the size of font used and should be enlarged in future reports. The officer confirmed that this would be changed as another Committee had already made the same comment. **Action required - Matthew Tullett**

Having reviewed and commented on the report,

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the report.

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

This standing item report reviewed the Committee's agenda plan, training requirements and proposed any appointments required for any outside bodies, internal advisory groups and panels within the Committee's remit. Attention was drawn to the following:

Appendix 1 Agenda Plan - setting out the current agenda plan.

Training - As the Committee Training Programme had been completed, Members were invited to consider whether the Committee had any further training requirements within the areas of responsibility of the Committee. No additional suggestions were made.

Appointments to Outside Bodies – None were required since publication of the report.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the agenda plan attached at Appendix 1 to the report.
- b) Not to propose any suggestions for further Committee related training.
- c) Note that no appointments to outside bodies or Internal Advisory Groups and Panels were required to be brought to the attention of the Committee.

271. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING THURSDAY 17th OCTOBER 2019

**Chairman:
17TH October 2019**

APPENDIX 1

MINUTE 265. BOURN AIRFIELD SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (CONSULTATION DRAFT JUNE 2019) COPY OF SPEECH FROM COUNCILLOR DES O'BRIEN FROM BOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Thank you for the opportunity to explain the concerns that Bourn Parish Council have with the Bourn Airfield Draft Supplementary Planning Document.

Since the inclusion of Bourn Airfield in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan our objections, and continuing concerns, relate to the generation of private vehicle trips from a development of 3,500 houses on this site. Bourn Parish Council will not stop making the case that all the national and local evidence clearly points to very substantial increases in traffic to and from the Airfield development.

The 'real world' evidence we have from Cambourne for traffic volumes and trip generation is clear and unequivocal. Bourn Parish Council have conducted our own traffic counts in the absence of updated data from the statutory authorities and the developers. November 2017 figures show that 2,178 vehicles leave Cambourne in the morning peak from a development, at that time, of 4,000 houses. Despite the ready availability of this evidence, the developer's Planning Application, and the District Council's Draft SPD, have failed to acknowledge the traffic levels that will be generated by the Bourn Airfield new settlement. Indeed both have sought to underestimate trip generation in their transport assessments. Mayer Brown, the developers' transport consultants, have estimated that WITHOUT MITIGATION only 960 cars will leave Bourn Airfield in the morning peak. How can these figures be reconciled and whose job is it to interrogate the figures, if not the County Council? This is an enormous discrepancy. A failure to understand and acknowledge the levels of traffic generation from BAD will have a profound impact on Bourn, Caldecote, Hardwick and other adjacent villages.

In addition, a great deal has been made of the ability of the Greater Cambridge Partnership High Quality Public Transport route to effect a modal shift that will sufficiently mitigate the impact of the development. This modal shift had not been quantified. We don't know how many commuters will leave their cars and opt for the Cambourne to Cambridge busway. The dispersed nature of employment sites around South Cambridgeshire, and the lack of connectivity between the busway and these dispersed employment centres, has been worryingly ignored. There is far too much wishful thinking in the drafting of this SPD and far too little acceptance that Cambourne provides the most realistic model for what will happen with traffic generation from Bourn Airfield.

And now comes the Coup de Grace. Cambourne has a direct access to the A428 a privilege that is to be denied Bourn Airfield. The wagons have been circled and we are told that a direct access to the A428 is not acceptable or desirable; it will encourage car use; there's no land available etc etc. The truth is that the option for a direct access to the A428 from Bourn Airfield has not been openly discussed, or debated. There has been no consultation. It was not fully investigated at the Local Plan Development stage and is now being off-handedly and summarily dismissed by Highways and the Planning Authority.

Bourn Parish Council's question is, who will take responsibility when 2000 cars leave Bourn Airfield every morning and spill out on to the old St Neots Road looking for the quickest way to the Biomedical Campus. Will the officers at South Cambridgeshire District Council hold up

their hands and say 'we miss calculated'? Will the County Council say, 'it's not our fault we were told the car numbers would be much lower and people would switch to the bus'?

Bourn Parish have done nothing more than continue to point that the levels of traffic that will be generated by Bourn Airfield cannot be sustained on the existing local road network and that a HQPT option cannot, and will not, mitigate the impact sufficiently.

There MUST be a proper consultation on the option for a direct access from the Bourn Airfield Development to the A428.

APPENDIX 2

BOURN AIRFIELD SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (CONSULTATION DRAFT JUNE 2019 - SUBMISSION FROM COUNCILLOR MARK HOWELL CAMBOURNE DIVISION

Dear Chairman, Vice Chairman and Members of Economy and Environment Committee

I must first apologise for not attending the Economy and Environment Committee today, but I am in Leicester for Cambridgeshire County Council as the County's representative on ESPO. Please accept this letter as my comments on the Bourn Airfield Supplementary Planning Document (Consultation Draft June 2019)

You may recall, when this item was last on the Economy and Environment Committee's Agenda I along with a Bourn Parish Council representative gave our views especially with regards to the traffic aspect. The principal concern is the traffic entering and exiting the development. The close proximity of Cambourne, has given local people, and dare I say elected members, a certain amount of expertise on this issue as over the twenty years since out new town has been occupied. Over that time period we have observed and participated in the traffic issues which have arisen in this very local area.

Therefore it is with that background I state I have grave concerns about the Bourn development not having direct access to the A428. I fear this issue will come back in the future and be a thorn in the County's side as the traffic build up increase and the St Neot's Road becomes more and more congested. What I see in the future is Cambridgeshire County Council taking costly remedial action for what is now a short term fix for outside agencies.

The whole purpose of the new A428 was to stop heavy traffic along the St Neot's road as it was unsuitable and caused excess vehicle movement through surrounding villages along its route. To now allow the Bourn development to access the St Neot's Road as its principal form of access can only be viewed as short sighted and what seems a retrograde action.

I request the Economy and Environment Committee to ask for further examination of this one particular issue. The evidence should be based upon the traffic movement of the final development as a whole as a starting point. Therefore, all parties are able to present their evidence in a full and transparent manner and a fair conclusion can be reached.

Yours Sincerely,
Councillor Mark Howell Cambourne Division