

County Council – Minutes

Please note the meeting can be viewed on YouTube at the following link:

[Full Council - 21 March 2023](#)

Date: Tuesday 21 March 2023

Time: 10:35 a.m. – 4:25 p.m.

Present:

S Ferguson (Chair)

S Kindersley (Vice-Chair)

D Ambrose Smith

M Atkins

H Batchelor

A Beckett

K Billington

G Bird

C Boden

A Bradnam

A Bulat

S Bywater

D Connor

S Corney

A Costello

S Count

P Coutts

S Criswell

C Daunton

D Dew

L Dupré

J French

R Fuller

I Gardener

N Gay

M Goldsack

B Goodliffe

N Gough

J Gowing

R Hathorn

A Hay

M Howell

R Howitt

J King

M King

S King

P McDonald

M McGuire

E Meschini

B Milnes

E Murphy

L Nethsingha

K Prentice

C Rae

K Reynolds

T Sanderson

D Schumann

J Schumann

G Seeff

N Shailer

A Sharp

P Slatter

M Smith

S Taylor

F Thompson

S Tierney

S van de Ven

A Whelan

G Wilson

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies were received from Councillor S Hoy.

122. Minutes – 7 February 2023 and Motions Log

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The motions log was noted.

123. Chair's Announcements

The Chair made a number of announcements, as set out in Appendix A.

124. Report of the County Returning Officer

Council received and noted the report of the County Returning Officer on the election of Councillor Geoffrey Seeff in the by-election for the St Neots The Eatons electoral division held on 16 February 2023.

125. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bulat declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Minute 133a), having partaken in an advisory project regarding voter identification for a not for profit organisation, which had involved advising the Mayor of London.

Councillor Gough declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Minutes 128 and 133b), as a former member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board.

126. Public Question Time

The Chair informed Council that due to high levels of interest, he had exercised his discretion to accept any eligible public questions that had been received before the deadline.

The Chair reported that nine public questions had been received from members of the public, as set out at Appendix B.

127. Petitions

The Chair reported that two petitions had been received from members of the public as set out at Appendix C.

128. Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project

It was moved by the Council's representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board, Councillor Meschini, and seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nethsingha, that the recommendations, as set out in the report on the Council agenda, be approved.

Councillor Slatter declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future.

Councillor Goldsack moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Criswell, as set out in Appendix D.

Following discussion under Part 4, Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than fourteen members requested a recorded vote on the amendment.

Following further discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

[Recorded vote attached at Appendix E]

Following discussion under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than fourteen members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

On being put to the vote, it was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Note the report, and the likely timescales for the formal consent process; and
- b) Agree to:
 - (i) Make an application under the provisions of Section 6 of the Transport and Works Act 1992 for an order authorising the construction and operation of a guided transport system from Cambourne to Cambridge
 - (ii) Seek a direction from the Secretary of State under Section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that planning permission be deemed to be granted for the development provided for in the proposed C2C Order;
 - (iii) Authorise the GCP Executive Board:
 - (a) To progress negotiations with any owners of interests in the affected land and other persons affected by the scheme and to make necessary arrangements to acquire land or rights within the proposed C2C Order, whether by agreement or through the exercise of powers contained in the C2C Order;
 - (b) To progress negotiations with any affected parties or objectors to the C2C Order with the aim of avoiding, or securing the withdrawal of, any objections to TWAO; and
 - (c) To promote the C2C Order through, and participation in, any public local inquiry or other processes and procedures arising or resulting from the submission of the application for the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO);
 - (iv) The delegation of powers to the GCP Executive Board to:
 - (a) Prepare the necessary documents and any other evidence deemed appropriate to support the Transport and Works Act application;
 - (b) Undertake further design development work on the C2C Scheme and progress the ongoing statutory process, including further refinements to the C2C Order prior to submitting the Transport and Works Act Order application and application for deemed planning permission; and

- (c) Deliver the C2C Scheme to practical completion subject to the C2C Order being made and deemed planning permission granted and to the approval of a full business case in line with any existing agreements and in compliance with the MoU between GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) in accordance with internal governance requirements and procurement best practice and in consultation with the Council's Section 151 Officer where appropriate; and
- (v) The delegation of powers to the Council's Section 151 Officer to negotiate, agree, enter into, execute and serve (where appropriate) all relevant legal agreements, notices and other documentation necessary to facilitate and underpin the C2C Order including provisions to protect the apparatus of statutory authorities which may lead to ongoing liabilities, and to submit the Transport and Works Act Order application, and the application that a direction be given that planning permission be deemed to be granted together with all supporting documents, and to prepare such further documents as may be required to support those applications, save that the C2C Order application will not be made until the satisfactory completion of agreements with the landowners of three development sites, namely Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge as approved by the Section 151 Officer.

[Recorded vote attached at Appendix F]

130. Items for determination from Staffing and Appeals Committee

a) Senior Manager Pay Data and Pay Policy Statement 2023

It was moved by the Chair of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Murphy, and seconded by the Vice-Chair of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Shailer, that the recommendation from the Staffing and Appeals Committee, as set out on the Council agenda, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by affirmation to:

approve the Pay Policy Statement 2023.

b) Pay Gap Reporting

It was moved by the Chair of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Murphy, and seconded by the Vice-Chair of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Shailer, that the recommendation from the Staffing and Appeals Committee, as set out on the Council agenda, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by affirmation to:

approve the Pay Gap Report 2023.

131. Committees – Allocation of seats and substitutes to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules

It was moved by the Chair of Council, Councillor Ferguson, seconded by the Vice-Chair of Council, Councillor Kindersley, and resolved unanimously by affirmation that the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out in agenda item 9, be approved.

132. Appointment of the Chair and Vice-Chair of Committees

The Chair accepted this additional item as a matter of urgency following the resignation of the former Vice-Chair of the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee, as a meeting of the committee was scheduled on 23 March 2023.

It was moved by the Chair of Council, Councillor Ferguson and seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Kindersley, that the appointment of Councillor Bulat as the Vice-Chair of the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee and Councillor Atkins as the Vice-Chair of the Children and Young People Committee be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by affirmation to:

- a) appoint Councillor Bulat as the Vice-Chair of the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee; and
- b) appoint Councillor Atkins as the Vice-Chair of the Children and Young People Committee.

133. Motions submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10

a) Motion from Councillor Lorna Dupré

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Dupré and seconded by Councillor Sanderson:

Voter Identification

This Council notes:

- The passing of the Elections Act 2022 including a new requirement for electors to show photographic identification at polling stations in order to vote in person;
- The concerns expressed at the principle of this requirement, and the likelihood that it will prevent large numbers of people from participating in elections with young people and BAME [Black, Asian, and minority ethnic] communities being particularly likely to be disenfranchised as well as carers, recent care leavers, and those leading complex and challenging lives; and
- The view of the Local Government Association and the Association of Electoral Administrators is that there is insufficient time to implement this requirement without

depriving many electors of their right to vote in the elections in May 2023, and that the timetable for implementation should have been put back.

This Council believes that:

- All residents eligible to vote should be encouraged and enabled to do so, with as few barriers to participation as can be proven to be absolutely necessary;
- The new requirement is disproportionate given that according to the Electoral Commission the UK has low levels of proven electoral fraud, and given that there were only six cases of voter identity fraud at the 2021 elections; and
- Many local authorities will find it difficult to staff polling stations if the role of polling clerks becomes one of policing and preventing rather than welcoming and facilitating.

This Council recognises that it has a role to play in ensuring access to the democratic process for its citizens, and that it has assets including staff and buildings with which to do so.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- i. Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to express concerns that this new requirement will prevent large numbers of people from participating in elections with young people and BAME communities being particularly likely to be disenfranchised;
- ii. Assist the district councils to implement these measures to prevent electors from being disenfranchised including supporting their work in promoting how people can apply for voter ID if they do not have suitable ID already;
- iii. Share publicity materials about the new requirement for voter identification and the risk that electors may be disenfranchised;
- iv. Raise awareness of this through our community facing services such as our Libraries, Think Communities, Registration, Skills and our Adults and Children's Early Help teams so that users of council services, who may be particularly at risk of losing their right to vote, are made aware of the requirement to apply for identification papers in order to vote;
- v. Work with partners including parish councils to increase awareness of the change in legislation and the new barriers to electoral participation; and
- vi. Make an offer to our district colleagues to support voter ID application facilitation by commissioning libraries, so that staff, volunteers and IT equipment can be made available to assist residents in successfully completing applications for voter identification certification.

Under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than fourteen members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

[Recorded vote attached at Appendix G]

b) Motion from Councillor Count

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Boden and seconded by Councillor Goldsack:

Core Purpose: To hold a local poll, under section 116 of the Local Government Act 2003 on whether Cambridgeshire residents want to pay a congestion charge to receive improvements in public transport, as outlined by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

The Council notes that:

- The GCP have been working towards a proposal to improve public transport, largely in the GCP area, paid for by a congestion charge on drivers in an area described by the GCP as a Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ).
- To progress towards a proposal the GCP undertook a consultation, which is finished and the results will be considered at its June meeting to decide whether to put forward a proposal for charging to Cambridgeshire County Council.
- The consultation, written by the GCP, concentrated on gaining its responses largely from the GCP area. That area also benefits the most from proposed improvements in public transport. However, the GCP cannot make the decision to charge, that decision is the sole responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council.

The Council:

- Expects to receive a petition from Kieron Johnson to hold a referendum on the congestion charge. Legally, a local poll is the format this would take. There are currently 15,663 residents who have signed that petition.
- Notes the wording in the petition is clear that most if not all believe a referendum would help stop a congestion charge. It is also clear that many believe the County Council should not make this decision based on the GCP consultation alone and would benefit from a clear referendum on the subject.
- Acknowledges that for a local poll to be credible the question asked must be clear, unambiguous, and unbiased, to deliver a fair result.
- Asks that any question should just require a yes or no response, balancing the benefits of improved public transport against the disbenefits of imposing a new tax on motorists.

Therefore, this Council recommends:

- i. A local poll be conducted across Cambridgeshire on the subject of congestion charging in the STZ as outlined by the GCP;
- ii. That the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire County Council commission a credible independent agency to draft a single yes/no question.

- iii. That a local poll be conducted on 4th May 2023 to align with various local elections taking place in order to help to keep costs down.
- iv. That a sum of £1.5m be allocated from reserves that have no specified spending in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy to cover the costs of this local poll.

Under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than fourteen members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

[Recorded vote attached at Appendix H]

c) Motion from Councillor Alex Bulat

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bulat and seconded by Councillor Goldsack:

The Council notes that:

- Anyone, regardless of their background or political affiliation, should feel safe to become a councillor and express their views through the local democratic processes.
- Debate and disagreement, as well as controversial topics, have always been a healthy part of our democracy. However, abuse, intimidation, threats and hate speech have no place in civil democratic debate.
- The role of a local councillor extends beyond council meetings and so the wellbeing of councillors needs to be considered when out in the community, on social media and in other discussion forums.

The Council welcomes:

- Cross-party working to encourage respect and a good quality of debate on issues that matter to our residents, during council meetings as well as community-based events. – supports good standards in public debate.
- Its strong Code of Conduct for both councillors and officers.

The Council expresses concern that:

- According to the Local Government Association (LGA) 2022 Councillor census, 7 in 10 surveyed councillors reported experiencing abuse and intimidation last year.
- There have been reports of increased abuse towards people in politics, especially on social media.
- A number of councillors have received direct threats or intimidation because of the views they expressed in debates in this council or while carrying out council duties.

The Council is recommended to commit to:

- i) Endorsing the “Debate Not Hate” LGA awareness-raising campaign and sharing the toolkit with councillors, officers and relevant stakeholders (Debate Not Hate – Campaign Toolkit).
- ii) Working with the police to provide training for councillors on how to respond – or not respond – to abusive emails, social media and written communication related to council matters.
- iii) Asking the Constitution and Ethics Committee to consider a live action plan to mitigate the risks of intimidation and abusive behaviours towards members and officers, ensuring safety is prioritised while they fulfil council duties.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

134. Questions

- (a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Council Procedure Rule 9.1)

No questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 of the Council's Constitution.

- (b) Questions on Fire Authority Issues

No questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 of the Council's Constitution.

- (c) Written Questions (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

No questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2 of the Council's Constitution.

Chair
16 May 2023

County Council – 21st March 2023

Chair's Announcements

People

Former County Councillor Geoffrey Woollard

It is with regret that the Chair reports the recent death of former County Councillor Geoffrey Woollard, who represented the Newmarket No.1 and Burwell Divisions on behalf of the Conservative Party from 1974 to 1993. The Council's thoughts are with his family and friends at this very sad time.

Messages

Cambridgeshire Apprenticeship Awards

The Chair attended New Shire Hall alongside His Majesty's Lord-Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, Mrs Julie Spence and the Vice Chair of Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor Sebastian Kindersley to celebrate apprenticeships within Cambridgeshire. Cambridgeshire County Council hosted the second Cambridgeshire Apprenticeship Awards to recognise, showcase and celebrate the commitment and achievements of individuals completing an apprenticeship and those supporting apprenticeships.

Magpas Air Ambulance Reception with Royal Patron Her Royal Highness (HRH) Princess Royal

On Friday, 10th February the Chair joined Magpas Air Ambulance staff, clinicians and former patients as they welcomed HRH The Princess Royal to the site of the charity's new base, to unveil a cornerstone for the new building. The new, purpose-built airbase and headquarters at Alconbury Weald will boast a dedicated state-of-the-art training centre to train the next generation of pre-hospital emergency doctors and paramedics; be equipped for 24/7 operations with well-being and rest facilities for crew and clinicians; and provide new community and patient facilities on site.

Huntingdon Pancake Flipathon

The Chair joined in with the annual Shrove Tuesday tradition with Huntingdon Town Council with the Mayors and Chairs of the county. This was a fun occasion joined by over 100 people filling the Market Square. After the 'Chain Gang' race, participants from the local community did a lap of the Market Square. This year over 80 students from Stukeley Meadows Primary School and Spring Common Academy joined in the fun, with other local groups and businesses also taking part.

Flag Raising for first Anniversary of the Invasion of Ukraine

The Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire County Council and the Chair stood in solidarity and raised the Ukrainian flag at New Shire Hall to mark the first anniversary of the invasion of Ukraine. It was a moving ceremony for all, and they had the pleasure to be joined by some Ukrainian families.

Flag Raising for Commonwealth

The Chair was an honoured to raise the Commonwealth flag at New Shire Hall. This marked the beginning of a week-long series of events and activities happening around the globe. The [theme for Commonwealth Day 2023](#) is 'Forging a sustainable and peaceful common future'.

Flag Raising for St Patrick's Day at New Shire Hall

On the 17th March the Chair had the joy of raising the St Patrick's Day flag at New Shire Hall. A national day of cultural celebration for St Patrick, patron saint of Ireland.

Visit to Comberton Village College

Comberton Village College have recently brought online its new £3m energy system. This was put in as part of the schools retrofit programme to encourage decarbonisation which Cambridgeshire County Council oversees. The Chair attended the event to mark this special occasion.

County Council – 21 March 2023

Public Question Time

Question from Sarah Hughes, Campaign Support Officer, Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

My question, as you said, is from the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance. Last week, the Secretary of State for Transport announced cuts to the budget for active travel schemes in England outside London. It is estimated that two thirds of the previously promised funding will be lost. Moreover, central government funding for buses lacks a sustainable long-term plan. In February, the government did extend the bus recovery grant, but the decision was only announced at the very last minute so some companies had already registered short notice service withdrawals and the extension was for a mere three months. Fuel duty, currently generates the treasury approximately £25bn per year – that is approximately 2.8% of all receipts. This revenue will decline rapidly and eventually reduce to zero as the country transitions to electric vehicles. The sale of new petrol and diesel cars and vans will end in just seven years' time. Since MPs recently revealed there are no plans to implement, or to consider implementing, a road pricing scheme in the UK, it appears there is no plan to replace this lost revenue.

Given the continued reduction of realistic funding from central government for sustainable transport, does the Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee think that it is becoming increasingly urgent that our region does its utmost to take back control of vital local bus services, alongside improving active travel opportunities, and work to deliver a reliable funding source for the future?

Response from Councillor Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Firstly, thank you, Sarah, for raising this important question and I'm sad you weren't able to make it and join us here in person today. Within this administration we are clear how importantly we take active travel and it's disappointing that government is reducing its active travel funding nationally.

Clearly, walking and cycling willingly remain absolutely vital to Cambridgeshire's future. In Cambridge we've already seen 30% of people cycling to work and our administration is keen to enable this kind of modal shift across the county. We are assembling an active travel centre of excellence to maximise the funding we receive in this area and lead the way in developing it - delivering active travel pipelines. Active travel should not be considered a bolt on, an extra, a nice to have, but rather it should be integrated into how we consider transport.

The Combined Authority Bus Strategy to develop a more convenient, attractive and easy to use bus network was consulted on earlier this year is up for approval at the CPCA Board [Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board] in March. Work continues on the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and the Network Review. The CPCA is investigating bus franchising which would indeed provide greater local control at the bus network in terms of routes, frequencies and integration. The CPCA is to provide an update on franchising in May, where the Mayor and CPCA Board would determine whether to progress franchising to public consultation. This would be informed by an outline business case.

The GCP [Greater Cambridge Partnership] is exploring wider opportunities for sustainable transport funding through Making Connections and will be considering the consultation results in June. Thank you.

Supplementary Question from Sarah Hughes, Campaign Support Officer, Cambridge Sustainable Travel Alliance:

Thank you, Councillor Beckett. Given that central government has just cut funding for active travel, as I mentioned, what will the County Council do to secure long term, sustainable funding that they control to ensure continuous investment in sustainable transport?

Response from Councillor Beckett:

Thank you, Sarah, and that's obviously a really important question. It's an item that the GCP has been consulting on as part of their sustainable travel zone. They received the biggest response in their history of 24,000 responses to their current proposals. We will obviously be looking at those responses and reporting back, but if the sustainable travel zone were to go ahead, it would add funding to the public transport that we desperately need within this county.

Question from Anna Gazeley to Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

So, from the UK Biodiversity Action Plan descriptions traditional orchards are hot spots for biodiversity in the countryside, supporting a wide range of wildlife as well as an array of nationally rare and nationally scarce species. The wildlife of orchard sites depends on the mosaic of habitats they encompass including fruit trees, scrubs, hedgerows, non-fruit trees within the orchard, the orchard floor habitats, fallen dead wood and associated features. As such, they are designated habitats of primary importance and rightly accorded protections.

In the C2C Full Council Agenda, Item Number 7, it states that there will be a loss of habitat of principle importance - woodland and traditional orchard. So, there is no question that the proposed route alignment will result in this loss to the environment. What is in contention, however, is that the GCP report states that the effects are expected to be lessened to non-significant between year 15 and 30 on basis of compensation habitat offsite. Steve Oram, the orchard biodiversity officer for The People's Trust for Endangered Species, has stated unequivocally that the destruction of such a valuable habitat of principle importance cannot be compensated. He goes on to add that this utterly destructive proposal can never achieve biodiversity net gain due to the vast amounts of damage that it will do to an ancient orchard full of veteran trees, and the enormous impact of a road going through so much previously undamaged and unfragmented countryside. I would like to add that beyond the impact on the wildlife of bisecting the orchard - which is already catastrophic - it would no longer be practically nor economically viable to manage an orchard and so would be lost in its entirety.

My question: Even assuming that councillors consider thirty years non-significant, what proof have you been presented that such mitigation is even possible?

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Thank you, thank you very much Anna and I would like to start by thanking Anna for showing me around the orchard recently, we've both gone and seen it and I know she's gone and done that for a lot of other people as well.

On the environmental statement, we have got an environmental statement that is substantially complete. We will make tweaks to graphics and technical appendices, but there is no outstanding work remaining that impacts on the orchard.

In terms of the environmental mitigation, the area where work continues is environmental mitigation is the ambition to go beyond the statutory 10% biodiversity net gain that is required for the scheme and achieve 20%. We will continue those discussions to mitigate the impact of the scheme and I expect it will be a key component of the public inquiry that is going to follow this, if indeed the decision today is to proceed with the TWAO [Transport Works Act Order].

We have- The GCP has extensively surveyed the orchard. Coton Orchard was planted around a hundred years ago and eleven of the original trees remain. We fully appreciate the importance of the orchard, and for this reason, we continue to explore ways of minimising land take within it, and to fashion an alignment that limits the adverse effects – for example avoiding all of the original trees, where one is currently impacted. I would like to encourage Anna to please take part in these discussions with us going forward, whatever happens today.

We do, however, also need to consider the impact that alternative alignments that don't impact the orchard would have on other sites of interest, including for example Madingley Wood - which is a site of special scientific interest - and the American Cemetery, both of which would be affected if the alignment was brought towards Madingley Road, and we have to mitigate the impact against those as well.

Supplementary Question from Anna Gazeley:

Thank you. With regards to these woods and the American Cemetery, the alignment proposed that suggested by the Cambridge Past, Present and Future would not impact these at all. In fact, this Council has heard from the Superintendent of the American Cemetery who is in support of Coton and our campaign.

My supplemental question would be: Have the members of this Council seen report on Sky News just three days ago that highlights that for a similar mitigation scheme, National Highways planted 850,000 saplings as part of a £1.5 billion upgrade of the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon, three-quarters of which have since died?

So, we actually drove past all these all these dead twigs inside of a plastic tube. Wildlife cannot nest on twigs, they can't wait- so okay, have you seen the report? That's my question? Thank you.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Thank you very much. And I haven't, but I will catch up on it. I have seen other things.

I am afraid, unfortunately, we have shown that the impact on Madingley Wood and the American Cemetery is present in the alternative. I mean that is- And we will discuss at length this report here later in the in the agenda, which will show that that is actually a concern.

In terms of the covenant we have with the American Cemetery, the covenant includes line of sight which is a very, very difficult aspect that take into consideration.

But I will catch up on any material that is brought to my attention. I would be very pleased to do that.

Question from Allan Treacy to Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Good morning. In connection with the C2C busway, I'm asking that the Chair will please ask councillors to raise their hands if they are aware of the following four points:

1. The near universal objections to the off-road section of the C2C busway from community groups, parish councils, thousands of petitioners, CPPF [Cambridge Past, Present and Future], the National Trust and CPRE [The Countryside Charity]; and
2. The enormity of the environmental damage being inflicted by the off-road section of the busway on greenbelt National Trust covenanted land. Especially the virtual destruction of the hundred year old Coton Orchard, which Anna's been talking about, which is the largest traditional orchard in the county, the eighth largest in the UK, and which barely gets a mention in the papers for this meeting; and
3. The BCR [benefit cost ratio] of 0.43, which falls absurdly below the normal benchmark of 2; and
4. The availability of an on-road alternative down Madingley Hill for a mere £20m.

Response from the Chair:

Mr Treacy, can you confirm this question was for Councillor Meschini, but you seem to be addressing it to me.

Response from Allan Treacy:

As submitted, I asked it. Would the Chair please ask councillors.

Response from the Chair:

Okay I'm- I thought you'd been advised this, but I'm afraid that the Constitution doesn't allow me to conduct opinion polls during a meeting and we- we have a very formal order of business. So, my answer to that question is, unfortunately, I won't be able to do that. Sorry. Do you have a supplementary question?

Supplementary Question from Allan Treacy:

Um I do. I'm saddened of course I wasn't told of that before the meeting, otherwise I would have changed my question. My supplementary question concerns the costing of the off-road bus way.

The Department for Transport requires optimism bias to be inserted into the early stages of costings - typically up to 65%. In other words, a project costing £200 million may cost eventually

£320 million, possibly, and so the optimism bias gets buried as the project proceeds. We haven't heard what optimism bias has been included in the current level of costings for the off-road busway and I'd like to know the answer to that, please.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Mr. Chairman, if you will allow- this is a supplementary, but if you will allow me two minutes to answer. I will answer the original questions, which I was my understanding they've been asked.

Response from the Chair:

So I might have cut you off. You can have two minutes to answer original question if you wish to answer your question, then answer supplementary afterwards.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

That's all right that's no problem at all, and you know Mr and Dr Treacy - they are- they have addressed the GCP Board in the past and I am very pleased to see them here again today. I had understood that the question was for me and therefore here I am - I provided, I prepared, an answer.

It is unfortunately not correct to suggest that there are near universal objections to the scheme. We have had extensive public consultations and ongoing engagement with residents, businesses, parish councils and key stakeholders which have shown that there is support for this scheme and there is support for the vital role it will play in tackling existing and future transport challenges in Cambridgeshire. I am reminded, in particular, of the views of Cambourne Community College, Cambridge Ahead and local representatives in Cambourne.

The environmental impacts of the scheme have been scrutinised in detail, including independently, during the past consultations and will be scrutinised in detail again if the secretary of state does hold a public enquiry. In terms of the orchard, we fully appreciate the importance of it and we are working to minimise land take within it, as explained previously.

The BCR of 0.43 refers to the transport user benefits only. The Business Case estimates the wider economic impacts would increase the BCR to 1.47 or 3.48 depending on additionality. Now this is- we have to be very clear here, this isn't arithmetic or mathematical games we are playing – additionality means the homes and jobs that the City Deal was signed to deliver.

The GCP has properly assessed the alternatives for improving public transport and this has been confirmed by Independent Audit and by the CPCA three times.

Evidence does not support the assertion that an on-road bus solution would perform better, nor that an on-road bus lane could be provided at a fraction of the cost: there is insufficient space to deliver such a scheme at the more constrained points by Madingley Wood and the American Cemetery, whilst also not addressing the M11 Junction 13 which remains a constraint. So, this is the answer to the original question. As for the finances, they are included in the most recent business case, it's all online.

Question from Dr Marilyn Treacy to Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Good morning.

The GCP paper relating to the Cambourne to Cambridge project under Section 2.1.2, it states: 'The C2C Scheme aims to provide better public transport, walking and cycling options in the area West of Cambridge in order to improve journey times and to address the transport constraint on growth by linking key employment and housing sites together and with the city centre.'

Cambridge's two largest and rapidly growing sites of employment are the biomedical campus to the south-east and the science park to the north. Taking real time data from Google Maps on the morning I wrote this question, I found that the journey times were as follows: Cambourne to Cambridge Science Park by the A428 and the A14 - 22 minutes, via Grange Road - 67 minutes; Cambourne to the Biomedical Campus, Addenbrooke's site, by the A428 and the M11 - 30 minutes, by Grange Road - 44 minutes. The West Cambridge site may become a major site of employment in future, but Highways England are looking at making the Girton interchange an always junction, which may solve potential problems of congestion on the A1303. Using an inbound bus lane on existing infrastructure will dramatically reduce costs, give better journey times and leave the environment intact.

Given the above, could you please explain the rationale for spending over £200 million on an offroad busway which transects the green belt, destroys a priority habitat and extends journey times?

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Again, thank you very much Dr Treacy, it is lovely to see you again.

A bus strategy is included in the scheme's business case and it demonstrates the benefits of the proposed scheme. And I'm afraid, unfortunately, when we make decisions like these we have to consider a rather more complicated pictures than what Google Maps is telling us today, unfortunately.

The growth of the West Cambridge site is happening right now - you can see the growth, you can see the buildings, the building site along Maddingley Road. And the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge Local Plans they make provisions for 2,350 dwellings - Cambourne West, Bourn airfield - 3500 dwellings, West Cambridge - 10,000 jobs. The Local Plan provides for and depends on for its success on these.

In terms of Girton interchange, this has previously been reviewed and discounted or, as the most truthful statement would be, there is currently no plan to carry on with it from on the part of Highways England. There is no access from the A428 to the M11/A1307, there was no upgrade provided as part of the A14 works, and there are no plans to provide such an upgrade. It is also worth noting that provision of major new slip roads and junction upgrades would be costly, complex and require significant land take with unknown environmental impacts. The evidence does not support the assertion that an on-road bus solution would perform as well, nor that we could provide that at a fraction of the cost and here I'm afraid I will have to refer back to the answer I've just given in order to avoid running out of time. But thank you again for coming.

Supplementary Question from Dr Marilyn Treacy:

Taking a journey via Grange Road is probably not going to be the optimum route to either the science park or the biomedical campus for those living in Cambourne and Bourn. If you take these commuters out of your calculations, potential commuters out of your calculations, where does that leave your business case with its woeful BCR of 0.43?

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

We can't take arbitrary commuters out of the business case. That doesn't stack up. And at the same time, you don't stop in Grange Road. The idea is that Grange Road is the last bit where you can have an offroad solution, after which the plan is that the bus would follow the U route, which is quite successful. So, it would connect people to the city centre and Cambridge Station. And once again, we have addressed the BCR before and I am not willing to reduce arguments about people's livelihoods and jobs and the growth that has been imposed upon us to a number like that, but thank you anyway.

Question from David Cairns, Transport Lead for Coton Parish Council to Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

The- the papers before you and the question for you is is is clear. In the papers you have seen, the business case said that the benefits cost ratio of this project is low. That's the adjective used in the papers in front of you. You've already heard Councillor Meschini say that there are further benefits to developed from other developments, such as housing and businesses, but of course those would come whatever bus scheme is chosen. The title of C2C is Cambourne to Cambridge. In developing this project, Cambridge to Cambourne is not a priority and there is no congestion. Bus routes- sorry bicycle routes are already being provided by the excellent project of the Greenways from GCP, so my question is as follows: Will the- will the Council consider examining an inward bound bus route only to deliver this benefit? Thank you.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Thank you very much indeed and welcome.

As we've explained a few times, so we have subjected this business case to an independent audit in 2021 already. And I will have to repeat, because this is very important, the scheme is intended to address not just current issues but the planned future growth along the corridor. As such, the benefits of the scheme will increase considerably when the new homes and jobs planned along the route, and required by the Local Plan, are included. And I'm not having this dismissed or pooh-poohed, this is the reason we're doing this.

The provision of a Greenway does not nullify the need for an active travel path. The provision of three new active travel routes – Comberton, Madingley Road and end-to-end provision along the C2C route – will play a vital role connecting communities to the west of Cambridge and they will help the sustainable growth of the site. And this is part of an integrated infrastructure plan which

the City Deal was required to deliver which will improve our creaking transport network and create better links between homes and jobs.

We have, in terms of your question about on-road, explored all of them including the inbound and the evidence does not support the assertion that the location would perform as well. And once again, I will have to refer you to the answer given before on that.

Supplementary Question from David Cairns, Transport Lead for Coton Parish Council:

Thank you, Chair and thank you colleagues. You've heard the answer, which I'm sure councillors are not surprised by. So, councillors the choice now is before you and the future direction of this discussion will either be a public inquiry - lawyers and court - or a opportunity to do something together.

I'm sure that many of you who live locally are fed up to the back teeth with this project. I'm sure that many of you who live further away, it's a long way away and you don't- it's not really in your position to care very much. But this of course is crucial for our small part of Cambridgeshire. So, the question to you all and the question to you, Councillor Meschini, is: Is this a project you would like to do together with us and deliver the benefits without destroying the countryside; or is something you intended to pursue as planned? Thank you.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

And the answer to that, of course, is that the project if the decision doesn't go ahead today, we will respond appropriately; if decision does go ahead today, that will be a final decision for the Secretary of State – that's how these things actually work.

And I would like to actually not allow people to think that we are just doing this to people. This has been ten years in the making, four public consultations, an environmental impact assessment, three independent reviews. We've been doing this together with people for as long as it's been possible. Most of which, without anything to do with me, because I've only just come here really quite recently. And we will continue to do this together with people as much as is possible, but we can't make alternatives viable when they are not. Thank you.

Question from Heather Du Quesnay, Chair North Newnham Residents' Association to Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Thank you for the opportunity to put a question to this meeting. As you said I'm the Chair of the North Newnham Residents' Association [NNRA], so I'm coming at this from a slightly different angle from some of the previous speakers.

The NNRA supports efforts to improve public transport links into Central Cambridge from its satellite communities. They are a key part of the Citizen City's Development Strategy. We welcome the decision, backed up by the environment impact assessment, to direct the route from the university's west Cambridge site into the city via the rifle range track and not Adams Road. The segregation of traffic is essential to protecting the safety of all road users. Our week long traffic survey in 2019 revealed that Adams Road is the busiest peak time cycle route in the city, with well over 800 bicycle movements an hour at its busiest time, as well as more than 200 pedestrian

movements. These numbers have increased since then and will continue to increase as the university moves more of its departments into the West Cambridge site. However, the scheme to restrict car parking in the North Newnham area, which for this purpose includes Clark Maxwell Road (not part of our organisation) shows no signs of progress. We estimated in November 2015 - yes more than seven years ago - that there were about 450 cars a day parked in our area alone. That would probably be increased by well over a hundred if Clark Maxwell Road were included. Most of the cars seemed to belong to commuters.

A well thought out parking scheme could offer a welcome supplementary revenue stream to the Council, but the major concern is the hazard that these vehicles represent to pedestrians and cyclists. Residents and users of college buildings can struggle to get in and out of their drive safely, sight lines are obscured and turning circles reduced. The junction of Wilberforce and Adams Road, with the entrance to the University Sports Ground and the start of the Coton footpath is a particularly hazardous area. Will the County Council please commit to carrying out the necessary work, in consultation with local residents, to make Adams Road and the surrounding streets and junction safe for all their users.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

Thank you very much. And this particular question is very welcome. Heather thank you. Very good to see you. I will be extremely brief.

I understand the GCP has committed to undertake the improvement in Adams Road. This will complement the wider Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and as part of the city deal sustainable transport programme. Work is ongoing. It is actually currently being done now. It is scheduled for delivery 2024 and we will write you with a detail about that.

Supplementary question from Heather Du Quesnay, Chair North Newnham Residents' Association:

I don't I don't need to ask very much of a supplementary question. I welcome your assurances. I'm conscious that during the morning you have emphasised the importance of integrated schemes with joining this up with the cycleway, and what have you. Can you please assure us that's not going to delay things any longer and confirm that the sort of timetable that you've indicated in writing after this meeting.

Response from Councillor Eliza Meschini, Council Representative on the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board:

I absolutely do. Thank you.

Question from Rory Comyn to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Good afternoon, councillors. I would like to start by saying to each and every one of you that this is a real opportunity for you to allay an unprecedented level of fear, mistrust, upset and quite frankly pure fury that this proposal has engendered in a population who, given recent and current events, look naturally to their elected officials for support. What concerns me and the thousands that have signed this petition is the fact that none of the councillors present here today have a mandate for imposing a congestion charge. Liberal Democrats and Labour, knowing this was in the pipeline, for

some peculiar reason, all failed to mention it at the last election. And yet, here they are now, united in pushing this monstrosity forward.

If I may, I would like to direct my question directly to you, Councillor Alex Beckett. You sit here as the Chair of the Highways Committee - a position of importance and authority granted to you by the people. I demand if those that put you in that seat knew about the plans you now so fervently support? My question is this, and rather like the referendum itself I'm looking for a simple yes or no: In securing this role did you personally include the proposal of a congestion charge in your manifesto?

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Firstly, thank you Mr Comyn for your question. I know we might not necessarily agree, but it's great to see residents engage and challenge. None of this is easy, there are difficult decisions to be made all around, but I'm really pleased to see that you are actually here today and able to bring your views – that's really important for all of us.

The GCP, as we all know, has carried out one of the biggest and most wide-ranging consultations in its history. It has led to over 24,000 responses. It deliberately asked a range of open and closed questions to ask people whether they supported the scheme, which elements they did support and elements they didn't support, what might be what they might see done differently, or what alternatives they propose. This was intended to provide richer and more nuanced feedback style than a simple yes or no. I do not believe this is a simple yes or no answer for any of this. This is a complex decision which requires complex analysis. All of us need to take a look at what feedback to the consultation says, look at any amendments that the GCP might bring and what scheme might be put forwards, before we decide on what needs to happen.

Supplementary question from Rory Comyn:

Right, so, that's a clear no then.

So, here's the thing. It's obviously clear that the proposal of a congestion charge was not in your manifesto, so why is it subject to your party's whip? It strikes me that you do not have the right to make a decision on the matter in that case. So do you not agree that it would be moral, decent and democratic of you to either stand for election on this issue, to determine whether or not you have our support, or save everybody's time by granting us a referendum today?

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Thank you to Mr Comyn and thank you to everyone else. I know this does invoke an awful lot of passion on everyone. I, for one, can assure you that I have not been whipped on this issue. Nobody has told me to vote one way or the other and I am very much intend to use my own moral compass and all the evidence in front of me before I make any decision on any final scheme that is passed.

Now, we owe it to the 28,000 people that replied to look through those responses. We owe it to them all, we really do. To be able to set that aside would be the least democratic thing that we ever did as a council. We owe it to them.

The results of the consultation will be included in a final report to the GCP scheduled for June 2023. Now, as you know, the proposals as they currently stand do not have any form of charging being implemented until 2028. There is a long time to go before this. There will be further elections before all of this. There will be many, many chances for people to have their say and to have their voices heard. Thank you.

Question from South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Daniel Lentell to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

There we go. Councillors, thank you.

My name is Dan and I am the South Cambridgeshire District Councillor for Over and Willingham. Interestingly, in our neck of the woods we've had two by-elections since these proposals were made. One in Longstanton, Oakington and Northstowe that led to a 40% swing against the Lib Dems (the party I resigned from over this issue). And last week in Cottenham, Councillor Gough's neck of the woods, another 40% swing against the Lib Dems.

I wonder what came up?

This is an issue that affects me as the resident of Over and Willingham, with villages which are set to be considerably worse off if Addenbrooke's is included in the zone. Also as a South Cambs District Councillor for that ward, I can see the serious damage to trust and confidence in our system that will be done if such a large innovation is done without any kind of mandate - either in a regular election or through a referendum. And I would argue that one thing that you can all do, and we can all do, to turn the temperature down and to engage properly with the 'debate not hate' agenda is-

Ok, what is democratic about doing stuff to people without their consent? And what is liberal about doing stuff to people without their consent?

Thank you, Chair.

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Thank you. And thank you Dan for bringing this question. Addenbrooke's is obviously incredibly important to all of us. It is an institution which plays such a part in all of our lives. I know, myself, I have to thank the staff of Addenbrooke's for the help they have given to my family. Personally, I'll never forget having to rush my wife there from our wedding engagement party and standing by her bed for the next week as she recovered from serious illness. I'll never forget saying goodbye to one of my friends in the Papworth. I don't think I'll ever be able to thank the staff of Addenbrooke's enough for what they have done for all of us, and I think it's incredibly important that you bring these points, really important to all of us.

The story of transport at Addenbrooke's though isn't so simple. Representing Queen Edith's on the border of Addenbrooke's, I know first-hand what misery inconsiderate drivers visiting the hospital can cause. Both sides willing, Councillor Lentell, I'd be willing to introduce you to the residents of Red Cross to hear their personal stories, if you wanted to. Similarly, I've heard from other residents who have had to choose between staying at the hospital for the treatment they need or catching the last bus home. We've heard from Mike Moore, the Chair of Cambridge University Hospital, about the lack of public transport has on staff recruitment. All in all, transport around

Addenbrooke's is a difficult issue which requires much serious, thoughtful consideration. Serious consideration, which is often not possible given the binary and dividing nature of a referendum.

The GCP has carried out the biggest and most wide ranging consultation, as I've said before. 24,000 responses. It deliberately asked a range of open and closed questions so that those exact issues could be captured and analysed. We owe it to all of those residents to listen to all of those responses and analyse. I'm sure we'll hear much more discussion of the pros and cons of a referendum – I know we have one more question asking about it before the debate is closed – but we owe it to people to listen to what they say. Thank you.

Supplementary Question from South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Daniel Lentell to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

The M11 access corridors play absolutely no part in congestion into Cambridge. My residents do not need to have a pebble between them and their healthcare put up by the Labour and Lib Dem councillors in this room.

Charles I. That man of blood. He tried to put in a tax without consent. George III tried to do it - tax the thirteen colonies without their consent. Representation not happening. Over and over again, history is making the mistake you guys are doing right now.

So here's my question: Taxation without representation. Guys, please don't hand the county over to the Tories. Do this properly. Question mark.

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

I don't think any of us want to hand the current County Council over to the Conservatives. We have seen the widest ranging consultation the GCP has ever done and as I said before it is incumbent on us to look at what that says. People are able to give their representations - you being here today is your representation. We have seen however many people around, talking to us, sharing their issues, and I think all of that requires us to look carefully, to think carefully and to take this matter incredibly seriously, which is what it deserves. This is not a simple issue and I don't think just linking down to simple issues is the way forwards.

Question from Roy Stamp to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Don't you think it's funny that the only people who are happy for the consultation are the minority who are wanting to impose this new tax? By the minority I mean 19%, according to the latest polls. Yes, 81% of us stand against this. So why are the 19% in favour of a consultation? I know, they think they know, as you know, as we all know, that the only way you are able to bypass democracy is to force this through by appearing to listen to the people.

This is not democracy.

You, all of you here, our elected leaders know it. You have a duty to defend the democratic process. Not a single one of you stood for election on this issue, as been said earlier. You have no mandate and, therefore, do not have the authority to make a decision for us.

Do you really want to be responsible further down the line for making this decision on our behalf? I wouldn't. Not for all the tea in China.

Given the gravity of the proposal and the lack of public public trust in the consultation, do the Council not agree that the only decent, moral and democratic decision open to them is to grant the people their right to vote on this contentious issue? The issue ever discussed in this chamber.

Thank you for listening.

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Thank you. And thank you for coming and asking your question. I actually thought you were going to ask a question about foster carers. But that's fine. Ok. Ok. No problem. But thank you for coming along and asking your question. It is really vital that we have everybody engaged.

Originally, I believed you were raising an issue about foster carers and it is an incredibly important part to talk about is people with disabilities and how they are affected by this. I hear constantly issues of people being affected with disabilities, from a lack public transport, or parking issues, to blue badge holders, pavement parking affecting the blind, all the way up to how busy streets can overwhelm children suffering from autism.

There are- These are all things that need to be carefully considered. One of the big strengths of referenda is that they treat everybody voting equally. It is also one of their biggest weaknesses. Referenda are notoriously bad at considering the needs of minority groups, as we've just highlighted with this overview. Is it right that an able-bodied person who only visits Cambridge once a week gets the same voice as somebody who is disabled who lives and works in the city?

Is it right a seventeen year-old, reliant on public transport to get to an apprenticeship, gets no voice at all in a referendum?

What about somebody living in Saffron Waldon, but caring for somebody in the city? Again, they would get no vote in a referendum.

So, whilst I understand the desire for direct democracy (and we're about to have a big debate on this), be aware referenda can lead some of the very groups that we care about the most - the groups that we are trying to protect - to become marginalised and excluded.

Supplementary Question from Roy Stamp to Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Well I do thank you for all the disability parts that you said in that, cause I've got Parkinson's so I do have a disability.

Okay then, would you mind explaining to me something. The consultation could be completed by anybody, anybody in the whole wide world and that's been proved by IT consultants. IT consultants have verified that it is completely impossible to filter out all the multiple entries because of this. The data being used by the decision makers is not reliable for that fact. So, you're talking about the people who just live around. What about the people all over the world? You know, who voted in it. You know, who went for the consultation. Given the information, do the Council not agree that the only way is for a referendum and risk making the wrong decision for the wrong, undue and poor information?

I was here two weeks ago, when I heard about Gerri Bird and all the things that happened to her and I didn't know any of that, and that really worries me about all you councillors making a decision today and that could all have-

Response from Councillor Alex Beckett, Chair of the Highways and Transport Committee:

Thank you again. And the point about Councillor Bird is well heard. I don't know if you aware, but after Mill Road all of us that voted in favour had our public details shared online, with people being encouraged to come round to our houses and have it out with us.

That's not what we should be doing in public society.

It is really important that we all talk and talk about this. This is- this isn't really challenging issue. It really is. And I believe that. So we do really need to consider it really, really carefully and that needs to be done with people being care- careful and actually listening to each other.

Quickly to come back to your point about people voting from over word. That's actually a slight specialist subject of mine - I used to be an IT security professional. All I used to do is doing those sorts of things. So there are very many ways that you can look to exclude those, and to look at where people have voted from, and to take out multiple responses. Very happy to do that. The GCP will no doubt be looking very carefully at the data to make sure there's an accurate reflection of what people believe, and they will be doing an awful lot of analysis on it.

It is within our bounds and we should be looking at that data, listening to all of those voices and analysing it, and then us taking the very, very difficult decisions forwards after that. It isn't going to be an easy decision for any of us, but we need to be doing it carefully and considered.

Thank you.

County Council – 21 March 2023

Petitions

Petition relating to the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway

Statement from Mr James Littlewood, Chief Executive of Cambridge Past, Present and Future:

Morning Councillors.

I'm presenting this petition on behalf of my charity, as well as the parish councils of Coton and Hardwick, Coton Busway Action Group, Coton Loves Pollinators and Save the Westfields. As of this morning, 7,500 people have signed a petition asking you to save the Coton Green Corridor, spare Cambridgeshire's largest remaining traditional orchard and find a better transport solution. Part of the GCP's proposed bus route road runs through land that was purchased by my charity in the 1930s and protected by the National Trust to preserve the historic setting of Coton and Madingley villages and the valued landscapes around them.

David Attenborough has recently said 'Never has there been a more important time to invest in our own wildlife, to try and set an example for the rest of the world, and restore our once wild isles for future generations.' We submitted a proposal to the GCP in 2021 that would avoid causing irrecoverable harm to ecology and landscape and with fewer carbon emissions. It also addresses the problem that this scheme is trying to solve, which is congestion on the A31303 Madingley Hill from the roundabout at the A428 to the M11 in Cambridge. Bus lanes and priority measures would enable buses to bypass this congestion. There is enough space for our scheme without harming Madingley Wood and the American Cemetery - I know I have measured it. And an independent auditor confirmed our scheme is viable and worthy of consideration. Our proposal would meet the requirement in the Local Plan to provide a reliable public transport link between Cambourne and Cambridge. Our proposal would support buses running directly to the biomedical campus via the M11 and the science park via the A428, as well as central Cambridge. In our scheme, the cycle route does not go over the highest hill in Cambridge, but instead follows the valley along routes for bridleway - a route that's already been progressed as far as Hardwick as part of the Comberton Greenway. At a fraction of the cost, our scheme would achieve a very high value for money treasury rating compared to the poor rating of the proposal in front of you.

Last week's budget confirmed the government's commitment to progress East-West railway as far as Cambridge via Cambourne. This will offer significantly faster journey times to Cambridge's main employment sites than the bus road will, further weakening the already poor business case for the bus road. Our scheme would also have a fraction of the maintenance costs, reducing the Council's long-term liabilities. Peter Blake has informed me that he would not commission an assessment of our scheme unless he was instructed to do so by the GCP Board. Today, 7,500 people are asking you to require that appraisal to be carried out so that you can make an informed decision about which option represents the best value for public money, the environment and future generations.

Thank you.

Petition asking for a referendum on the Sustainable Travel Zone

Statement from Rory Comyn on behalf of Kieron Johnson, Chair of Cambs Against the Congestion Charge:

Good afternoon again, councillors.

I'm presenting this petition on behalf of Kieron Johnson, Chair of Cambs Against Congestion Charge, who are supported fully by Cambridgeshire Residents Group, the GMB Union [General, Municipal, Boilermakers' and Allied Trade Union] and thousands upon thousands of ordinary people who will have their lives impacted by the introduction of this new tax.

In addition to the 15,600 signatures on this petition, I feel it pertinent to mention the 29,000 signatures raised on Change.org petition, started by Liam Geraghty; as well as the 8,000 signatures raised by Anthony Brown.

Be under no illusion. The full weight of public opinion is presented here, with the current poll standing at 81% against the proposed congestion charge. And to dismiss this request in our opinion would send a frightful message to the people that you are supposed to represent. And we strongly advise you not to sow the wind.

I have heard Councillor Baigent of the GCP, Labour councillor for Romsey ward, state that it would be far too expensive to hold a referendum, that we simply cannot afford it. Well, the people of Cambridge have an answer for that. We can't afford not to hold a referendum. The care workers can't afford not to. The trades people can't afford not to. The small businesses can't afford not to. The infirm who don't qualify for blue badges can't afford not to. The low-income households can't afford not to. The GMB union state that their members can't afford not to. The thousands of residents that took to the streets to march to protest can't afford not to.

You can't afford to not hold this referendum either. Because the eyes of the whole of Cambridgeshire are upon you now, as our elected officials.

Where consultations fail, democracy must prevail. And this consultation has failed. The process has lost the trust of the people and for good reason. It is widely felt that the questions were weighted to achieve the outcomes desired by the GCP. Many valid points were able to be overlooked in final deliberations and, furthermore, the Council's decision is not bound by the outcome of a consultation in any case.

This consultation is not democracy. Referendum is.

Judging by what has been said in the media, we have a horrible suspicion that another argument that will be used by this Council to brush aside this fair and reasonable demand, is that the issue is far too nuanced for a simple yes/no vote to be appropriate. That argument may have held some weight had £350,000 of our money not been spent on a comprehensive campaign by the GCP to ensure that we are all fully aware of the supposed benefits that the proposed charge is set to deliver. Let me stress that we are not calling for a referendum on the more nuanced issues in any case. We simply demand that the GCP rethink their method of funding and adjust their ambitions accordingly. They must cut their coat according to their cloth.

Before you make your decision today, it falls to us to remind you all that not a single member of this chamber, or indeed all of Cambridgeshire, stood for election on this issue. That the Council, therefore, have no mandate to make a decision that will impact the lives of so many people.

There must be no taxation without representation.

It is a sad indictment that councillors have been rushing to remove their contact details from the public domain. Granted it's sensible a move, given that the current climate, but it shouldn't have to be that way. This is only necessary because the councillors are no longer representing the needs of their constituents and offering them support with their concerns.

It is time for attitudes to change.

We call upon you now to put aside your personal beliefs. To put aside what your party expects of you. To stand up proudly for democracy and the people that you represent. To acknowledge the people's lack of belief in the consultation. To have faith in their good judgement and ultimately to preserve the dignity of this chamber, by handing the burden of this dreadful decision to those whom it affects the most.

Thank you.

Item 7 (Minute 128) Better Public Transport: Cambourne to Cambridge Project – Conservative Amendment

Councillor Goldsack moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Criswell, as follows (additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough):

The Full Council is asked to:

- (a) Note the report, and the likely timescales for the formal consent process; and
- (b) Agree to:
 - (i) **Ask the Chief Executive to have an impartial report prepared to directly compare the on-road bus prioritisation scheme and separate cycle scheme proposals, put forward by Cambridge Past, Present and Future (CPPF), (including the ability to liaise with CPPF should any clarifications be required) against the largely segregated busway and maintenance track Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposal. The report to be produced to the best of their ability for the July meeting of Council, using latest available data and officers' best judgement to include direct comparisons between the two schemes for:**
 - 1. **Both legs of return journey times, to and from Cambourne to: (i) The West Cambridge Campus, (ii) The Addenbrooke's bio medical campus, (iii) The Cambridge Science Park and (iv) Cambridge City Centre, using public transport.**
 - 2. **Both legs of the return journey time for general traffic, to and from Cambourne to Cambridge City Centre.**
 - 3. **Estimated capital costs.**
 - 4. **Impact on the County Council finances for future maintenance costs.**
 - 5. **Delivery timescales and a judgement on whether both need powers of Transport and Works Act orders and compulsory purchasing powers.**
 - 6. **The difference in the ecological impacts of constructions that would therefore need to be mitigated.**
 - 7. **Impact on carbon net zero targets, considering both construction and longer-term impacts.**
 - 8. **The BCR for both schemes and a value for money judgement for both.**
 - 9. **Anticipated impact and timescales on both schemes should the Girton interchange be made all-way.**

10. Impact and timescales on both schemes and their BCR in relation to government announcements in the March budget and in May regarding details of proceeding with the East West rail proposal.

11. Officers best judgement on compliance with the Local Plan 2018.

(ii) This Council further delegates to the Chief Executive, in consultation with group leaders, the right to add (but not subtract) any other further important points of comparison felt need to be included in the report.

(c) Agree to:

(i) Delay considering recommendations ii to vi below until the July meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council, to enable the consideration of the report.

(i) (ii) Make an application under the provisions of Section 6 of the Transport and Works Act 1992 for an order authorising the construction and operation of a guided transport system from Cambourne to Cambridge;

(ii) (iii) Seek a direction from the Secretary of State under Section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that planning permission be deemed to be granted for the development provided for in the proposed C2C Order;

(iii) (iv) Authorise the GCP Executive Board:

(b) To progress negotiations with any owners of interests in the affected land and other persons affected by the scheme and to make necessary arrangements to acquire land or rights within the proposed C2C Order, whether by agreement or through the exercise of powers contained in the C2C Order;

(c) To progress negotiations with any affected parties or objectors to the C2C Order with the aim of avoiding, or securing the withdrawal of, any objections to the TWAO; and

(d) To promote the C2C Order through, and participation in, any public local inquiry or other processes and procedures arising or resulting from the submission of the application for the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO);

(iv) (v) The delegation of powers to the GCP Executive Board to:

(a) Prepare the necessary documents and any other evidence deemed appropriate to support the Transport and Works Act application;

(b) Undertake further design development work on the C2C Scheme and progress the ongoing statutory process, including further refinements to the C2C Order prior to submitting the Transport and

Works Act Order application and application for deemed planning permission; and

- (c) Deliver the C2C Scheme to practical completion subject to the C2C Order being made and deemed planning permission granted and to the approval of a full business case in line with any existing agreements and in compliance with the MoU between GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) in accordance with internal governance requirements and procurement best practice and in consultation with the Council's Section 151 Officer where appropriate; and

- ~~(v)~~ **(vi)** The delegation of powers to the Council's Section 151 Officer to negotiate, agree, enter into, execute and serve (where appropriate) all relevant legal agreements, notices and other documentation necessary to facilitate and underpin the C2C Order including provisions to protect the apparatus of statutory authorities which may lead to ongoing liabilities, and to submit the Transport and Works Act Order application, and the application that a direction be given that planning permission be deemed to be granted together with all supporting documents, and to prepare such further documents as may be required to support those applications, save that the C2C Order application will not be made until the satisfactory completion of agreements with the landowners of three development sites, namely Cambourne West, Bourn Airfield and West Cambridge as approved by the Section 151 Officer.

Voting Record for Item 7 (Minute 128) – Conservative Amendment

| COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote | | COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote |
|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|--|----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|
| AMBROSE-SMITH D | Con | X | | | | | HOWELL M | Con | X | | | |
| ATKINS M | Lib Dem | X | | | | | HOWITT R | Lab | | X | | |
| BATCHELOR H | Lib Dem | | | | X | | HOY S | Con | | | | X |
| BECKETT A | Lib Dem | | X | | | | KINDERSLEY S | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BILLINGTON K | Con | X | | | | | KING JONAS | Con | X | | | |
| BIRD G | Lab | | X | | | | KING MARIA | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BODEN C | Con | X | | | | | KING SIMON | Con | X | | | |
| BRADNAM A | Lib Dem | | X | | | | MCDONALD P | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BULAT A | Lab | | X | | | | MCGUIRE M | Con | X | | | |
| BYWATER S | Con | X | | | | | MESCHINI E | Lab | | X | | |
| CONNOR D | Con | X | | | | | MILNES B | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| CORNEY S | Con | X | | | | | MURPHY E | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| COSTELLO A | Con | X | | | | | NETHSINGHA L | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| COUNT S | Con | X | | | | | PRENTICE K | Con | X | | | |
| COUTTS P | Lib Dem | | X | | | | RAE | Lab | | X | | |
| CRISWELL S J | Con | X | | | | | REYNOLDS K | Con | X | | | |
| DAUNTON C | Lib Dem | | X | | | | SANDERSON T | Ind | | X | | |
| DEW D | Lib Dem | | X | | | | SCHUMANN DAN | Con | | | | X |
| DUPRE L | Lib Dem | | X | | | | SCHUMANN JOSH | Con | X | | | |
| FERGUSON S | Ind | | X | | | | SEEFF G | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| FRENCH J | Con | X | | | | | SHAILER N | Lab | | X | | |
| FULLER R | Con | X | | | | | SHARP A | Con | X | | | |
| GARDENER I | Con | X | | | | | SLATTER P | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| GAY N | Lab | | X | | | | SMITH M | Con | | | | X |
| GOLDSACK M | Con | X | | | | | TAYLOR S | Ind | | | | X |
| GOODLIFFE B | Lab | | X | | | | THOMPSON F | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| GOUGH N | Lib Dem | | X | | | | TIERNEY S | Con | X | | | |
| GOWING J | Con | X | | | | | VAN DE VEN S | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| HATHORN R | Lib Dem | | X | | | | WHELAN A | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| HAY A | Con | X | | | | | WILSON G | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| | | | | | | | Total | | 9 | 17 | | 4 |
| Total | | 16 | 14 | | 1 | | Complete Total | | 25 | 30 | | 5 |

Voting Record for Item 7 (Minute 128)

| COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote | COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote |
|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|
| AMBROSE-SMITH D | Con | | X | | | HOWELL M | Con | | X | | |
| ATKINS M | Lib Dem | X | | | | HOWITT R | Lab | X | | | |
| BATCHELOR H | Lib Dem | X | | | | HOY S | Con | | | | X |
| BECKETT A | Lib Dem | X | | | | KINDERSLEY S | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BILLINGTON K | Con | | X | | | KING JONAS | Con | | X | | |
| BIRD G | Lab | X | | | | KING MARIA | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BODEN C | Con | | X | | | KING SIMON | Con | | X | | |
| BRADNAM A | Lib Dem | X | | | | MCDONALD P | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BULAT A | Lab | X | | | | MCGUIRE M | Con | | X | | |
| BYWATER S | Con | | X | | | MESCHINI E | Lab | X | | | |
| CONNOR D | Con | | X | | | MILNES B | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| CORNEY S | Con | | X | | | MURPHY E | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| COSTELLO A | Con | | X | | | NETHSINGHA L | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| COUNT S | Con | | X | | | PRENTICE K | Con | | X | | |
| COUTTS P | Lib Dem | X | | | | RAE | Lab | X | | | |
| CRISWELL S J | Con | | X | | | REYNOLDS K | Con | | X | | |
| DAUNTON C | Lib Dem | X | | | | SANDERSON T | Ind | X | | | |
| DEW D | Lib Dem | X | | | | SCHUMANN DAN | Con | | X | | |
| DUPRE L | Lib Dem | X | | | | SCHUMANN JOSH | Con | | X | | |
| FERGUSON S | Ind | X | | | | SEEFF G | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| FRENCH J | Con | | X | | | SHAILER N | Lab | X | | | |
| FULLER R | Con | | X | | | SHARP A | Con | | X | | |
| GARDENER I | Con | | X | | | SLATTER P | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| GAY N | Lab | X | | | | SMITH M | Con | | X | | |
| GOLDSACK M | Con | | X | | | TAYLOR S | Ind | X | | | |
| GOODLIFFE B | Lab | X | | | | THOMPSON F | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| GOUGH N | Lib Dem | X | | | | TIERNEY S | Con | | X | | |
| GOWING J | Con | | X | | | VAN DE VEN S | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| HATHORN R | Lib Dem | X | | | | WHELAN A | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| HAY A | Con | | X | | | WILSON G | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| | | | | | | Total | | 18 | 11 | | 1 |
| Total | | 15 | 15 | | 0 | Complete Total | | 33 | 26 | | 1 |

Voting Record for Item 10a) (Minute 133)

| COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote | COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote |
|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|------------------|
| AMBROSE-SMITH D | Con | | X | | | HOWELL M | Con | | | | X |
| ATKINS M | Lib Dem | X | | | | HOWITT R | Lab | X | | | |
| BATCHELOR H | Lib Dem | | | | X | HOY S | Con | | | | X |
| BECKETT A | Lib Dem | X | | | | KINDERSLEY S | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BILLINGTON K | Con | | | | X | KING JONAS | Con | | X | | |
| BIRD G | Lab | X | | | | KING MARIA | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BODEN C | Con | | X | | | KING SIMON | Con | | X | | |
| BRADNAM A | Lib Dem | X | | | | MCDONALD P | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| BULAT A | Lab | X | | | | MCGUIRE M | Con | | X | | |
| BYWATER S | Con | | X | | | MESCHINI E | Lab | X | | | |
| CONNOR D | Con | | X | | | MILNES B | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| CORNEY S | Con | | X | | | MURPHY E | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| COSTELLO A | Con | | X | | | NETHSINGHA L | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| COUNT S | Con | | X | | | PRENTICE K | Con | | | | X |
| COUTTS P | Lib Dem | X | | | | RAE C | Lab | X | | | |
| CRISWELL S J | Con | | X | | | REYNOLDS K | Con | | X | | |
| DAUNTON C | Lib Dem | X | | | | SANDERSON T | Ind | X | | | |
| DEW D | Lib Dem | X | | | | SCHUMANN DAN | Con | | | | X |
| DUPRE L | Lib Dem | X | | | | SCHUMANN JOSH | Con | | | | X |
| FERGUSON S | Ind | X | | | | SEEFF G | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| FRENCH J | Con | | X | | | SHAILER N | Lab | X | | | |
| FULLER R | Con | | | | X | SHARP A | Con | | X | | |
| GARDENER I | Con | | X | | | SLATTER P | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| GAY N | Lab | X | | | | SMITH M | Con | | X | | |
| GOLDSACK M | Con | | X | | | TAYLOR S | Ind | | | | X |
| GOODLIFFE B | Lab | X | | | | THOMPSON F | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| GOUGH N | Lib Dem | X | | | | TIERNEY S | Con | | X | | |
| GOWING J | Con | | X | | | VAN DE VEN S | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| HATHORN R | Lib Dem | X | | | | WHELAN A | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| HAY A | Con | | X | | | WILSON G | Lib Dem | X | | | |
| | | | | | | Total | | 17 | 7 | | 6 |
| Total | | 14 | 13 | | 3 | Complete Total | | 31 | 20 | | 10 |

Voting Record for Item 10b) (Minute 133)

| COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote | COUNCILLOR | Party | For | Against | Abstain | Absent / No Vote |
|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|------------------|----------------|---------|-----|---------|---------|------------------|
| AMBROSE-SMITH D | Con | X | | | | HOWELL M | Con | X | | | |
| ATKINS M | Lib Dem | | X | | | HOWITT R | Lab | | X | | |
| BATCHELOR H | Lib Dem | | X | | | HOY S | Con | | | | X |
| BECKETT A | Lib Dem | | X | | | KINDERSLEY S | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BILLINGTON K | Con | | | | X | KING JONAS | Con | X | | | |
| BIRD G | Lab | | X | | | KING MARIA | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BODEN C | Con | X | | | | KING SIMON | Con | X | | | |
| BRADNAM A | Lib Dem | | X | | | MCDONALD P | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| BULAT A | Lab | | X | | | MCGUIRE M | Con | X | | | |
| BYWATER S | Con | X | | | | MESCHINI E | Lab | | X | | |
| CONNOR D | Con | X | | | | MILNES B | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| CORNEY S | Con | X | | | | MURPHY E | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| COSTELLO A | Con | X | | | | NETHSINGHA L | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| COUNT S | Con | X | | | | PRENTICE K | Con | X | | | |
| COUTTS P | Lib Dem | | X | | | RAE | Lab | | X | | |
| CRISWELL S J | Con | X | | | | REYNOLDS K | Con | X | | | |
| DAUNTON C | Lib Dem | | X | | | SANDERSON T | Ind | | X | | |
| DEW D | Lib Dem | | X | | | SCHUMANN DAN | Con | X | | | |
| DUPRE L | Lib Dem | | X | | | SCHUMANN JOSH | Con | X | | | |
| FERGUSON S | Ind | | X | | | SEEFF G | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| FRENCH J | Con | X | | | | SHAILER N | Lab | | X | | |
| FULLER R | Con | | | | X | SHARP A | Con | X | | | |
| GARDENER I | Con | X | | | | SLATTER P | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| GAY N | Lab | | X | | | SMITH M | Con | X | | | |
| GOLDSACK M | Con | X | | | | TAYLOR S | Ind | | | | X |
| GOODLIFFE B | Lab | | X | | | THOMPSON F | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| GOUGH N | Lib Dem | | X | | | TIERNEY S | Con | X | | | |
| GOWING J | Con | X | | | | VAN DE VEN S | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| HATHORN R | Lib Dem | | X | | | WHELAN A | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| HAY A | Con | X | | | | WILSON G | Lib Dem | | X | | |
| | | | | | | Total | | 11 | 17 | | 2 |
| Total | | 13 | 15 | | 2 | Complete Total | | 24 | 32 | | 4 |

