

**ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2017

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 11.25 p.m.

**Present:** Councillors: D Adey, D Ambrose-Smith, I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, R Fuller, N Kavanagh, D Giles, S Tierney, J Williams and T Wotherspoon (Vice Chairman).

**Apologies:** None

**45. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Fuller declared a non-statutory (non-pecuniary) disclosable interest as the Cabinet member for Housing and Planning at Huntingdonshire District Council with responsibility for developing the Local Plan for the District area and took no part in the discussion or voting on the report on Huntingdonshire Local Plan. With regard to the same report, Councillor Giles declared a disclosable non pecuniary interest as a member of Huntingdonshire District Council.

**46. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

**47. MINUTE ACTION LOG**

The Minutes Action Log update was noted with the following updates:

**A10 Ely to Kings Lynn**

Action a) Officers meeting with Cllr Ambrose-Smith to discuss issues around:

- the impact of new housing development and local business expansion around Littleport / Ely when assessing the improvement proposals for the A10
- need to prioritise the provision of a cycleway between Littleport and Ely

as the meeting had not yet taken place, Cllr Ambrose-Smith requested this action should be shown as ongoing.

action b) seeking confirmation from the Mayor of the Combined Authority regarding the priority status of improvements to the A10. The Service Director Strategy and Development indicated that officers had arranged to meet with both Greater Cambridge Partnership and Combined Authority officers to brief them on the Cambridge to Ely study and allow them to brief their respective Boards. It was anticipated that this would lead to a joint meeting of the Boards together with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee to discuss taking forward the results of the Cambridge to Ely Study.

## Land North of Cherry Hinton

The Chairman highlighted that at his request the officers would be organising a meeting between him, the Vice Chairman and local Members to discuss the issues around the proposed spine road in advance of the preparation of a report to the Committee. Councillor Williams requested that he should also be invited to the meeting as it affected his Fulbourn division.

### 48. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

One Petition was received with over 200 signatures presented by Gloria Schumperli a local resident of Cherry Hinton calling for the reinstatement of Bus Route 17 return journeys during the day time ideally at the level they were before January 2017 running every two hours from 8 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. or alternatively:

- In addition to the 7.50am and 6.20 pm one-way existing journeys, to reinstate two return journeys, one around 10 am and another around 2pm. This will give the users of Bus Route 17 a partial solution to their current problems. Alternatively,
- To restructure current bus journeys to allow some other bus services such as 114 and 196, for example, to be rerouted so that the Coldhams Lane area is serviced, from the junction of Coldhams Lane and High Street Cherry Hinton, to the junction of Coldhams Lane and Newmarket Road. Or, alternatively,
- To allow bus users with bus concessions to be able to use Bus Route 17 at 7.50 am on daily basis without restrictions. This means making their bus concessions valid before 9.30 a.m. on Bus Route 17.

The supporting detail of the presentation had been circulated to Members of the Committee the day before the meeting and which drawn on for the presentation is attached as Appendix 1 to these Minutes.

Questions of clarification to the petition presenter included:

- Asking had she had any dialogue with the bus company regarding her request. In reply she indicated she had not, but had attended a Bus Forum meeting which included service representatives from Stagecoach regarding the 114 service and her impression from that meeting was that the services were going to be withdrawn. The Member who had asked the question suggested her next step should be to speak to the Bus Company directly.
- Another Councillor picking up on the point she had made suggesting restructuring current bus journeys to allow some other bus services such as 114 and 196, for example, to be rerouted so that the Coldhams Lane area was serviced, asked if she was aware that the buses she had mentioned were double deckers and would not be able to travel along Coldhams Lane due to the low bridge. He asked which end she was referring to and if the Cherry Hinton end

asked why the Citi 1 was not suitable. In reply she indicated that in relation to the other bus services her location required a 15 minute walk to the nearest bus stop for either of them.

The petition spokeswoman asked for clarification whether the Committee was able to make recommendations to change bus routes. In response, the Chairman explained that a full written reply was to be provided within 10 working days following the meeting but that an important factor was whether it was a subsidised or commercial route. Officers clarified that it was the latter, and as a result, the commercial decision of the company to change times / to withdraw services was a commercial decision for which the Council had no responsibility.

**It was resolved:**

to provide a written response to the petition organiser and spokesperson Gloria Schumperli within 10 working days.

**49. SUPPORTED BUS SERVICES TOTAL TRANSPORT MEMBER STEERING GROUP**

At the Economy & Environment Committee on 10th August 2017 officers were requested to undertake a full Countywide review of contracted bus services and community transport provision with a view to identifying further efficiencies and alternative means of provision. As a first stage to this, officers were asked to come back to Committee with Terms of Reference for the Review to include members as part of the review group.

This report proposed amending the Terms of Reference for the existing Total Transport Member Steering Group and that the Group's membership be increased from eight to twelve and its remit be increased with the details and reasons set out in the report.

In discussion views expressed included one Member being of the view that 12 was too many for the group, while another suggested it would be appropriate that one of the new Members should be drawn from Cambridge City due to the number of bus routes affected by recent changes. As a response to this another Member highlighted the lack of Fenland representation.

On the basis that the four additional places being sought on the Total Transport Member Policy Steering Group would be filled on a proportionality basis, and as at the meeting neither the Conservative Group or the Liberal Democrat Group was in a position to propose its nominations, a delegation was given to the Chairman and Vice Chairman as set out below in resolution c).

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree to amend the responsibility of the current Total Transport Member Policy Steering Group;
- b) Agree to the proposed amendments as set out in para 2.2 to 2.5 to the Terms of Reference,

- c) Ask the Political Groups to provide Democratic Services outside of the meeting with their nominations for the additional four members to the Total Transport Member Policy Steering Group and that a delegation be given to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee in consultation with the Executive Director Economy, Transport and Environment to agree the additional four places. (*Post meeting note: Councillors Bates, Criswell, Fuller and Nethsingha were confirmed as the Members to take the four additional places*)

## 50. TRANSPORT INVESTMENT PLAN (TIP) SCHEME LIST

This report requested consideration and approval of the Transport Investment Plan (TIP) for Cambridgeshire setting out the transport infrastructure, services and initiatives required to support the growth of Cambridgeshire. The TIP Scheme List was reviewed and updated on a regular basis to take account of any changes in policy, legislation, funding, development proposals and scheme delivery. It was highlighted that the list had been updated to the end of August and therefore some of the schemes listed may have since been completed.

The TIP Scheme List was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and was presented with the schemes grouped by District with each scheme containing information on:

- Category – Cycling, Walking, Public transport, Traffic & highway, and Safety
- Scheme location
- Scheme description
- Strategy basis
- The scheme's associated Programme

In discussion:

- The Council Cycling Champion expressed his disappointment that the List had few proposed cycle schemes for Fenland.
- One Member suggested that an additional column was required to show funding sources and cost details. In response to this and another question it was explained that the schemes in the TIP were un-prioritised, and that the information in the report was part of a larger document which included financial information. However the costings and funding was not made public due to financial confidentiality.

The Committee supported the Chairman's proposal that the most up to date district scheme list, including funding source information, should be sent to all the County Council members in each district area in a confidential e-mail to help facilitate their dialogue with district and parish council colleagues. **Action: E Evans**

It was resolved to:

- (a) approve the Transport Plan 2017

(b) officers to send to all the local County Councillors the extract from the latest version of TIF which applied to their district area to enable them to undertake any further necessary discussions with other tier councillors.

## 51. HUNTINGDONSHIRE LOCAL PLAN TO 2036; CONSULTATION DRAFT 2017

Due to the timescale involved for the 'Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036: Consultation Draft 2017', officers had already submitted the response attached as an appendix to the report to Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC). This report asked the Committee to comment on and endorse the County Council's response.

The report highlighted that the 2017 draft (which had taken on board previous comments made on earlier draft consultations):

- Excluded the Wyton Airfield allocation as a result of the Strategic Transport Study which had demonstrated that the road infrastructure requirements to re-develop the area were undeliverable.
- Excluded the former Forensic Science Laboratory site at Hinchbrook. There were no plans to include the site at Gifford's Park near St Ives as an allocation or any reference to RAF Molesworth.

The key issues highlighted were:

**Renewable Energy** - the County Council had objected to policy 'LP36, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy' which identified that no planning applications for any wind development across the district would be supported. As drafted, it would act as an impediment to the delivery of the County Council's Corporate Energy Strategy.

**Education** With regard to the Strategic Expansion Location at Alconbury Weald and particularly the proposal to allocate an additional 1,680 homes on the site of RAF Alconbury, the County Council would need to future proof the secondary school site in order to respond to additional demand for school places should dwelling numbers exceed those indicated in the Plan. The Enterprise Zone would bring around 8,000 jobs by 2036 which was likely to include a large number of parents requiring childcare and therefore the Plan needed to consider working parents. The Loves Farm Reserved Site has been left out of the St Neots Eastern Expansion which currently had significant issues relating to the availability of primary school places in the area. The allocation made no reference to education and how the impact of the primary aged school children arising from this development would be mitigated.

**Transport** The Committee was asked to ignore paragraph 2.7 of the report which referenced transport as this had been included in error. It was highlighted that as the County Council officers had been working closely with HDC on various strategies and projects, they were able to confirm that the aims and objectives of the Local Plan aligned with the relevant County Council strategies and were therefore fully supported.

In discussion one local Member in confirming the great concerns locally regarding the education provision at Loves Farm. He also highlighted the issue of affordable housing provision. In response it was agreed that the lead officer would contact officers in

Having considered the response,

It was resolved to:

- a) Endorse the response as set out in Appendix 1 to the officer's report.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

North Uttlesford sits adjacent to South Cambridgeshire, with the villages of Linton, Great and Little Abington, Duxford and Hinxtton all being close to the shared boundary. This report considered the key issues and impact upon Cambridgeshire residents / Council services raised by the local draft plan.

The Plan proposed to provide new dwellings at two existing market towns (Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow), larger villages and through development of three new garden communities at:-

1. North Uttlesford (land adjacent to the Cambridgeshire boundary to the east of the A11 between Hinxtton and Linton);
2. Easton Park (to the east of Stansted Airport); and
3. West Braintree (land west of Braintree town centre).

The North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC) proposal was of most significance for Cambridgeshire, due to its proximity to the County and the potential impacts (both positive and negative) on infrastructure and employment opportunities.

Set out in paragraphs 2.8 – 2.12 of the report was a summary of the key issues with Appendix 1 containing the officer response submitted to meet the deadline of 4<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

Key issues highlighted included:

**EDUCATION** - As NUGC planned to provide for its own education needs, as detailed in the report it was considered that there would not be any long term impact on Cambridgeshire schools. In the shorter term, there needed to be early provision of education infrastructure for the development. Any reliance on Cambridgeshire schools would need to be agreed with the County Council, prior to any planning approvals, and measures put in place to secure any associated funding requirements.

**TRANSPORT** - County Council officers had concerns that NUGC was reliant on large scale improvements to the A505 of which no scheme had currently been identified or firm timescales for study work to begin. Developer funded improvements could potentially accommodate a certain level of homes and Officers wished to continue dialogue with Uttlesford District Council (UDC) on the referred to cap and the potential reliance upon utilising any spare capacity on the Cambridgeshire network. Officers also had a number of concerns relating to the transport work assumptions and for these

reasons, an objection was recommended on transport matters. The officer recommendations and above objection was supported by District Councillor Tony Orgee who had submitted comments to the Chairman expressing concerns regarding the impact of the Plan on the local road network.

In discussion issues raised by Members included:

- Highlighting that the Greater Cambridge Partnership were looking into a potential busway option along a disused railway line in Sawston that could help alleviate some of the transport concerns. He made the point that Whittlesford rail station would be the closest station for those who wished to commute to London and that UDC needed to look at modelling the transport pressures from the new development as well as ensuring the Greater Cambridge Partnership were taking into account this new development to the south in terms of their own transport plans.
- Raising a concern that the response made no reference to either flood mitigation measures - highlighting that in February Hinxton, Icleton and Duxford had all suffered flooding - or to the adequacy / capacity to provide sufficient water and sewage supply to the new community. In response **the lead officers undertook to consult further with the County Council's Flood and Water Team on why they had not commented, and whether any further response was required on this issue and would copy the Committee into the response received. Action: Colum Fitzsimons.**

Having considered the response, it was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Endorse the response as set out in Appendix 1.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

### 53. CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN : DRAFT PLAN JULY 2017

Central Bedfordshire share a boundary with South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire with key transport routes, such as the A1, A428 and the East Coast Mainline railway passing through Central Bedfordshire. As part of Central Bedfordshire Council's preparation for a new Local Plan for the provision for between 20,000 and 30,000 new homes (in addition to the already identified 23,000 homes) a Draft Plan was published and consulted on during July and August.

The Plan proposed a number of strategic growth locations, two of which were in close proximity to Cambridgeshire as detailed in the report and were therefore likely to have significant impacts on strategic and local transport networks. The report summarised the key strategic transport issues arising and the implications for Cambridgeshire. A detailed set of transport comments had been sent to Central Bedfordshire in advance of their deadline for responses, as attached at Appendix 1 to the Officer Report. A significant amount of the proposed development was dependent on improvements to strategic transport networks including the A1 and A428/A421 corridor, plus the

development of critical new infrastructure, like the proposed East-West Railway and the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

On the developments the following issues were highlighted:

**Four new villages east of Biggleswade** - This proposal was to develop a network of linked villages to the south of Sutton, west of Dunton and east of Biggleswade. The development was dependent on improvements to the A1 and the local road network. Improvements to public transport links to Biggleswade train station will also be required. The Council supported the aim of improving public transport, walking and cycling links to Biggleswade railway station in order to maximise rail mode shares.

**New market town near Tempsford** - Full scale development here was dependent on improvements to existing transport infrastructure, such as the A1 and A428 and on assumptions about the route of the proposed East-West Rail. A station at the new development would be critical to supporting this development. It was confirmed in discussion that a preferred route for East-West Rail, would not be established until the end of this year, with route options both north and south of Sandy currently under consideration. Officers therefore considered that more detailed deliberation of the strategic infrastructure requirements and timings of the above to support the proposed development was needed.

The scale of growth along the A1 Corridor and combined with proposed growth at Wyboston in the Bedford Local Plan would have a significant impact on the transport network in Cambridgeshire and therefore the development in Central Bedfordshire needed to demonstrate that the impacts on the Cambridgeshire transport network could be mitigated, and that account required to be taken of the congestion issues with the aim to promote travel by non-car modes. Any infrastructure proposals for the A428 corridor resulting from the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan should look to complement the A428 bus priority proposals being developed as part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Other issues highlighted included:

- That residents of Gamlingay in South Cambridgeshire had a strong desire for cycle connections between the village and Sandy Railway Station to be improved and that there should be collaborative work to achieve these aspirations.
- No information has been provided on the nature and scale of impacts of the development on the road network outside of Central Bedfordshire, particularly on the B1040 and B1042 into Cambridgeshire.
- That development on the scale proposed would require highway improvements to the local and strategic network. As a result the main recommendation from the officers was that the County Council should continue to work with Central Bedfordshire Council on transport matters as the Local Plan process progressed.

In discussion issues highlighted included:

- Two Huntingdonshire members expressing their concerns regarding the impact of the development on St Neots, with concerns that the Plan was no more than a



wish list that did not address transportation issues, the provision of jobs for the new communities or the impact of the proposed new science and technology business park on other businesses in the A428 corridor.

- That the proposed response was not sufficiently robust in respect of infrastructure concerns and the effect of plans on the A428 and surrounding Cambridgeshire villages / towns, compared to those sent by the district councils. Questions were raised on whether Officers should consult with their counterpart officers in South Cambs and Hunts. In response to the concerns, the Chairman agreed that the County Council's officers' should seek the views of colleagues in the District Councils in order to ensure if possible, a more joined up consensual approach on shared concerns. He asked that the officers should bring back their conclusions to the Chairman and Vice Chairman in order to see if any further changes should be made as an additional response as part of the delegation resolution.

Having considered the response,

It was unanimously resolved to:

- a) Endorse the response as set out in Appendix 1.
- b) Delegate to the Executive Director (Economy, Transport and Environment) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee the authority to make minor changes to the response.

#### **54. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – AUGUST 2017**

Economy and Environment Committee received the latest Finance and Performance Report for the period to the end of August 2017 to enable them to both note and comment on the projected financial and performance outturn position.

It was highlighted that:

**Revenue:** That at this stage of the year ETE was forecasting an overspend of £49k a reduction of £128k from the previous report. There was an estimated £1m pressure on waste which came under Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee with underspends on the Concessionary Fares budget estimated at £400k which were being used to partially offset this pressure.

**Capital;** A successful bid was made to the Department of Transport to secure £1.3m of capital funding from the Safer Roads Fund for A303 improvements to be completed by 2018-19. Pressures relating to land purchase for the Kings Dyke overpass and pressures on the Ely Southern Bypass Scheme were again detailed in Appendix 6 of the report.

**Performance:** on the revised suite of fourteen performance indicators, two were currently showing as red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area and the average journey time per mile during the morning peak on the most congested routes) three were showing as amber, and nine green. At year-end the current forecast was

that only one performance indicator would be red (Local bus journeys originating in the authority area).

It was resolved to:

note the report.

**55. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2018-2019 TO 2022-23**

This report provided the Committee with an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for Economy, Transport and Environment that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee.

Changes to the previous year's budget had been forward as individual proposals for consideration by committees, General Purposes Committee (GPC) and ultimately Full Council. Proposals were classified according to their type, as outlined in Table 3 of the appendix accounting for the forecasts of inflation, demand pressures and service pressures, as well as savings. In order to balance the budget savings or additional income of £37.2m was required for 2018-19, and a total of £85m across the full five years of the Business Plan. The tables in the report showed that £5.540m of residual savings was still to be identified in 2018-19 with section 3.3 detailing the actions currently being undertaken to close the gap

It was noted that Committees would receive a further update report on the revenue business planning proposals in December at which point they would be asked to endorse the proposals to GPC as part of the consideration for the Council's overall Business Plan.

The Chairman highlighted and the Committee noted that Strategic Management Team had set up 12 Outcome Focussed Reviews and that he had been asked to sit on the one set up for Total Transport.

In respect of the budget saving heading B/R 6.104 'Partners Contribution to Removing Park and Ride Charges' for which the County Council would pick up half the cost involved, this would take effect from April 2018.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the overview and context provided for the 2018-19-2022-23 Business Plan Revenue proposals for the Service.
- b) To note the draft revenue proposals that were within the remit of the Economy and Environment Committee for 2018-19 to 2022-23

**56. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN**

The Committee noted the most up to date version of its Training Plan.

**57. ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

Having received the forward agenda plans as set out in the agenda:

It was resolved to note the agenda plan with the following additions / potential additions:

That subject to Chairman /Vice Chairman approval the following reports will be rescheduled

from 16<sup>th</sup> November Committee

- a) Land North of Cherry Hinton – Spine Road Moving to 7<sup>th</sup> December
- b) Planning Obligations Strategy moving to 8<sup>th</sup> February

The following key decision report to be added to the 8<sup>th</sup> February Committee:

Ely Bypass Costs - Author/Presenter – Brian Stinton

**Councillor Fuller asked when the Committee would see the St Neots Master Plan. The Service Director Strategy and Development undertook to find out and also as part of this query, ask the Combined Authority how they would engage on this with all the relevant authorities. Action Bob Menzies**

**58. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING 10 A.M. THURSDAY 16<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2017**

**Chairman: 16th November 2017**

**Petition for Reinstating Bus Route 17 Return Journeys During Day Time**  
**Detail for the presentation from Gloria Schumperli the organiser and petition presenter**

In the past, Bus Route 17 used to run hourly from Mondays to Saturdays doing return journeys every time. Four years ago the frequency of the bus was reduced to return journeys every two hours only. This made for 6 return journeys a day. This year, from the beginning of January, all 17 Route buses were stopped, with the exception of one bus going to the city centre at approximately 7.50 in the morning, and a return bus from the city centre at approximately 6.20 in the evening. This means that all the areas cover by Route 17 are not longer serviced during the day time. And the only 2 buses running are only one-way buses mainly used by people going to work in the early morning and returning home late in the evening.

This has been an unfortunate decision affecting a considerable number of people. A great number of bus users are senior citizens. This means people who are not car drivers any longer, people who have, in many cases, health issues and people who, on the whole, rely on public transport to carry out their daily activities. One such activity is the weekly shopping that many senior citizens carry it out with the help of trolleys. Many senior citizens are people with walking difficulties which means that they rely on the use of walkers which adds to the problems of moving about and getting to places. These people are particularly affected by the withdrawal of Bus Route 17 day services.

If you would see the difficulties they face to be able to get to places you would understand their concern. It is hard for many senior citizens to moved about, in the best of circumstances, but particularly so if transport is not available.

Not everybody has a son or daughter or a neighbour who can give a hand and, anyway, many senior citizens feel pride on being independent. This has been jeopardised by the current changes. Also, not only the elderly but also mothers with young children and people from all ages have been affected.

I was a frequent user of Bus Route 17. I live in the Coldham's Lane area and the withdrawal of the bus services has affected greatly my chances to use public transport and my access to key shopping areas and the city centre services. As the only bus running in the morning is the 7.50 am bus I cannot use it as my Bus Concession only works from 9.30 in the morning but there are not buses running at that time. If I was to use the 7.50 am bus I would need to pay for the ticket which I cannot afford because I have a low income. Many other senior citizens face the same problem.

Bus 17 used to serve the Beehive centre where ASDA is located. Compared to other supermarkets ASDA prices offer a more affordable shopping outlet and it was favour by many users of Bus 17. These people have been greatly affected as they cannot longer do their weekly shopping at ASDA. This means, their weekly expenses are higher. I know of Bus 17 users that are forced to pay for taxis in order to manage their weekly shopping. This means that a decision made by Stagecoach has dear consequences for ordinary people. This means that people's livelihoods are affected negatively by such decisions at a time when prices keep rising and the pound keeps losing its buying power.

There are some very important questions that need answering:

Why the transport routes offered by Stagecoach are unable to cover all main areas of the city?

For example, Coldhams Lane runs from the High Street of Cherry Hinton, crosses over the Sainsburys roundabout and continues all the way to the Newmarket Road. However, such a long and vital road which is a very busy road, is no longer serviced by any Stagecoach Route, due to the withdrawal of day time Bus Route 17.

Why citizens that are opting for public transport rather than the use of private cars are being ignored and the bus services they used to rely on have been withdrawn?

Citizens that rely on public transport - something that it is in the interest of reducing traffic congestion on the roads and it is supposed to be in the political agenda of the council and the government at large – cannot be offered bus routes that cover key areas of the road network of the city such as Coldhams Lane, for example. This is a contradiction in terms.

I have run a collection of signatures among people in my neighbourhood who want to see Bus Route 17 being reinstated during the day time. This petition has been supported by many of the businesses from the Beehive Shopping Centre who also signed the petition.

Coldhams Lane is earmarked for further housing developments. At present there are two main building developments being implemented. One is at the corner of Coldhams Lane and Hatherdene Close, with 56 new houses already authorised to be built and with works starting in the very near future. The other is at the corner of Coldhams Lane and Rosemary Lane with, approximately, 40 new dwellings, which are being erected as I speak and will be ready for occupation at the beginning of 2018. This is an indicator that Coldhams Lane is becoming highly residential and the area deserves to have proper public transport availability which at the moment amounts to zero as there are not bus routes running through it. Two sporadic bus journeys without return services are a mockery of transport availability.

Some possible solutions to the current situation

1. To reinstate Bus Route 17 services as they were before January 2017. This is, running every two hours, from 8am to 6pm. It would be a total of 6 return journeys daily. This would be the ideal solution. Or, alternatively,
2. In addition to the 7.50am and 6.20 pm one-way existing journeys, to reinstate two return journeys, one around 10 am and another around 2pm. This will give the users of Bus Route 17 a partial solution to their current problems. Alternatively,
3. To restructure current bus journeys to allow some other bus services such as 114 and 196, for example, to be rerouted so that the Coldhams Lane area is serviced, from the junction of Coldhams Lane and High Street Cherry Hinton, to the junction of Coldhams Lane and Newmarket Road. Or, alternatively,
4. To allow bus users with bus concessions to be able to use Bus Route 17 at 7.50 am on daily basis without restrictions. This means making their bus concessions valid before 9.30 a.m. on Bus Route 17.

I hope you have an idea of the difficulties customers of Bus Route 17 are experiencing at present. We hope some adequate solution can be found by the relevant authorities.

