

**(SPECIAL) ENVIRONMENT  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**27 September 2005  
10.00am – 12.41pm

**PRESENT:** Councillors Reid (Chair), Adey, Baker, Bradnack, Durrant, Herbert, Holland and Ward (Vice Chair).

**ALSO PRESENT:** Executive Councillors Cllr Bailey (Planning and Transport), Cllr C Rosenstiel (Deputy Leader)

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****05/ENV/55 Apologies For Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Stuart and Kightley.

**05/ENV/56 Declarations Of Interest**

Codes of Conduct personal interests were declared as follows:

Cllr Durrant as Co Chair of Cambridge Futures (a planning policy think tank).

**05/ENV/57 Cambridgeshire Long Term Strategy**

The meeting began with a presentation from Mr Brett of Atkins who had been undertaking work for the County Council on the long term transport strategy. (see [www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/councillors/comtabl5.htm](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/councillors/comtabl5.htm) and call up 27 September agenda for the presentation). Paul Cook, County Council Transport Planning Officer was also present.

Councillor Bradnack asked whether Atkins has taken into account a scenario of the Guided Bus not going ahead and if fuel costs increased dramatically over the study period (to 2021). Mr Brett stated that if the Guided Bus did not go ahead more work would need to be done on the public transport element of the study covering the A14 corridor. With regard to higher than modelled fuel costs, that in itself would result in a higher reduction in car use. He also undertook to provide the members with more detailed figures for the urban area, as the figures given in the presentation were for the sub-region. Members noted that the study was the strategic view with the detailed site by site work to follow. The County Council would make the information available to Scrutiny Committee members as it became available.

*Action by Atkins/County Council officers*

Councillor Durrant asked how much work in the study had been done on congestion charging. Mr Brett stated that the model had worked up scenarios based on time equivalent outcomes. Road pricing or other ways of demand management could arrive at these outcomes. The work so far had not looked at how any form of demand management (including road pricing) would be undertaken.

---

Councillor Adey asked whether the model had investigated the re regulation of the bus industry; changes to the City Core Traffic Management Scheme; future improvements to the rail system (e.g. Thameslink 2000, increased frequency to Ipswich); growth in employer green travel schemes. Mr Brett stated that the model has taken into account improvements to the bus service (but not re-regulation), it assumed the Core Scheme as it was now, employer green travel schemes were part of overall future demand management. With rail, the model was based on the advice from the Strategic Rail Authority, although he would check to see if the Thameslink 2000 scheme had been incorporated and the increase in trains from Ipswich.

*Action by Atkins*

Councillor Baker asked if the model had thrown up any surprises and to clarify that the access road to Addenbrookes was an access road and nothing more. Mr Brett stated that more work would need to be done on the traffic needs of the south eastern sector of the City. However, the model had shown that there was no case for an orbital route in the north and west of the City.

Councillor Bradnack referred to the Cambridge Futures study and tunnelling routes. Councillor Reid referred to University studies which had suggested the tunnelling costs were much less than the Cambridge Futures study proposed and would provide the information to Atkins. Mr Brett advised the Scrutiny Committee that he was aware of the Cambridge Futures study, but was not starting from a blank sheet. The Atkins model and transport planning work is based on realistic timescales, deliverability and funding.

In response to a request from Councillor Reid, Mr Brett undertook to provide details of the assumed bus speeds in the model, so that it can be differentiated between the car times (e.g. across town).

*Action by Atkins*

Turning to the report from the Head of Policy and Projects, members noted that the model will have taken into account the projected growth in employment in the City and related changes to transport movements. Mr Brett undertook to provide members with the figures of trip movements to and from new City development sites which had been taken from the Structure Plan

*Action by Atkins*

Councillor Durrant wanted greater transparency in debate on the long term transport strategy. He stated that the City had agreed future land use without taking into account transport planning, the County Council would not debate Congestion Charging and neither Authority had looked at the Cambridge Futures study in any detail. He was of the view that there should be research on an orbital route and congestion charging.

Councillor Bradnack proposed an amendment to recommendation (b):  
“after demand management add ‘and the range of proposals for orbital and other additional routes identified by Cambridge Futures in their study ‘What Transport for Cambridge’”

The Director of Environment & Planning advised the Scrutiny Committee that it would be wrong to focus alone on particular aspects of the Cambridge Futures study.

---

There needed to be a balanced transport package, based on sustainability and with new highways as a last resort.

Councillor Reid had sympathy with Councillor Bradnack's view that the Cambridge Futures work could be 'lost' and would hope that the County Council and Atkins would use it and other studies to inform and develop their thinking. However, she could not support the amendment, as the Scrutiny Committee had not debated the Cambridge Futures study.

*Action by Atkins/County Council*

Councillor Bradnack's amendment was lost by 4 votes to 0.

Councillor Bradnack proposed an additional recommendation:

"That the Executive Councillor publish detailed transport forecasts and implications of the impact of each major development site in the Cambridge sub-region on the City's transport infrastructure"

Councillor Baker queried whether the Executive Councillor had such authority and proposed re-wording the amendment to 'seek to publish'

The County Council officer stated that as the studies were undertaken, the information would be made available.

Councillor Bradnack's proposal was agreed by 2 votes to 1.

*Action by County Council*

*(Also, County Council to make available to members of the East Member Reference Group the documents for the work to be commissioned on the Cambridge East study)*

Councillor Bradnack introduced his final additional recommendation:

'In the event that these forecasts and implications suggest that transport problems associated with major developments proposed in the Local Plan may not be compatible with a sustainable pattern of transport in and around Cambridge, the Executive Councillor will review the Council's position on the scale and siting of urban extensions which the Council has supported or will support'

The Director of Environment & Planning advised members that the Local Plan Inquiry would be looking at the concerns raised in this proposed recommendation and it should be left for that process rather than to have the debate be re-opened at the Scrutiny Committee meeting.

Councillor Bradnack's proposal was lost by 4 votes to 0.

Regarding the recommendation's in the officer report, Councillor Ward questioned whether (c) was necessary, rather could members just support the sentiment? The

---

Head of Policy and Projects stated that it would be helpful for the County Council if members supported the recommendation but suggested that it be re-worded: 'support the County Council in appropriate bids into the Local Transport Fund, Transport Innovation Fund and other sources of Government funding.'  
The Committee supported this re-wording by 4 votes to 0.

The Head of Policy and Projects referred to a stakeholder meeting that Atkins had organised for 25 October and suggested a Member Workshop beforehand.

It was noted that the Chair and spokes would agree the minutes of the meeting so that they would be passed to the County Council and Atkins for information and action.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed the recommendations for the Executive Councillor by 4 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Transport approved the recommendations as amended.

**CHAIR**

---