

**ENVIRONMENT  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**9 January 2007  
10am – 2.55pm

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ward (Chair), Bailey, Baker, Durrant, Herbert, Holland, Holness, Newbold and Shah.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Executive Councillor Reid (Planning and Transport)  
Executive Councillor C Rosenstiel (Environmental Services)

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****07/ENV/01 Minutes**

The minutes were amended as follows: Under 06/ENV/70, add to final paragraph "Section 106 performance management/evaluation of actual measures" so that the minute reads "**Agreed** that the issues regarding S106 matters including Section 106 performance management/evaluation of actual measures be considered at the Planning Obligation Steering Group". When these changes had been made the minutes would be signed as a correct record by the Chair.

**07/ENV/02 Apologies For Absence**

None.

**07/ENV/03 Declarations Of Interest**

Councillors declared the following personal interests:

Cllr Holness in minute number 07/ENV/11 as a member of Sustrans and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign

Cllr Durrant in minute number 07/ENV/11 as co-chair of Cambridge Futures and in minute number 07/ENV/07 in relation to the grant to the Nappy Network as a member of Cambridge Re-Use Recycling Network.

Cllr Baker in minute number 07/ENV/07 as a member of the Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire and Peterborough.

Cllr Shah in minute number 07/ENV/07 as his daughter works for Cambridge Carbon Footprint.

**07/ENV/04 Public Questions**

None.

**07/ENV/05 KEY DECISION Service Plans for 2007/08, Revenue and Capital Budgets 2006/07 (Revised), 2007/08 and 2008/09 (Forecast)**

*(see also record of decision 07/ENV/02)*

The Committee began by considering the Service Plans and raised the following to which officers replied (A):

---

## Waste Management

- Why was recycling of batteries being delayed until 2008/09?

A: Batteries were classed as hazardous waste and there was currently no facility available. The county-wide review of the waste strategy would include the need for this facility to be made available.

The Committee then considered the budget report and raised the following:

- In relation to RB1256 on page 17 of the agenda "Increased charges for Landfill Tax on commercial waste. A substantial increase in Landfill Tax cannot be fully recovered from customers without jeopardising the trading position". Some businesses find it difficult to sort their waste (especially during out of hours and seasonal influences) and this may contribute to more going into landfill sites. How might this be addressed?

A: The Council has a duty to collect domestic waste but for the collection of commercial waste, it is in competition with other organisations. It does provide a trade waste collection service eg cardboard collection in the city centre had been introduced in the last 2 months and mixed glass collections would be extended in the next 2 weeks. Another way of addressing the problem would be for the Council to do more to encourage recycling in the commercial sector.

The Executive Councillor requested that obstacles to separation of waste in the commercial sector be investigated as the Council was committed to encouraging recycling in the trade waste sector.

The Chair asked that a briefing note on the current situation with regard to trade waste re-cycling be sent to members of the Scrutiny Committee and that a report about progress be brought to committee in 6 months time.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

Action  
Roger  
Coey/  
Cttee  
Mgr

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

### **07/ENV/06 NON KEY DECISION Green Parking Initiatives for Off-Street Car Parks** *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/03)*

The Executive Councillor introduced the report. She said that she was following the policy adopted by the government in relation to Vehicle Excise charges such that car park charges in the city's off street car parks would vary in relation to the emissions produced by any particular model of car. The number of season ticket holders was in the hundreds so few of them would be affected. She was also setting aside a small sum to investigate the scheme in place in Manchester. She also wanted to encourage the use of electric bikes and cars by providing powering up points in car parks. Road pricing would also be needed to tackle congestion and the impact on climate change of emissions.

Councillors raised the following to which officers replied (A):

- On the subject of roadpricing, higher-polluting vehicles should be charged more than lower-polluting ones.
-

A: Incentivising lower-polluting vehicles will only encourage more usage of such vehicles; users of public transport should be incentivised instead.

- The use of electric bikes should be encouraged
- A green energy supplier should be used for electricity and charging points
- Investigate the possibility of generating own electricity via a wind turbine on the car park.
- Electric bikes could be a laudable alternative for use by those living in the urban extensions and thought could be given to this.

After discussion it was agreed that recommendation 2.2 be amended so that the proposed electric chargepoints for electric vehicles be sited in the Queen Anne car park and those for electric bikes in Park Street car park if this were technically feasible.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations, with the amendment to 2.2, for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

**07/ENV/07 NON KEY DECISION Sustainable City Core Funding Grants** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/04*)

The Environment Co-ordinator introduced the report. Members asked for and were given further information about Cambridge Carbon Footprint. Two points were then made:

- That the organisation be encouraged to observe best practice such that the Chair should not also be the Treasurer
- That a mechanism be found to inform members of the names of directors of organisations applying for grants so that any prejudicial interests could be identified before the meeting.

Action
Simon Chubb

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

**07/ENV/08 NON KEY DECISION Quality Charter for Growth in the Cambridge Area** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/05*)

The Executive Councillor welcomed the document but suggested that it seemed generic rather than specifically about Cambridge; for example more of the photographs could be of Cambridge.

Councillors raised the following to which officer replied (A):

- The Sustainable Design and Construction document (which was also to be considered later on the agenda) was not integrated with this document such that some of the aspirations for sustainable design and construction were not included in the Charter. How would the Charter be used?
  - What was the cost in the coming year? What would that sum pay for?
-

- Acknowledged that it was about learning about and spreading good practice but this needed to be more specific to Cambridge. Disappointed there was nothing novel in the Charter.
- When would the document be complete and come into use?

A: The document had a number of uses and the engagement of the stakeholders in its preparation had been important. The second stage would build on that. It was complementary to documents such as the one for Sustainable Design & Construction and the Local Plan. It had raised new issues in relation to questions of governance. It would cost an estimated £30,000 in the coming year, funded by Cambridgeshire Horizons, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Inspire East with £5,000 contributed from the City Council's consultancy budget. The funding would pay for the work of the consultants, *urbed*, for workshops and visits. Agreed that it needed to be specific to Cambridge and the plan was to test it on the planning applications being submitted in the next few months in relation to the Southern Fringe. Ultimately it would be built into the brief for other urban developments in the city. The draft document would be used now to produce a final document by the end of July 2007.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

**07/ENV/09 KEY DECISION Service Plans for 2007/08, Revenue and Capital Budgets 2006/07 (Revised), 2007/08 and 2008/09 (Forecast) (see also record of decision 07/ENV/06)**

The Head of Policy & Projects tabled an update to the Service Plan for Planning Policy & Projects.

The Committee considered the Service Plans and raised the following to which officers replied (A):

**Planning Policy & Projects**

- On the subject of sustainable urban drainage, the County Council was responsible for maintenance of roads and gulleys and this was not being done.
- Concern about the cumulative impact of covering front gardens in tarmac for car parking.
- New developments do have to have sustainable drainage systems but there was a problem of enforcement on the use of front gardens.

A: Uncertain whether planning permission would be needed for tarmac on front gardens for car parking; an officer would look into and report back.

Action Brian Human
--------------------------

**Economic Development & Tourism**

In reply to a request from Councillor Durrant that resurfacing the roads in the Market Square be considered, the Executive Councillor said that, in the first instance, the request should be dealt with by the Executive Councillor for Customer Services &

Resources as the Market and the Guildhall developments were a part of such a request.

The Accountant introduced the budget report. He referred to the table about the 2006/07 revised budget and said that, at the Council Meeting on 7 December, the Employee Transport Incentive Scheme virement from Customer Services & Resources had been revoked. The budget report to Strategy Scrutiny would be amended to reflect the revised position. This scheme would remain the responsibility of the Executive Councillor for Customer Services & Resources. He also tabled changes to the Eligibility Criteria for the Taxicard Scheme referred to in section 5.2.2 of the report and a revised schedule of charges for Parking. The charge for Grafton West would be £1.10 on Sunday and not £1.00 and in the New Scheme for Season Tickets, band 'e' related to vehicle emissions of over 166 grams per km, not 150 as in the published report.

The Committee then considered the budget report and raised the following:

- There was congestion in the city centre over the Christmas period because it was cheaper in the car parks on Sundays.
- Referring to the Fisher Square Environmental Scheme on the Capital Hold List, a request for more information.
- Referring to the Eligibility Criteria for the Taxicard Scheme – clarification requested that officers would still have discretion to sort out queries from individuals on an individual basis once the new scheme was implemented.

The Executive Councillor said that once the Park & Ride from Trumpington was fully operational on Sundays, then Car Park prices would be increased on Sundays. She said that the budget for the Fisher Square Scheme was £47,000 rather than the £70,000 in the report. She also confirmed that items H21-26 could be struck off the hold list as these had been superseded by other schemes. She said that the revised Taxicard Scheme was to try and meet the needs of people who had not been covered by the current scheme. She affirmed that officers would deal with queries on an individual basis as before.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations as amended for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

**07/ENV/10 KEY DECISION Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document** *(see also record of decision 07/ENV/07)*

Councillors raised the following to which the officer replied (A):

- Welcomed the document but paragraph 3.3 of the report on page 210 seemed to allow a loophole for developers to opt out of the renewables standards.
  - Why could these criteria not be applied to all new developments by tailoring the criteria?
  - With reference to section 7.3.2 of Essential & Preferred Standards would it be possible to put in the new Quality Charter discussed earlier the desirability of seeking to exceed these standards in the light of emerging technologies.
-

A: The viability clause was one inserted by the Inspector during the examination of the Local Plan and cannot be altered. The SPD cannot alter criteria; only provide further guidance on the policies of the Local Plan. The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) criteria only apply to the large Urban Extensions as set out in the Local Plan.

The Executive Councillor acknowledged that the document had to work within the constraints of the Local Plan but its contribution was to spell out what the guidance in the Local Plan actually would mean in practice. So it did need to be as specific as possible.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 5 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the recommendations.

**07/ENV/11 NON KEY DECISION Cambridge East Transport Study** (*see also record of decision 07/ENV/08*)

The Executive Councillor welcomed the report from the consultants Steer Davies Gleave. She said that in addition to the issues in the report, there were other linked issues such as road pricing, demand management and government funding. She referred to the motion put by the Labour Group to the meeting of Full Council on 7 December 2006 and the importance of the City and County Councils working closely together. She had supported the proposal in the motion that a joint working party be set up.

The Transport Planning Manager amended the last part of recommendation 3 (amendment in bold) to read “the detail of the comments to be agreed through consultation between the Chair **and Spokes** and the Executive Member”.

A presentation was given by Martin Higgett of Steer Davies Gleave.

In summary, the study investigated whether a modal split of 60% non-car use could be achieved from a new development in Cambridge East. This meant also studying the impact on the surrounding road network.

Over the past 5 years, the population of the city had increased by 5% and those working in the city by 15%. However, using 1995 as the base year, there had been a 20% growth in bus passengers and cyclists and the use of cars had gone down by 10%. Use of the Park & Ride services had doubled over that 10 year period. Data from the 2001 census indicated that, for the city as a whole, 45% of citizens used car, 45% cycled or walked and 10% used public transport. The percentages were higher for car use in Abbey ward (50%) and Cherry Hinton (60%). This shows that the modal split advocated for Cambridge East could be achievable, given current trends, if public transport were to be made more attractive.

The background to the Modelling of “The Long Term Transport Strategy and High Quality Public Transport” was that 11,500 new dwellings would be built in the city. This modelling was used to assess the amount of traffic likely to be generated and the impact on the surrounding road network. This Strategy indicated a likely total of 33,000 trips from Cambridge East during the 3-hour weekday peak time of 7-10am. Of these

---

41% were likely to be by car (equivalent to 4512 trips per hour of which 347 per hour would be within Cambridge East itself). With an area-wide demand management scheme, 3,747 car trips per hour were likely.

Modelling indicated where this car traffic might go:

- Trips to the west of the railway line including Trumpington – 1539 per hour of which 646 to city centre
- Trips to southern Cambridge/south of Cambridge 1880 per hour of which 757 to Southern Fringe
- Trips to the north/west (via A14) 671 per hour of which 302 to Northern Fringe
- Trips east (via A14) 422 per hour.

The forecast mode split of trips to the city centre in addition to the 646 by car was walk/cycle 679 and bus 952.

Cambridge East was expected to generate high car traffic demand but modelling suggested little change in levels of traffic on the surrounding road network. This was thought to be due to:

- Improvements to Cambridge East and wider transport strategy would benefit all Cambridge residents and reduce mode share of cars across the network
- By providing local housing, Cambridge East replaced some (longer-distance) trips into Cambridge
- Some existing car users might use bus or cycle instead.
- Cambridge East displaced some traffic using this part of the network such that some current users found alternative routes into the city, travelled at different times or chose not to travel at all.

Councillors raised the following to which the officers replied (A):

- Currently Newmarket Road and Perne Road were prone to heavy traffic, so concerned about the additional 10-12 cars per minute forecast in the modelling

A: Further modelling would be carried out by Atkins for Cambridgeshire County Council as this model needed updating. Demand management would reduce the levels. Public transport and cycling had to be made top priorities. At the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Committee meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> January a paper would be presented relating to these issues and how they could be ameliorated in the short term.

- Could research be conducted or data be found that showed how many people would be likely to stop commuting into Cambridge from the outlying villages because they would move closer to Cambridge once the new developments (such as Cambridge East) were built.

A: Some work had been done on where people travel from eg some surveys in Ely but consideration could be given to further work to give better information. County officers would liaise with City officers about this and report on the outcomes of the discussion at a future committee.

- If traffic was decreased on Newmarket Road, it might encourage people who do not currently drive to take to their cars again; if however there was a lot of congestion, then long-distance commuters might consider an alternative such as public transport.

A: Agreed.

---

- Would it be possible to have figures which take into account the changes planned for the A14 so that there are figures without the changes and figures including the changes.

A: That would be possible to do but difficult.

- It has been predicted that traffic in North West Cambridge would lead to high levels of congestion by 2025, was this also expected in East Cambridge?

A: To some extent the same applies but the key was to invest in public transport and cycle routes. It also needed to be remembered that the study for Cambridge East was narrowly defined due to the requirements of the Local Development Framework. A wider study was also needed and this would be provided via the Cambridge Area Transport Study.

- Welcomed the fact that market research into people's travel decisions was being done. The assumptions that commuters make were critical. Had such assumptions been factored in to the model?

A: Steer Davies Gleave had a role in relation to the Transport Innovation Funding role provided by Atkins to challenge assumptions. So this report was a first attempt at that. The Cambridge East development would take 15 years from start to completion and the assumptions about travel and transport would need to be re-visited continually over that period.

- Was any specific market research being planned looking at people's travel habits and how these might change?

A: Transport Innovation Funding had been given to the County Council, a proportion of which would be precisely for this purpose. This research would be for an area wider than Cambridge East, but the results should prove informative and useful.

- The modelling assumed that buses were full but, in real life, this was rarely the case.

A: The modelling carried out on bus routes was for peak hours when buses were indeed usually full. Other aspects such as the ticket system and vehicle quality also had to be improved to encourage people to switch to using buses.

- A lack of parking had never been an issue for bicycle usage at the Cycle Campaign Group; the main reason was danger from cars and lorries.

A: Market research was being considered better to understand how to get more people to cycle and why they were currently not doing so.

- A segregated bus route was needed along the length of Newmarket Road

A: This could be provided along with improved access to the retail park and junction improvements. This was one of a number of options all aimed at limiting the opportunity to increase general traffic.

- Was the segregated bus route linked to the Guided Bus? Would the Guided Bus lead to restricting access where there were many residential accesses? There was also a need to meet the missing link between Newmarket Road and the Rail Station.

A: The study had not yet gone into that level of detail. Technical and operational issues would have to be considered. Once the Guided Bus was operational, then issues could be examined.

---

- It was important to set down the rules now for cycle routes, segregated highways (as in the Netherlands and Denmark), buses that would be quiet and carbon neutral, producing no pollution and roads that were permeable to rain run off.

A: The Cambridge Area Transport Strategy would consider these broad issues. The definition of high quality in all aspects of transport would be decided as part of that strategy.

- When would that Transport Strategy be ready and when would it be brought to the Scrutiny Committee to consider?

A: Initial conclusions would be ready in early Spring and would be taken to Member meetings, including ones organised for the City Council. Later drafts could be considered by this committee if Members wished for this.

Action Paul Cook/ Cttee Mgr
---

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote) the recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

- Coldhams Lane and Barnwell Road were also congested in peak hours and also in the middle of the day. Were there any plans to deal with this?

A: Agreed that the other areas in the city needed to be studied and not only Cambridge East and Newmarket Road. This was being done. Barnwell Road in particular was a key route and a segregated bus route was being considered for it.

- When was it planned to put these studies out to public consultation particularly in Abbey, Coleridge, Petersfield and Romsey wards?

A: This was only half the strategy. A lot depended on Marshall's plans. When Cambridge East as a whole was possible, then public consultation would take place.

Councillor Durrant asked the Scrutiny Committee to support the unanimous decision made at East Area Committee that rejected bus routes across the city's commons. After considerable discussion of this issue in which many members agreed about the importance of commons and meadows as different open space to that provided by parks, he proposed an additional recommendation as follows:

"We should not put public transport corridors across the surface of commons and meadows".

On a show of hands (by 4 votes to 4 and on the Chair's casting vote) the additional recommendation was not supported.

The Executive Councillor spoke about the part of recommendation 4 which included "establishing the all-party joint City/County Councillor Working Party, as agreed at Council on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2006, to consider proposals for Cambridge East in the context of wider proposals likely to emerge from the County's Long Term Transport Strategy". She said that she had raised this with colleagues at the County Council but had not yet received a response. One possibility was for the city to set up a Working Party and to invite County colleagues to attend.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 0) the amended recommendations for the Executive Councillor.

The Executive Councillor agreed the amended recommendations.

### **07/ENV/12 Decisions by the Executive Councillors**

Councillor Durrant said that the Labour Group had made their views known on these decisions at the 12 December meeting of the Development Plan Steering Group particularly the Response to the South Cambridgeshire District Council Consultation on Gypsy & Traveller Pitch Provision and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations Preferred Options.

### **07/ENV/13 Regional Spatial Strategy**

**Agreed** that the Scrutiny Committee would make formal representation on the Government proposals which relate to this Strategy at a Special Meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee to be held on 27 February at 10am.

**CHAIR**

---