

**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL, SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL AND  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AND SPATIAL  
PLANNING GROUP: MINUTES**

Date: Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2014

Time: 3.00 - 5.00pm

Place: Committee Rooms 1 + 2, The Guildhall, Cambridge CB2 3QJ

Present: Cambridge City Councillors  
K Blencowe, C Rosenstiel and T Ward

South Cambridgeshire District Councillors  
P Corney, S Kindersley and T Wotherspoon

Cambridgeshire County Councillors  
I Bates (Chairman), J Hipkin and D Jenkins

**Officers:** Cambridge City Council – P Dell, S Saunders & J Sykes  
Cambs County Council – A Blowers, M Bowles, D Lawson, B Menzies  
and J Smith  
South Cambridgeshire District Council – C Hunt, K Miles and J Mills

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were presented on behalf of Councillor Susan Van de Ven.

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22<sup>ND</sup> MAY 2013**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

In response to a question about consulting with sixth formers/colleges on the transport strategy proposals, Officers confirmed that they were looking to engage with young people on this issue before the end of the summer term 2013.

**4. TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE:  
CONSULTATION REPORT**

The consultation ran simultaneously with the Local Plan consultations during the summer of 2013 (22/7/13 to 14/10/13), and was steered by this group.

- There were around 800 responses, plus 200 from schools, 700 of which were either online or in hard copy, and there were 100 more substantial text comments along with comments sent through from Cambridge & South Cambridge Local Plans submissions
- Of the 700 responses; approx. 30% were from Cambridge, 59% from South Cambs and the remaining were commuters that regularly pass through the area (the responses showed the postcodes)

- There were a number of consultation methods; 25 exhibitions, school newsletters, social media, press releases and stakeholder comments.
- Also taken into account transport related comments on the Local Plans.
- The focus of the consultation was to seek views on the draft and approach/objectives.
- There were 5 key questions;
  1. Keeping traffic at today's levels: 42% strongly agreed, 34% agreed
  2. More space for sustainable traffic: 44% strongly agreed, 31% agreed
  3. Restrictions on car traffic on some Cambridge roads: 38% strongly agreed, 24% agreed
  4. If more Park & Ride sites created, potential for more restrictions on street parking:  
23% strongly agreed, 27% agreed, 22% undecided
  5. Enabling people to use public transport for part of their journey: 42% strongly agreed, 37% agreed
- There were also 3 text questions focussed on firstly seeking input on any gaps in strategy, and scoping views on the cycle network & where new transport hubs could go. The responses were wide ranging and key issues were identified to enable a focus on necessary alterations post-consultation. Key issues were;
  - Ambition – too ambitious for some, not ambitious enough for others, with calls for Dutch standard cycling in Cambridge
  - Public transport – some prefer more focus on rail, some prefer other modes
  - More focus on environment including air quality, natural & historic environment
  - Interaction of modes
  - Concerns on implications of proposed demand management
  - Concerns re deliverability of development in terms of public transport – asking for more details eg. on A428 public transport & viability - capacity for roads to take further development – and questions about how to fund major infrastructure
- All these were used to inform alterations and influence final draft.

Arising from the report and presentation, individual Members:

- Queried whether fair to split 'undecided' in line with those of the decided? If yes, then 'agreed' and 'strongly agreed' become formidable, is it reasonable to make those deductions? Officers outlined that 'undecideds' weren't included as definitive responses here and that analysis suggested that although more people tended to agree with principles, were unsure given lack of detail on intentions;
- Commented that 700 responses was not a high enough sample size to be strongly significant given the population, also cautioned that at the last meeting it was suggested a concerted effort be made to contact those who don't normally contribute, and asked how that was that done in practice? Officers advised that there was a wide consultation, including targeted consultation with schools with specific events held e.g. Swavesey Village College, the 200 students filled out forms which have been considered and will be used especially on South Cambs cycling aspect. They also attended a small business exposition at Marshalls, a Disability Consultative panel and used social media to engage more broadly;
- Queried the point that to consider South Cambs residents as non commuters is wrong, the responses between South Cambs and City are noticeably different in a number of areas and that the Park and Ride has not been sold to South Cambs. In

addition confirmed that it is normal to exclude 'undecideds', and asked if officers had weighted sample according to population or if there is any breakdown between City and South Cambs residents on different questions? Officers stated that there was no more data on representativeness of sample, that consultation was extensive and that there was substantial coverage giving breadth of coverage and links with local plans consultation;

- Thanked Matthew Bowles for his presentation, and noted that the numbers are small so advised not getting carried away. Noted the good response with Local Authorities being joined up.

## **5. FINAL DRAFT OF THE TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND ACTION PLAN**

The report was presented to Members with Officers confirming that Members support was appreciated to steer and develop the plan. Officers explained that;

- The Strategy is both long term and high level, and aims to maintain traffic at 2011 levels by facilitating alternative travel modes. The action plan is expected to be a living document, which can be reviewed over time.
- There was good support from the sample with the aim being to address the key issues from the consultation. It was noted that the Strategy complements the Local Plans, and the policies are based on the Local Transport Plan and outlined an example of the Policy on cycling and walking. Officers also said that there was strong support for exploring potential for rail including a new station at Addenbrookes and also for exploring potential for East West Rail.
- There was general support in principle for Demand Management but that people wanted more information on the specifics proposed. Officers confirmed that a separate study will be undertaken to inform development of the demand management and orbital capacity.
- An action plan was presented which includes a draft programme and major scheme specifications; Intended to be a living document, Noted that it is high level and the aim is to add to this and agree priorities over time
- Funding is critical, and a considerable amount of money will be required to deliver the Strategy aims and the full range of funding streams will need to be explored. The City Deal is being developed, which proposes to retain a share of additional tax revenue generated from growth. If successful, this would enable more funding to be secured to invest in Infrastructure. Officers confirmed the aim would be to invest in infrastructure with the aim of facilitating growth and supporting modal shift.
- Officers outlined examples of major growth areas and proposals including Cambourne and Waterbeach.
- Members' views and comments were sought on the Strategy ahead of County Council Cabinet consideration on 4<sup>th</sup> March for adopting the Strategy as part of the LTP. More work would be needed to develop the Action plan related to growth and achieving the modal shift over time and it was envisaged that another similar group would be involved to review action plan and prioritise deliverables.

Some detailed points raised by Members include

- Cllr Wotherspoon queried reference to Oakington bypass as part of Northstowe build and that there wasn't an identified requirement. Officers agreed to review and address this point.
- Cllr Wotherspoon queried the emphasis on the busway when the percentage of cyclist's responses was higher than bus users, page 4.35 and queried whether over-reliance on buses and not enough on cycling. Officers confirmed that high quality passenger transport in many cases will involve reallocating road space, and mainstreaming cycling provision. It was also noted that the particular part referred to was talking about capturing mass of people – long distance cycleway may not provide the viable journey that reliable public transport would.
- Cllr Rosenstiel pointed out that it could be more ambitious to consider East West Rail via St Neots and Cambourne – this could bring significant contributions to some of these aspirations and allow some sharing of costs – also for Addenbrooke's Station.
- The relationship between TSCSC and existing Corridor Area Transport Plans was queried. Officers confirmed that these Plans were successful in securing developer contributions and enabling a large number of schemes to be delivered. However the approach remained robust and the Transport Strategy provides an update on schemes and interventions needed across the wider area in support of growth. Officers confirmed that the Strategy includes reference to the Area Corridor Plan approach continuing in terms of securing contributions to complement the Strategy aims until CIL was adopted locally.
- Cllr Hipkin noted that the press release quote could be open to misinterpretation, as unclear that this is outlining what is needed to support growth rather than fully funded plan. Minutes of last meeting noted need for prioritisation but unclear how that will be undertaken and emphasis on TSCSC being aspirational and not certain. Consequent section needed on prioritisation, focusing on public support, costings, impact assessments, otherwise risk lack of public interest and creditability. Officers confirmed that there was a lot of work underway at the moment on a range of sources to develop a programme that fits with Local Plan trajectories and a draft programme has been included in the Action Plan which sets out timescales for key major schemes. Also officers are developing an Assurance Framework for City Deal to demonstrate how schemes could be prioritised over time to demonstrate value for money and deliverability. A rigorous process would be in place with partners to assess and agree priorities to assess merits of each scheme.
- Cllr Blencowe confirmed that he was content that this group be seen as body to discuss more detailed aspects, and noted an interesting extension to corridor idea, and the importance of ensuring this approach to intercept more trips eg. North out to Ely. He noted that prioritisation has to be aligned with deliverable growth plans, and the need to start using 'Greater Cambridge' more often and looking across boundaries.
- Cllr Jenkins noted that the Strategy could be more navigable in future for general public. Good story worth seeing. Should be something on 'marginal transport', i.e. what is being done on smaller routes and in villages. Also whether potential to challenge legislative issue that prevent better aligning of bus and rail? Also need for

some mechanism for intelligent bus lanes to allow use when not being used by buses. Paying enough attention to junction safety for cyclists? Need to address risks associated with A14, including B1049 in strategy. Officers noted marginal transport but added that there is not the resource to take that approach with all the parishes, and noted that further work will be done to update Action Plan in time.

- Cllr Kindersley added that opponents to A428 corridor growth will be making objections, and not to assume at the moment that all sites are certain to go ahead. Also not to forget obligations to communities re previous developments. The table appears to show prioritisation (action plan page 3-2) policy 16, there is no provision generated for safe cycling in the vast majority of South Cambs and a priority should be included for safe rural cycleways. Officer's emphasised success in securing cycling funding in the last 2 years and that a cycling and pedestrian strategy was to be developed.
- Cllr Wotherspoon said that City Deal was not a foregone conclusion, may be overplaying hope and outlined that Cllr Hickford had asked to raise the possibility of a parallel route to A1307 for consideration noting the large amount of development on the A1307 corridor, and concerns re over-reliance on rail on that corridor. Officers confirmed that a study would soon look at the A1307 corridor public transport options including rail as well as the A505 road issues.
- Cllr Ward outlined need for more clarity on rural cycleways and that Cambridge City Council would support them. Also emphasised that Newmarket Road bus lanes need better enforcement.
- Cllr Corney queried how well the strategy considers elderly, particularly in rural areas.
- Cllr Rosenstiel outlined that Cambridge cycling distances are shorter than London and London cycling numbers are increasing, so it's possible for more rural areas. That London exploits the back roads for cycling, and there may be opportunities for creating new routes for rural cycling into Cambridge. There is a need to make Newmarket Road bus lanes more obvious.
- Cllr Wotherspoon added that Strategy pointed to the Huntingdon corridor as a model to emulate, including the high quality cycle route.

Officers noted comments and asked for any further comments ahead of Cabinet on 4 March 2014.

## **6. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE EAST**

Officers introduced the item and explained a new Area Action Plan (AAP) is needed for the area identified in the Cambridge City Council and SCDC Local Plans. The AAP will not revisit Minerals and Waste policies. Therefore Cambridgeshire County Council would be a stakeholder in the AAP process, rather than a partner.

Questions:

Cllr Sebastian Kindersley asked for clarity on the area boundaries of the AAP and Officers provided more detail on the proposed area for the AAP.

Cllr John Hipkin asked if the AAP's purpose was to bring the new rail station at Chesterton and the Local Plan/AAP side of things together and made the point that the Chesterton Station Planning Application was already in. Cllr Hipkin asked if this was impacted by the AAP. Officers confirmed that there was lots of development to co-ordinate in the area and the AAP intended to set out the aspirations for development in the area to prevent a piecemeal approach. Officers also confirmed that there was no desire to hold up the new station development. The AAP would seek to ensure that any further development in the remainder of the area comes forward under the principles guided by the AAP.

Cllr David Jenkins asked if a map showing the area could be provided next time NFE was discussed, the recommendation as set out in the report by officers was then agreed.

## **7. NEXT STEPS AND DATES FOR FUTURE MEETING**

Sara Saunders asked for a meeting in early April to help progress the NFE AAP work.

Dearbhla Lawson added that an update on City Deal could be timely.

Friday 4<sup>th</sup> April at either 2pm or 3pm was agreed.

Cllr Ian Bates also asked that further meeting dates for the months ahead are looked into and brought to the next meeting.