

**COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN  
6 JULY 2005**

**CONTENTS**



**South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Committee Meetings
2. Call-in Arrangements

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE CONSERVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY PLANNING  
PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. Gog Magog Countryside Project
2. Partnership Project for Habitat Enhancement on River Shep
3. Development of a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region

**DECISIONS MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

1. Conservation Manager:  
Boxworth Community Archaeological Project – grant for on-site interpretation board

**MINUTES**

1. Environmental Health Portfolio Holder – draft Minutes of 27 June 2005
2. South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee – Minutes of 20 June 2005

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM:  
11 July to 15 July 2005**

**Contact**

<b>Mon 11 Jul</b>				
<b>Tue 12 Jul</b>	2 pm	Arts Development Advisory Group	Swansley Room	Katrina Perry
<b>Wed 13 Jul</b>	3 pm	Waste Management Advisory Group	Mezzanine	Katrina Perry
<b>Thu 14 Jul</b>	10 am	Cabinet	Council Chamber	Maggie Jennings
<b>Fri 15 Jul</b>				

**CALL IN ARRANGEMENTS**

The Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee or any five other Councillors may call in any executive decision recorded in this bulletin for review. The Democratic Services Manager must be notified of any call in by **Wednesday 13 July 2005 at 5 pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 14 July 2005**.

Any member considering calling in a decision made by Cabinet is requested to contact the Democratic Services Section to determine whether any relevant amendments have been incorporated.

The call in procedure is set out in full in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, 'Scrutiny and Overview Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE CONSERVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY PLANNING PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
Gog Magog Countryside Project – implementing the proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy	To formally confirm the authority's support for the development of the Gog Magog project, by the Cambridge Preservation Society and Wildlife Trust.  In the event that GADG ii funding is awarded for the project, consider appropriate funding, subject to resource availability, for the subsequent development of the project.	To facilitate the development and completion of the CPS's funding bid under GADG II, as part of the development of the proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy.  Direct funding support is unlikely to be required until after 2007/08 and will then be subject to SCDC approval and completion of the expenditure of ODPM GADG II funding, and availability of resources at that time.
Proposed Demonstration Partnership Project for Habitat Enhancement on the River Shep	To authorise officers to continue development work with local groups and the Land Drainage Manager.  To agree to re-allocate funding of up to £5,000 from the budget for works to the 'Wilbraham New Cut' (in the budget for Ecological Support Services, authorised 3 March 2000) for a demonstration project on the River Shep, subject to leverage of other partnership funding from the Environment Agency and other suitable bodies.	In order to progress river enhancement projects in the district by developing an exemplar partnership project.

Development of a 'Green Infrastructure Strategy' for the Cambridge Sub-Region	To authorise support for the development of the proposed 'Green Infrastructure Strategy' and re-allocate £5,000 from the budget for a 'Survey of Watercourses' (authorised on 17 January 2000, under the budget for Ecological Support Services) to contribute to the necessary financial package and develop the project, subject to confirmation of matching funding from the project partners.	To enable the strategy to be developed and help direct the form of the document and thereby the development of a network of green infrastructure for the district.
---	---	--

**DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS AND REPORTED FOR INFORMATION**

**Conservation Manager**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Decision and Reasons</b>
Boxworth Community Archaeological Project	To support the Boxworth Community Archaeological Project by allocating a grant sum of up to £2,000 to design and produce an on-site interpretation board as a part of the wider archaeological investigation of the area. The grant sum to be allocated from the budget for 'Community Archaeological Projects' within the Heritage Initiatives Fund in the Conservation Portfolio. This contributes to the package of funding supporting the on-going and extensive archaeological investigation of the village. Funding of £25,000 has been secured from the Lottery with another £15,000 raised locally.

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Notes of the Environmental Health Portfolio Holder  
Meeting held on Monday, 27 June 2005 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE, Environmental Health Portfolio Holder

Officers: Steve Hampson Housing and Environmental Services Director  
Dale Robinson Chief Environmental Health Officer

### Action

#### 1. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The notes of the meeting held on 3 March 2005 were agreed as a correct record.

#### 2. MATTERS ARISING AND ACTION POINTS

**Environmental Health and Pest Control Customer Satisfaction Survey** (Minute 3.1) – action point still to be completed.

**Pet Shops – with exotic or dangerous wild animals** (Minute 8.1) – only one pet shop in the district sells exotic animals, and as a result it was agreed that there would be no further increase in the licence fee.

**Implications of Capping** (Minute 10.1) – four areas are still open for discussion. Discussions to progress these were occurring as quickly as possible in order to bring the topics to the special Cabinet on 21 July.

DSR /  
PMQ

#### 3. END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT - ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS 04/05

**Development of Transactional Website** – expected to go live later in 2005.

**Increase Capacity within Home Improvement Agency** – there has been some improvement, but the service continues to have staffing problems.

**Production of Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy** – the strategy required some work to improve its layout and make it more coherent.

**Introduce new Housing Health and Safety Rating System** – delayed due to legislation not being implemented until 2005/06.

**Implementation of licensing of HMOs** - delayed due to legislation not being implemented until 2005/06.

**Provision of On-Line Live Air Quality Information** – the system is working but it has not gone live to the public yet.

**Complete WM Best Value Review** – the target has been missed, but work on it continues and it is now progressing through the Member decision-making process.

**4. END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT - ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & WASTE MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2004/05**

The reason for missed targets in some places could be traced back to problems with other performance indicators, for example percentage of staff turnover.

It was suggested that LPSA targets be added to the PI monitoring.

**5. HAMPSHIRE QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE MATRIX - END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE 2004/05**

Analysis of Environmental Health service performance against the Hampshire Matrix is completed on a six monthly basis. This end of year analysis has shown a continuing overall substantial rise in performance over the time the matrix has been used.

Whilst there was no mechanism for comparing data from SCDC with that of other authorities nationally, some benchmarking was undertaken against the other Cambridgeshire authorities. Work is underway at present using a spider chart to make comparisons. It was agreed that some of this comparator information would be made available at a future Portfolio Holder meeting.

The Portfolio Holder **NOTED** the improvements made and **AGREED** that she wished to see further service level improvements made on the level of service score achieved against the criteria for the specific service in question.

**EHMT**

**6. WASTE COLLECTION - CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR 2005/06**

The Waste Management Advisory Group was due to discuss the Cleanaway contract and its possible renewal at its next meeting on 13 July, before it goes to Cabinet on 14 July for a decision. It would therefore not be possible to finalise the arrangements for the green box collections until after these meetings.

The Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to the implementation of the revised Christmas/New Year 2005/06 Waste Collection arrangement as detailed in the report, with the exception of the green box collections, to be finalised following Cabinet's decision on 14 July 2005.

**SHC /  
IG**

**7. PLASTICS BANK RECYCLING**

Recycling was working well but the situation was not ideal with residents continuing to fail to crush all bottles before putting them into the banks. Volume of bottles was greater than the banks and collections could regularly cope with and fly tipping was still occurring at some recycling sites.

It was noted that the reason for the recommendation for the current contract to be extended to July 2007, was that the County's PFI contract was due to start after that date.

The Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to:

- (a) Continue the current contract with Messrs Pearsons Ltd until July 2007; and
- (b) Re-invest any credit from Pearsons back into the scheme to improve the recycling sites and negotiate with them as to the best way to increase capacity with either additional banks or additional collections or a combination of these two measures.

**TC /  
SHC**

**8. REAL NAPIES TRIAL**

Prior to the Real Nappy Week (20-25 June 2005), very few Real Nappy kits had been distributed to families. At the time of the meeting, no feedback had been received as to the level of interest expressed during the promotion week.

The Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to make the remaining kits available to all families following Real Nappy Week.

**TC**

**9. LPSA - STREET CLEANING TARGET**

A discussion on the LPSA targets focused particularly on the street cleaning aspect, with emphasis placed on the difficulty SCDC would have reaching the target of 29%. The Portfolio Holder agreed that it was better for SCDC to be part of the LPSA than not. The Policy and Performance Review Manager was asked to feed back on a regular basis to the Environmental Services Manager about progress towards the target.

**PS /  
PMQ**

**10. CHOOSING HEALTH - IMPLICATIONS FOR SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DC**

The requirements of the Choosing Health white paper that have direct implications for SCDC were split into eight areas of focus. As per the report, many of the actions would need partnership working with organisations such as the PCT, with some being less the responsibility of SCDC than its partners, e.g. Children – which was mostly aimed at education (the County’s responsibility), so the SCDC role is perhaps unclear or particularly small.

A mapping exercise would be needed to establish how far SCDC was already delivering the Choosing Health agenda as activities undertaken across the organisation, not just within Environmental Health, could fall within it. There was currently no joined up working or knowledge of the fact that some activities already fit, or how activities might fit, under the Choosing Health banner.

It was acknowledged that it would be necessary to define which partner – SCDC, LSP, and the Improving Health Partnership – did what activity, to avoid duplication of effort.

The Portfolio Holder **NOTED** the report and **RECOMMENDED** that:

**IG**

- (a) A ‘mapping exercise’ be carried out at officer level to identify where the Council is already delivering Choosing Health with the results to be fed back to the Portfolio Holder meeting; and
- (b) Through the mapping exercise, identify areas of weakness where better co-ordinated services on Choosing Health can be delivered.

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**The Role of the Portfolio Holder in Licensing Hearings** – It was clarified that the Portfolio Holder was not allowed to take part in the hearing process and decision-making, but could observe the hearings to ensure procedures were being adhered to.

**Forward Plan and Future Meetings** – The Housing and Environmental Services Director indicated that dates for future meetings had been set, and that a forward plan of agenda items was to be devised. Both the forward plan and the meeting dates were to be passed to the Portfolio Holder for information.

**DSR**

---

**The meeting ended at 4.35 p.m.**

---

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** 20th June 2005

**Time:** 1400h – 1525h

**Place:** South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne

**Present:** County Councillors  
D Jenkins, L J Oliver, J E Reynolds, M Smith and M Williamson

District Councillors  
D Bard, J D Batchelor, S G M Kindersley, D S K Spink and  
R Summerfield

CALC Councillors  
G Everson, M Farrar and J McGregor

Also present  
County Councillors T Stone and L Wilson  
District Councillors M Mason, E Pateman and Dr J Williamson  
Parish Councillor G Smith

### **1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

County Councillors Batchelor and Kindersley declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the County Council's Code of Conduct in their capacity as District Council representatives on the Committee. County Councillor Williamson also declared a personal interest in his capacity as the County Council nominee on the South Cambridgeshire District Committee of the Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils.

### **2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor Dr D Bard was elected Chairman for the municipal year.

### **3. MINUTES – 7TH MARCH 2005**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7th March 2005 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 177, Page 4, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham, add the following in bold "...Local Members, District Councillors **Dixon** and **Wotherspoon**".

Arising from the minutes, the following matters were also raised:

Minute 177, A1198 Ermine Street, Caxton – Councillor Spink, the Local Member for Caxton, expressed her continued concern about the delay in introducing measures to prevent traffic using Caxton village as a shortcut alternative to the newly constructed bypass. She highlighted again the need for better signage through Caxton to assist in reducing the speed of traffic through the village.

Minute 178, A14 Village Traffic Calming Project – Progress Report – Speaking as a Local Member, District Councillor Mason, reported that the Histon and Impington traffic calming scheme was progressing and being monitored closely.



#### **4. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Councillor L J Oliver was appointed Vice-Chairman for the municipal year.

#### **5. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATING CONVENTIONS**

The Committee was informed of its terms of reference and operating conventions, which had been updated to reflect the new political management arrangements at the County Council. It was reported that, following a review of constitutional arrangements, the functions of the Area Joint Committees had been identified as executive and, as such, were subject to call-in by the County Council. The County Council's constitution had been amended to reflect this new arrangement.

Some Members expressed concern that an executive member of the County Council could be appointed to the Committee regardless of whether that member's electoral division was within the Area Joint Committee boundary. It was felt that this representative might not be so familiar with the needs of South Cambridgeshire as other representatives on the Committee.

A representative of CALC commented that the Operating Conventions did not prevent a CALC representative from chairing the meeting.

It was resolved unanimously:

To note the updated Terms of Reference and Operating Conventions.

#### **6. PETITIONS RECEIVED**

##### Request for an Urgent Review of the Traffic Situation in Bourn

The Committee received a 248-signature petition, presented by Mr G Smith, Vice-Chairman, Bourn Parish Council, requesting an urgent review of the traffic situation in Bourn. The petition was supported by the Local Members District Councillors Pateman and Spink respectively.

In response to questions, Members were informed by the petitioner that:

- the flow and speed of traffic had increased through the village Bourn as a result of the Cambourne development.
- no speed measurements had been taken in the village since the development of Cambourne.
- the speed limits had not changed in the village for a long time, and the Parish Council had submitted bids for funding to the Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement scheme to have the speed limit reduced in The Broadway.
- a request to reduce the speed limit in the area of The Broadway was outside the village envelope and would therefore not comply with the County Council's Speed Limit Policy. Members queried why the advice given by the Department for Transport in Circular 1/04, Setting Local Speed Limits, had not been applied in this case. It was noted that the County Council was still working to Circular 1/93, as Circular 1/04 was a consultation document. Once guidance had been introduced, the County Council would need to review its policy in conjunction with the Constabulary. Some Members highlighted the need for the County Council to be more forward looking and to change its policy in advance of the guidance to allow for the number of frontages to be considered. It was important that traffic at the entrances to Bourn was slowed down to protect young families in houses on The Broadway and other local residents.
- the need for traffic amelioration clauses as part of the planning permission for the Cambourne development had been a concern of local residents. Members were informed that planning

permission had recommended no exit on to The Broadway from Cambourne but this unfortunately had not included the exit on the A428.

- local residents were keen for a review of the traffic situation in Bourn in order to obtain the necessary evidence for speed reduction measures.

The petitioner was informed that the Committee would consider the issues further at its next meeting. In accordance with the County Council's petitions procedure, a full response to the points raised would be sent to the petitioner following further consideration and consultation.

## **7. PETITIONS UPDATE – BARTON ROAD, COMBERTON**

The Committee was reminded that it had received, at its meeting on 7 March 2005, a 72-signature petition requesting the existing 30mph speed limit on Barton Road in Comberton be extended to include Horizon Park. A request to include Barton Road on the County Council's Speed Limit Review list had been received in March 2002. However, these requests were dealt with in chronological order with only sufficient funding for one scheme to be completed per financial year. Given these budgetary constraints, it was not possible to stipulate when a review of the current situation on Barton Road, and any subsequent alteration, would be carried out.

The Parish Council's representative, Dr Howard Roscoe, acknowledged that the introduction of a 30 mph speed limit would require traffic calming measures. He therefore queried whether a 40 mph limit could be introduced immediately to allow the Parish Council to submit a Jointly Funded Minor Highways Improvement bid for a 30 mph limit at a later date. Members were informed that officers would need to review existing speeds before introducing a 40 mph limit.

The Chairman read the comments of the Local Member, District Councillor Harangozo, who had been unable to attend the meeting. He was very concerned that recommendation (ii) would result in no action being taken on this road where speeding was so frequent either because a scheme was unlikely to generate the points required or, equally, because monies would not be available due to budget cutbacks. He thought that the recommendation would give false hope to the community. He asked that the 30 mph limit be extended immediately to Horizon Park or as far east as was possible. This was now a fairly built up area with many traffic movements. Local residents had been complaining about excessive speed on this stretch of road for years. Road traffic had grown enormously in Comberton in the last few years, not least because of the expansion of the College. He also requested other measures to encourage safer driving such as a) verge gates to 'narrow' the road to reduce long-distance views and b) 'slow down' markings on the road surface.

The Chairman proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Reynolds, to include an additional recommendation to ask the County Council to carry out a traffic survey regarding the feasibility of imposing a 40mph speed limit, as an interim measure, whilst the Parish Council put forward a Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement bid. One Member was concerned that this would impact on the fairness of the current scheme. He was aware of a number of villages in the same situation as Comberton who would be waiting many years for their speed limit to be reviewed. Another Member suggested that the current system of prioritising requests for speed limits should be based on accident records.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- i) note the concerns of petitioners regarding Barton Road, Comberton;
- ii) note the inclusion of Barton Road, Comberton as part of the County Council's Speed Limit Review programme;

- iii) ask the County Council to carry out a traffic survey regarding the feasibility of imposing a 40mph speed limit as an interim measure whilst Comberton Parish Council put forward a Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement bid; and
- iv) inform the petitioners accordingly.

#### **8. JOINTLY FUNDED MINOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES AND CYCLEWAY PROVISION 2005/06**

The Chairman reported that the District Council had allocated £100,740 to a "Sustainable Transport" budget for Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvements and cycleway development. The Committee would need to determine how to apportion funding between the two programmes. He suggested that an equal split would provide little scope for cycleway development, and it might therefore be more appropriate to bring forward Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement schemes. The District Council was unable to confirm its budgets for 2005/06, as it was still awaiting the outcome of its appeal against the proposed Council Tax capping.

County Council representatives acknowledged the budget position faced by the District Council. However, they highlighted the need to progress schemes as soon the budget situation was confirmed. Councillor Reynolds proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Spink, to amend recommendation (ii) in order to speed up the process.

It was resolved unanimously:

- (i) to note the current position with regards budgets for Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvements and cycleway development in 2005/6.
- (ii) that the apportionment of funding of the District Council's budget for Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvements and cycleway development be determined electronically by the Committee, subject to the District Council's confirmation of its budget, with a further report presented to the next meeting in the event of a failure to agree.

#### **9. ACCIDENT REMEDIAL SCHEME: JUNCTION OF A10 WITH DENNY END ROAD, WATERBEACH**

The Committee was asked to approve the construction of the proposed casualty reduction measures at the junction of the A10 and Denny End Road, Waterbeach. Members were reminded that they had supported the accident remedial measures for the purposes of consultation at their last meeting. The consultation had been very favourable with only the Police and the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board raising concerns. These had been taken into consideration and accommodated within the details of the scheme. It was noted that few replies to a consultation on a scheme usually indicated a favourable response. Waterbeach Parish Council had been the only local Parish Council to respond to the consultation providing a favourable response.

Members noted that the scheme design included provision for cyclists and queried the number of cyclists currently using the junction. They were informed that although no cyclists currently used the junction, there was an aspiration to form an Ely to Cambridge cycle route as part of the Sustran's national cycle network. Speaking as a Local Member, County Councillor Williamson, expressed his enthusiastic support for the scheme, and reported that it would encourage cyclists working at the Landbeach Research Park. Members also queried the impact of the scheme on the B1047, as there was concern that this junction could be used as a 'rat run' for A14 traffic. It was noted that traffic flow surveys had been carried out, and Horningsea Parish Council consulted.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- approve the construction of the proposed scheme, as set out on Plan 1 attached to the report.

## **10. BAR HILL JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT**

The Committee received a report detailing the proposed improvements to the Bar Hill/B1050 Hatton's Road junction in advance of significant housing growth at the proposed Northstowe development. These improvements to safety and the reduction in queuing time from the direction of Longstanton would need to be implemented prior to April 2006 in order to be funded by Growth Area Delivery Grant (GADG). Members noted a Figure showing clusters of the majority accidents around each of the three give-way traffic islands at the junction. They also noted a Figure detailing the preferred solution.

Members commented on the estimated cost of a scheme, which could only last for a period of six years. Speaking as a Local Member, County Councillor Reynolds, reported that he, together with the County Councillor for Willingham Division, and Bar Hill Parish Council, supported the scheme. Both Councillors had been particularly concerned about the number of accidents at the junction. The cost of the scheme was economically viable given that the financial cost of a serious accident was £0.75m. He hoped that it would save lives and prevent serious injury even if it was only for a limited time.

There was concern about the poor indication of existing give-way features at this junction, which did not allow sufficient time for motorists to react. It was hoped that they would be better indicated in the new scheme. Members also expressed concern about the possibility of confusion in relation to the proposed junction layout.

It was resolved unanimously to support the scheme.

## **11. STRATEGY FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT SITE SIGNS**

The Committee considered a policy for development site signs on the public highway, which had been approved by the County Council for use in Cambridge with a recommendation that other Area Joint Committees also consider adopting it. The policy would ensure that access for construction traffic and deliveries was made by the most appropriate route and would avoid clutter caused by signs erected by developers without authorisation. It was not proposed to introduce the policy retrospectively but a sweep of existing signs would be undertaken.

Members commended the policy, as they were concerned about the persistence of signs long after developments had been completed. Speaking as a Local Member, District Councillor Mason, raised concerns about the proliferation of signs on poles rather than lampposts in connection with the Histon and Impington traffic calming scheme. He suggested that the County Council needed an overall policy to prevent the clutter of signs in conservation areas. Members were informed that the new Traffic Signs Regulations had led to an increase in the size of signs, which could no longer be displayed on lamp columns. Some Members were concerned that too many signs could even contribute to accidents.

It was resolved unanimously to support the procedure for managing signing for new development sites as detailed in section 2 of the report.

## **12. NETWORK MONITORING REPORT 2004 AND NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2005**

The Committee noted the three parts of the Network Monitoring Report 2004 –Traffic Monitoring, Road Safety Monitoring and the Joint Road Casualty Data Report. The Committee also noted the Network Service Plan (NSP) 2005, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members. It

provided details of all the transport schemes that were programmed for delivery over the next 12 months in Cambridgeshire, including the South Cambridgeshire Highways Division.

Members were informed that there had been a 6% increase in Park and Ride fare paying passengers. Traffic crossing the county screenline had grown by 30% over the last ten years compared to a national average of 18%. There had been increase in five axle plus Heavy Commercial Vehicles, which had resulted in damage to verges and surrounds. It was noted that the Caxton Bypass Scheme would be delivered in quarter three.

Members raised the following issues in relation to the reports:

#### Network Monitoring Report 2004 – Part 1 Traffic Monitoring

- queried whether the opening of the last Park and Ride site in 2002 might have had an impact on bus passengers on Cambridge radial routes.
- highlighted the need to investigate the recording of pedestrians entering and leaving Cambridge station as a means of measuring rail usage. Some Members felt that the increase in figures in 2004 might not be due just to rail usage.
- highlighted the need for better data to compare rail usage with Park and Ride.
- the need to improve the print quality of the diagram of traffic flows on inter urban roads. Members queried why this data could not be compiled on a 12 hours basis in order to make comparisons between traffic flows on northern radial routes around Cambridge. It was suggested that traffic was increasing on the B1049 whilst traffic entering Cambridge had decreased.
- the need for the County Council to use population figures to provide urban area comparisons rather than the nine towns given that some South Cambridgeshire villages were larger than some of the towns. Members suggested that the volume of traffic going through Histon and Great Shelford could be larger than these towns. It was noted that the County Council was moving away from Market Towns to a corridor approach based on radial routes into Cambridge. The Director of Highways and Access agreed to raise the need to review the data base with the Sustainable Infrastructure Team.

#### Network Service Plan 2005

- queried when the commitment to provide £3.9m towards the cost of the A1198 Papworth Everard Bypass would be received from the Government. It was noted that the County Council had provided GO-East with additional information and was awaiting a response. Members highlighted the need for the Bypass to be considered in conjunction with the dualling of the A428. It was noted that the County Council was liaising with the Highways Agency regarding these two roads. The Director of Highways and Access agreed to circulate the Committee with an update.

It was resolved unanimously:

- i) to note the Network Monitoring Report 2004, including Part 1 – Traffic Monitoring, Party 2 – Road Safety Monitoring, Part 3 – Joint Road Casualty Data Report; and
- ii) to note the Network Service Plan 2005.

### 13. VARIOUS STREETS, DUXFORD & WHITTLESFORD – PROHIBITION OF WAITING

The Committee considered objections to a draft Order that was proposed to prohibit waiting in various streets in Duxford and Whittlesford. It was noted that a number of parking restrictions had been proposed for the vicinity of Royston Road, Whittlesford in response to complaints over obstructive parking. Local residents were concerned that some commuters using Whittlesford Station were choosing to park on street to avoid charges in the station car park. There was particular concern about cars parked close to the junction of Duxford/Moorfield/Royston Road obstructing the visibility of vehicles exiting Royston Road.

The County Council had received six objections and representations by both residents and users of Royston Road to the proposed parking restrictions. Members received a tabled plan of the proposed parking restrictions and a copy of the objections/representations. One representation had been made to the proposed prohibition of parking on Duxford and Royston Road. There was concern that the restrictions requested by Royston Road residents were too draconian in nature. It was therefore proposed to carry out a review of the restrictions in Royston Road only with all affected parties.

Speaking as a Local Member, County Councillor Stone, highlighted the concerns of local residents who had been complaining for the last five years. Although, the houses were set back on Royston Road, it was noted that residents on the Duxford side of the road had to negotiate steep driveways. The road itself was not very wide when cars were parked either side, which made it difficult to turn. He was concerned that commuters sometimes blocked driveways or parked too close to the edge of a driveway, which reduced visibility for local residents exiting their driveways. He highlighted the importance of restrictions at the Duxford/Moorfield/Royston Road junction to improve safety. He noted the need for a review but asked for a timescale to be set. Members were informed that progress would be dependent on the availability of all affected parties to achieve a mutually acceptable solution.

The Committee queried whether there was any evidence that the Whittlesford Station car park had reached its capacity. The Local Member reported that he inspected the car park on a regular basis and it was rarely full although this might not be the case at peak periods. On balance, the Committee felt that the Order should be introduced as advertised for prohibition of waiting at any time parking restrictions as detailed in the tabled plan. They welcomed a proposal to carry out a review of the restrictions in Royston Road only with all affected parties.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- i) determine the objection without holding a public inquiry;
- ii) to approve the prohibition of waiting at any time parking restrictions as set out in the plan attached as **Appendix 1** to the minutes;
- iii) recommend that more consideration be given to the proposed parking restrictions in the vicinity of Royston Road, taking into account the views and requirements of all road users, residents and commuters in the area and formalise a parking scheme which satisfied the needs of all affected parties and did not reduce the level of service to Whittlesford Rail Station; and
- iv) inform the objectors and residents accordingly.

## **14. AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee noted its agenda plan up until the 2006 spring cycle and requested the following additions:

### 12 September 2005

- Joint Funded Minor Highway Improvement Schemes – to agree Committee representatives on the Assessment Panel.

### To be programmed

- Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement Schemes – Review of consultation process in relation to conservation areas.