



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN
ISSUE DATE 7TH APRIL 2004**

CONTENTS

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

1. Committee Meetings
2. Invitation to attend the first screening of the new Hardwick Youth Consultation Video
3. Training courses, seminars and conferences
4. Member Allowances paid in 2003-2004
5. Call-in Arrangements

MINUTES AND AGENDAS

1. Cabinet minutes from 25th March 2004
 - Council Tax demand 2004-2005
 - Grant to Rampton Village Hall
 - Membership of the Northstowe Member Steering Group
 - Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Order – Transport Works Act 1992
 - Needs assessment for Travellers
 - Clarity of Procedure Action Plan
 - Cottenham Residents Association
 - Finance for additional Traveller work
2. Cabinet minutes from 1st April 2004
 - Food Service Plan 2004 – 2005
 - Executive Delegated Powers
 - Authority to appear in Court
 - LGA Annual conference topics
 - Arts Partnership Grants to:
 - Cambridge Arts Theatre
 - The Junction/CDC
 - Housing Repairs and Maintenance (for information only)
 - Housing Stock Options Appraisal Update (for information only)
 - Shire Homes Planned Maintenance Programme (for information only)
3. South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee minutes from 8th March 2004

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM 12 th April 2004 to 16 th April 2004			
MONDAY 12 th April 2004		EASTER MONDAY	
TUESDAY 13 th April 2004	2pm	NOWG	Committee Room 1
WEDNESDAY 14 th April 2004			
THURSDAY 15 th April 2004	2pm	Scrutiny Committee	Council Chamber
FRIDAY 16 th April 2004	10am	Waste Management Advisory Group	Committee Room 1

INVITATION TO ATTEND SCREENING OF YOUTH CONSULTATION VIDEO

We would like to invite all Councillors to the first screening of the new Hardwick Youth Consultation Video at 10:30 am on **Wednesday 14th April**. The venue is the Cambridge Arts Picture house, Regent Street, Cambridge.

The video has been created by a group of young people from Hardwick working with outreach workers, the Parish Council and Community Beat Manager to present a positive image of young people in the community. The young people and professional filmmaker involved in the video will be present to answer questions.

For more information on this event please contact Susannah Harris, Community Development Officer on (01223) 724155 or susannah.harris@scamb.gov.uk or Steph Hogger, Arts Projects Officer, on (01223) 724142 or stephanie.hogger@scamb.gov.uk

TRAINING COURSES, SEMINARS AND CONFERENCES

Subject	Location and Date
---------	-------------------

Health, Housing and Sustainability

The seminar will look at ways of joining up key elements that affect the long-term quality of life. The formula that links sustainability and health is simple: good quality environments and opportunities for employment that alleviates poverty are keys to good health. But how do we create these links in practice? Our speakers will look at:

- the links between poverty, housing and health
- ways that housing regeneration can be linked to a sustained improvement in health
- how housing design can affect health
- practical schemes for improving health through sustainable community development

Thursday 13 May 2004

10:30 – 15:00 (Lunch provided)

LGIU Offices

22 Upper Woburn Place, London WC1H 0TB
(5 minutes from Euston Station)

MEMBERS ALLOWANCES PAID IN 2003 – 2004

Councillor	Total Basic Allowance	Total Special Responsibilities Allowance	Attendance Allowance	Childcare or Dependence Allowance	Travelling Allowance	Subsistence Allowance
AGNEW, SJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£593.64	£0.00
BARD, Dr DR	£4,017.00	£7,004.04	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
BARKER, CC	£4,017.00	£7,004.04	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
BARRETT, RE	£4,017.00	£248.41	£0.00	£0.00	£795.90	£1.50
BATCHELOR, JD	£4,017.00	£7,004.04	£91.17	£0.00	£2,087.46	£275.57
BRYANT, RF	£4,017.00	£3,259.97	£0.00	£0.00	£2,080.19	£0.00
BULLMAN, EW	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
CATHCART, NN	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£2,203.35	£0.00
CHATFIELD, JP	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
COLLINSON, RF	£4,017.00	£6,137.94	£0.00	£0.00	£474.71	£11.64
COURSE, Mrs MP	£4,017.00	£1,353.95	£0.00	£0.00	£720.71	£0.00
DAVIES, NS	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
DRIVER, R	£4,017.00	£101.63	£0.00	£0.00	£14.59	£0.00
ELLWOOD, MR	£363.85	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£53.99	£0.00
ELSBURY, G	£4,017.00	£433.04	£0.00	£0.00	£615.97	£4.00
FLANAGAN, TJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
GRAVATT, CJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
HALL, R	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£590.74	£0.00
HARANGOZO, Dr SA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
HATTON, Mrs SA	£3,639.06	£0.00	£91.17	£0.00	£529.64	£342.82
HEALEY, Mrs JM	£4,017.00	£3,999.96	£0.00	£0.00	£420.01	£0.00
HEAP, Dr JA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
HEAZELL, Mrs EM	£4,017.00	£7,004.04	£0.00	£0.00	£965.17	£39.68
HOWELL, MP	£4,017.00	£1,500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£81.48	£0.00
HUGHES, Mrs J	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£237.17	£9.50
KIME, SJ	£388.74	£677.81	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
KINDERSLEY, SGM	£4,017.00	£3,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,459.86	£0.00
LOCKWOOD, Mrs JE	£3,639.06	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
MANNING, LCA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£326.28	£0.00
MATTHEWS, RM	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
MONKS, EL	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
MUNCEY, Mrs JA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£300.70	£0.00
MURFITT, Mrs CAED	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,148.00	£9.33
NICHOLAS, JA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£650.88	£0.00
NIGHTINGALE, CR	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£204.67	£0.00

ORME, Dr JPR	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£508.78	£25.06
PAGE, R	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
PORTER, DL	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
QUINLAN, JA	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
REGAN, DJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
ROBERTS, Mrs DP	£4,017.00	£7,004.04	£0.00	£0.00	£721.68	£0.00
SABERTON, WH	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SCARR, NJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SHEPPERSON, J	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SMITH, Mrs GJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£316.23	£1.00
SMITH, RGR	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SPINK, Mrs DSK	£4,017.00	£10,505.00	£91.17	£0.00	£2,134.98	£364.16
STEWART, JH	£4,017.00	£2,250.00	£0.00	£0.00	£268.69	£0.00
STROUDE, PL	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SUMMERFIELD, RT	£4,017.00	£7,880.04	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
SUTHERLAND, Mrs LM	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£53.84	£0.00
TRUEMAN, Mrs VM	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
TURNER, RJ	£3,639.06	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
WATERS, Mrs BE	£3,639.06	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
WHERRELL, DALG	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£237.17	£0.00
WILSON, LJ	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,340.54	£0.00
WYATT, AW	£4,017.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£780.87	£15.54
ZIAIAN-GILLAN, SS	£394.74	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00

CALL-IN ARRANGEMENTS

The Chairman of the Scrutiny 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 14th April 2004 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 15th April 2004**.

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 Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.

CABINET

At a meeting of Cabinet held on
25th March 2004

PRESENT:	Mrs DSK Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder
	RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader and Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder
Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	CC Barker	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	RF Collinson	Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RE Barrett, RF Bryant (morning only), NS Davies, TJ Flanagan (morning only), CJ Gravatt, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton (afternoon only), Mrs JM Healey, SGM Kindersley, Mrs JA Muncey, LCA Manning JP, Mrs CAED Murfitt, CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, J Shepperson (morning only), Mrs GJ Smith, RGR Smith and PL Stroude were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor JA Nicholas, for the entire day, and from Councillor RF Collinson, for the afternoon only.

Procedural Items

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Cabinet welcomed Steve Hampson, Housing and Environmental Services Director, and Tim Wetherfield, Head of Policy and Communications.

The Leader welcomed back Councillor Mrs JA Muncey and expressed best wishes for her continued good health.

2. PUBLIC MEETING AT COTTENHAM

(With permission of the Leader)

Councillor RF Collinson explained that he had a prior engagement and would have to send apologies for the afternoon portion of the Cabinet meeting. He explained that he and Councillor JA Nicholas, as local members for Cottenham, urged the Council to resolve the planning contraventions in their village as soon as possible.

A public meeting had been held in Cottenham on 23rd March at which a majority voted not to pay their Council Tax in protest against what they saw to

be the District Council's inaction over the Smithy Fen travellers' site. A photograph in the *Cambridge Evening News* clearly showed him and a number of other residents with their hands in the air and the caption stated it was during a vote to withhold Council Tax. Councillor Collinson explained that the photograph was actually of a vote to form a Residents' Association, or of a vote to ask the government to limit the number of occupants on travellers' sites, both issues which he supported. Councillor Collinson would be writing to the *Cambridge Evening News* to correct the situation and ask them to be more careful about future reporting; if his letter were not printed, he would raise the matter with the Press Complaints Commission.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith declared a non-prejudicial interest in Item 4 (Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Order) as Chairman of Directions Plus, a disability information service.

Decisions made by Cabinet

4. COUNCIL TAX DEMAND 2004/05

(Urgent item with permission of the Leader)

There had been an error in the percentage rise printed on the Council Tax demand: "South Cambridgeshire District Council" had been printed opposite the total and percentage rise for the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and vice versa. The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder explained that an announcement and apology would be printed in the *Cambridge Evening News* and included with the next edition of *South Cambs Magazine*, which was delivered to every household in the District.

The Finance and Resources Director explained that, after he had received advice from the Head of Legal Services and had reviewed the Council Tax Regulations, he had concluded that the Council did not have a legal obligation to re-bill as the total amounts were correct as printed. Although the precise cost of a re-billing exercise had not been established, it had been previously calculated for another authority to be in the range of £50,000.

Members were disappointed that the error had occurred but agreed that the cost of re-billing was prohibitive and Cabinet

AGREED that a public announcement and apology be printed in the *Cambridge Evening News* and included on a leaflet displayed prominently with the spring edition of *South Cambs Magazine*.

The Chief Executive explained that the Council Tax demand had been printed before agreement had been reached to exclude "6010 Cambourne Business Park" from the Council address. All future literature would print the agreed address.

5. RAMPTON VILLAGE HALL

The Rampton Village Hall Management Committee had applied for grant aid to rebuild the foyer and front part of the Village Hall, providing access and facilities for disabled users. The Community Development Portfolio Holder noted the strong support of local members Councillors RF Collinson and JA Nicholas and explained that there was an urgent need for building work to keep the hall viable. Councillor Collinson explained that the Village Hall was the only community facility in Rampton and noted the Council's previous support for works.

Cabinet

AGREED to approve the grant of £59,000 to Rampton Village Hall Management Committee for 2003/04, which includes the unclaimed figure of £12,000 indicated in 1998 towards the cost of laying the village hall foundations.

6. MEMBERSHIP OF NORTHSTOWE MEMBER STEERING GROUP

Cabinet, at its meeting of 31st July 2003, had agreed that one member of the Cambridgeshire County Council should serve on the Northstowe Steering Group, but a request from the Steering Group had been made for Cabinet to consider increasing that membership to two. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that the two local County Councillors both held portfolios which they felt were relevant to the development, but noted that the Steering Group was expected to run for ten years and it was unlikely that they would keep the same portfolios throughout. He also noted that County Council representative was expected to attend as a local member, not as a Portfolio Holder.

Cabinet

AGREED to keep the County Council membership on the Northstowe Member Steering Group at one seat.

7. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY ORDER: APPLICATION BY CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL UNDER THE TRANSPORT & WORKS ACT 1992

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder reminded Cabinet that the Council had always supported the guided bus scheme in principle. Although the rail lobby had made representations, the purpose of the discussion was to make representations on the Transport and Works Act Order and not a debate on bus versus rail options.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that, although the Guided Busway was not a perfect scheme, it was the only comprehensive solution presented but it was important that the issues raised by South Cambridgeshire District Council should be addressed. It was necessary to provide the infrastructure to support the high level of development proposed

for the District and the Council, after having previously considered various options, costs and patronage, had decided to support the Guided Bus system.

Advantage of Guided Bus over Increased / Improved Regular Bus Service

The Guided Bus system could be delivered by 2007 in time to meet the requirements of the first residents of Northstowe, and would be free from the heavy traffic congestion on the A14 which delayed existing bus services. The Guided Bus could be developed in conjunction with the service providers to produce low emission vehicles and offer passengers a better quality of ride than a regular bus. A continuous walking / cycle route between Cambridge and St Ives would be developed alongside the Guided Bus track. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed to request that Cambridgeshire County Council provide further information about use of the Guided Bus track during adverse winter weather conditions and how it would be kept clear of leaves and litter.

Addenbrooke's Link

A link to Addenbrooke's was a vital part of the service, and the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed to investigate details of how the Guided Bus could penetrate the Hospital site. Some Members were sceptical of the link to Addenbrooke's and felt that employees and hospital visitors were just as likely to use the bus from the Trumpington Park and Ride.

Maintenance Track

Concern was expressed about the safety and convenience of cyclists and pedestrians using the maintenance track as it crossed the main track at various locations.

Disabled Access

Concern was expressed that the system was not fully accessible by disabled people and the 7-inch kerbs would be difficult for people with pushchairs to navigate. Councillor PL Stroude noted that the kerb might not be necessary as the Guided Bus could use a Global Positioning System or similar to follow the track.

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith asked that a disability forum be immediately implemented to offer constructive criticism of the scheme. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that any group wishing to appear before the planning inquiry had a statutory requirement to make representations by 2nd April, and agreed to provide members with the address to send representations. Councillor Mrs Smith queried whether the District Council could make representations on behalf of the forum, establishing the forum later. The Leader reminded members that the Cambridgeshire County Council was obligated to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act.

Park and Ride Stops

Members noted that whilst the Report from the Development Services Director suggested a Park and Ride site north of Willingham this could prove difficult to construct as the countryside here was open fen. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that the proposal was not site-specific but aimed to encourage Cambridgeshire County Council to investigate places where traffic could be intercepted as early as possible before the route reached Longstanton / Northstowe, preventing increased traffic through villages such as Willingham. The District Council was very mindful of flooding issues in the area.

More clarification should be sought about ensuring that any Park and Ride site, "kiss and ride" site or car park associated with the scheme was designed to prevent "cruiser" gatherings. In addition, careful consideration and design of stops and associated infrastructure would be necessary to prevent nuisance to local residents through group gatherings.

There was a need to clarify the management of short-term car parking at Histon and how to restrict its use to local people rather than longer distance commuters. An integrated parking / bus ticket was a possible solution. There was a dilemma between limiting the number of spaces in Histon, risking increased car parking on side roads, or increasing the number of spaces and making the site attractive for use by long-distance commuters thus adding to traffic in the village.

Heavy / Light Rail Alternatives

A rail system would be unable to access Cambridge city centre and the Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) had demonstrated that a railway would not achieve financial viability and would always require public subsidy. Councillor JD Batchelor, the Council's representative on the County Council Rail Strategy Group, reported that at the recent meeting of that body the rail industry had stated that it was uninterested in providing a line to St Ives.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) agreed to provide the member who had raised the issue of comparative costs with the cost analysis set out in the CHUMMS study, comparing the Guided Bus with heavy and light rail alternatives.

Access to village stops

Local Members concurred with the report regarding the provision of a "kiss and ride" facility at Swavesey. It was suggested that a drop-off / pick-up facility 1½ miles from the village was unlikely to be used sufficiently to justify the substantial environmental impacts in a sensitive location, a situation not unlike that at Oakington, where no provision had been made for vehicular access.

Members raised concerns about the apparent contradiction of approaches towards addressing travel needs of commuters and day users at village stops. Only Histon with a small car park would serve day users if adequately managed. The characteristics of the stops at Oakington and Swavesey were very similar, yet had been treated differently. In addition, unlike the car park at Histon, the Swavesey "kiss and ride" did not address local needs.

Environmental and Economic Impact

The removal of the existing rail line and its impact on the local environment and economy was queried. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that the rail line was likely to be unstable and would need to be rebuilt, at a substantial investment, if it were to be used for heavy rail.

Recommendation

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that the representations from the District Council would be sent to the Department for Transport for the independent inspector to review. Cambridgeshire County Council would receive copies of all representations and aimed to work with all parties to determine ways to improve the scheme.

Cabinet, with six in favour and two opposed,

AGREED to support the Guided Bus proposals in principle but that the strong representations made on the points set out in the report

and in the Appendix of Technical Comments which are required to be addressed.

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder thanked the Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) and his team for their work on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Order.

The meeting was adjourned at 11.40 and reconvened at 14.00

8. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of item 9a in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)4 of the Local Government Act 1972 (exempt information as defined in paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act).

Confidential Item

9. TRAVELLERS

(a) Site Reports and Updates: Histon, Cottenham

Councillor SGM Kindersley deplored the comments made by Councillor Mrs DP Roberts at a Cottenham public meeting, as printed in the *Cambridge Evening News*, and asked that she either retract her statements or resign. Some Members supported Councillor Kindersley's statement and others praised Councillor Mrs Roberts' work with residents. Councillor Roberts assured Councillor Kindersley that she was not advising residents to withhold Council Tax but was stating what she would likely do were she a resident and not an elected representative. She condemned other members and officers for not attending the meeting and said that she was not prepared to apologise or resign. The Leader reported that she had not been invited to the meeting and the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that his invitation had arrived less than a day before the meeting and the meeting had conflicted with a commitment he had in his own village.

The Deputy Planning Director expressed concern with the implication that officers had not attended because they were avoiding meeting the residents. The local member had advised him that his presence could detract from the evening's discussions. The Deputy Planning Director had also met with one of the organisers before the meeting to brief him on the issues. Councillor Mrs Roberts retracted her comment about officers and the Deputy Planning Director apologised for not responding to the invitation.

Histon

Three enforcement notices had been served at the Histon site for breach of planning conditions, the most recent for connection to mains power for toilet facilities. No additional caravans had been moved onto the site and residents had been co-operative and helpful. There had not been further expansion of the site and the injunction was on hold pending the planning appeal on 10th August.

Cottenham

Documentation was circulated including aerial photographs of the site and a list of approved, authorised pitches, appeal sites and unauthorised occupation. Various sites in breach of planning control were identified and it was reported that an appeal had been set for 20th July. It was difficult to judge the total number of people on the site based solely on caravan and vehicle numbers; the population figures cited had been provided by the police following their own investigations.

Councillor Mrs Roberts commended the work of the Enforcement Section and thanked the Enforcement Officer for his admirable recent work. The Enforcement Section comprised only 1½ full-time officers, with another full-time officer beginning at Easter, to cover the entire District. The Head of Community Services agreed to review the role the Travellers Officer could play to work with or support the Enforcement team.

Mr David Brock, the Council's external solicitor, clarified that, before a judge would consider sending an individual to prison for contempt of court, it would be necessary to determine whether planning permission could make the individual's actions lawful retrospectively. A judge, therefore, would likely require that the planning process run its course before the Authority would be allowed to return to the High Court for an injunction.

The meeting then became open.

Decisions made by Cabinet

9. TRAVELLERS (CONTINUED)

(b) Legal and Regulatory Process and Procedures

Temporary Stop Notices

Under the present system, an enforcement notice was required before a stop notice could be issued. An amendment to the bill, if approved,

would allow stop notices to be issued without enforcement notices but, as the notices were usually issued in conjunction, the amendment would make little difference. The Head of Legal Services explained that direct action by the Council following the issuance of enforcement notices would have an effect, but the outcome had to be weighed against the considerable cost per case.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)

The latest guidance from the ODPM applied to unlawful encampments on private land or grass verges and did not apply to travellers' sites.

The Development Services Director explained that he had recently written to remind the ODPM that no response had yet been received to the Council's letter of January 2004. The Information Team were asked to issue a press release highlighting the lack of response from the ODPM despite the urgency of the situation in South Cambridgeshire.

Planning Applications

The Council was likely to receive applications from travellers without local connection. Planning applications could not be refused on the grounds that there was not enough provision in the local area or that suitable alternatives existed elsewhere within the authority; decisions for travellers' sites must be based on normal planning guidance with regard to conservation, archaeological awareness and local provision of amenities.

Compulsory Purchase Orders

Imposing Compulsory Purchase Orders on travellers' sites would impact Council Tax due to the expense of cleaning and securing vacated sites.

Needs Assessment

A quantitative travellers' needs assessment should be completed as soon as possible. Mr Brock advised that "need" should be defined as "local need", although it was difficult to say how this would be interpreted in court.

Cabinet

- AGREED**
- (a) to undertake a qualitative needs assessment as soon as possible; and
 - (b) to request officers and Members to work with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure that this is a priority which the County Council will resource jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

(c) Clarity of Procedure Action Plan

Management Team had recently conducted a strategic risk assessment in which travellers, with the associated workload and costs, had been identified as one of the top three risks to the Council.

Development Services proposed a draft framework for a strategy to deal with unauthorised gypsy encampments but, due to resource constraints and the four on-going appeals, work on a draft could not commence before autumn. The draft framework would include production of a guide for the public to show the planning and legal processes, helping to inform residents of the Council's powers with relation to unauthorised encampments.

Cabinet

AGREED that Development Services prepare a draft framework including an enforcement manual for reference by members of the public, showing how the Council used enforcement powers, more explanation for local communities and mechanisms for informing Parish Councils.

(d) Policies: District and National

Local Plans 1 and 2 had served the Council well but the current situation necessitated that additional provision for handling travellers' sites be made in the new Local Development Framework (LDF). In advance of making additional provision in the new LDF and in the light of the unforeseen upsurge in travellers resorting to the District, further survey material and guidance on the implementation of the travellers policy in Local Plan 2 was necessary to address the unusually high numbers of travellers now resorting to the District. There was also a need to address national policy as recent correspondence with the ODPM had demonstrated that concentration of number was not a material consideration.

Cabinet

AGREED (a) that the Planning Policy Advisory Group together with the Travellers Consultative Group:

- (i) consider whether the Council can improve how it works with Environmental Health, the police and local community service provides in providing for travellers;
- (ii) investigate further the impact of unauthorised travellers sites and breaches of planning conditions on South Cambridgeshire's communities; and

(iii) prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance to develop policy HG 21 "Gypsies and Travelling Show People" of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 concerning the number and scale of sites in any locality; and

(b) in order to maintain momentum in the preparation of the new Local Development Framework for South Cambridgeshire, that planning consultants be retained to prepare and consult on the proposed Gypsies Supplementary Planning Guidance.

(e) Cottenham Residents' Association Letter

The Cottenham Residents' Association (CRA) had agreed to write to the ODPM and Councillor Mrs Roberts asked Cabinet to support the sentiments expressed in the letter (copied at Appendix A). The CRA were requesting that the numbers of travellers be taken into account as a material planning consideration, and that national guidelines be changed, allowing size of encampments and number of travellers to be factors when determining planning decisions.

Members expressed some concerns:

- the CRA was not an elected body and that some inaccuracy about the Council's dealings with travellers had already been conveyed at the CRA's recent meeting;
- the CRA's letter should also be forwarded to the local Members of Parliament;
- the Council supported all the constituents in Cottenham and not just the Residents' Association;
- the reference to numbers of travellers within the CRA's letter was unclear;
- coalescence of sites was problematic but not mentioned in the CRA letter; and
- the CRA was recommending that residents should withhold their Council Tax and members could not agree with illegal action.

Cabinet, with four in favour and two against,

AGREED to support all the people of Cottenham by endorsing the sentiments contained within the Cottenham Residents' Association's letter to the ODPM, although the Council could not condone the withholding of Council Tax.

(f) Finance

Cabinet, at its meeting of 22nd January 2004, had accepted that accurate budgetary positions were impossible but had acknowledged that sufficient resources must be identified to oversee the growing problems. Members discussed transferring internal staff or employing external consultants to assist with enforcement, the implications of establishing a dedicated team to deal with travellers' issues and whether the Council had a case to apply for central government funding.

Cabinet

AGREED that a budgeted report be brought to a future Cabinet detailing the costs of recruiting additional internal support or using external consultants for enforcement work, the revenue implications of establishing a dedicated support team, and whether central government could be approached for funding once expenditure has occurred.

The meeting ended at 16.20

Statement from the Cottenham Residents' Association

Motion calling on Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott and Planning Minister Keith Hill to:

- Amend the law and adopt the widely-held view of genuine Travellers from the various ethnic groups that the size of all sites should wherever possible be restricted to 10-15 plots and to an absolute maximum of 20 plots.
- Listen to law abiding Travellers who recognise the benefits to themselves and the local communities from limiting the size of sites.
- Understand, as genuine Travellers do, that peaceful co-existence within any community is a reflection of the trust which is born as fear and threat disappears.

We demand that Mr Prescott and Mr Hill address the issue of limiting the sizes of sites (and their number in any one area) as a matter of extreme urgency on the grounds of public safety and so that the Human Rights of all concerned can be effectively recognised.

CABINET

At a meeting of Cabinet held on
1st April 2004

PRESENT:	Mrs DSK Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder
	RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader and Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder
Councillors:	Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	CC Barker	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	RF Collinson	Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RF Bryant, R Hall and SGM Kindersley were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from the Development Services Director.

Procedural Items

10. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

The Leader was authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 4th March 2004 as a correct record.

Monitoring of Council 2003/04 Priorities – Third Quarter to December 2003 (Minute 4)

Members would receive a full Housing Development update including the corrected target of affordable, key sector and general needs housing provided through all means, as well as the successful Housing Corporation bids. There had been a very disappointing response from the Housing Corporation: it was likely that the Council would receive £10 million rather than the £50 million expected and the Housing Corporation hoped that s106 agreements could cover the remaining funding. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder offered any possible assistance to the Housing Portfolio Holder with discussions with the Housing Corporation, as the reduction in funding would have planning implications. The Leader agreed to raise the issue with the Infrastructure Partnership.

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell declared an interest in item 3 (Food Service Plan) as a member of the Country Market in Great Shelford, although she did not produce food for the market.

Recommendation to Council

12. FOOD SERVICE PLAN

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder commended the Food Service Plan, a comprehensive explanation of the work and structure of Environmental Health in relation to food safety. The Chief Environmental Health Officer confirmed that there were sufficient resources to accommodate the current workload, although staff could be stretched if there were a major situation. Officers were commended for their good performance with inspections.

The Chief Environmental Health Officer explained that premises of people selling jam and chutney by the roadside should be registered, although the need for registration would be dependent on the extent of their food production. Mobile food vans were likewise required to register, including their name and address. Environmental Health Officers could investigate personal or mobile premises if concerns were raised.

Councillor RF Collinson expressed concern about elderly or visually disabled residents who may not be able to read expiry dates on food packaging and asked whether specialised training could be made available for community groups or charities. Limited resources made it difficult to provide personalised training, although educational packs could be produced. Food Hygiene courses were offered for a fee, and could be tailored to accommodate special needs.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Food Service Plan 2004/05 be approved.

Decisions made by Cabinet

13. EXECUTIVE DELEGATED POWERS

The Constitution Review Working Party recommended functions currently reserved for the whole Cabinet which could be delegated to individual Portfolio Holders to enhance the Cabinet's capacity to give priority to strategic issues and to provide focus on performance in priority areas during its discussions. Councillor RF Bryant, Chairman of the Constitution Review Working Party, commended the report.

It was confirmed that the Democratic Representation Budget funded the Leader's attendance at conferences as well as members' seminars and training courses. In light of the likely increase in training, the Information and

Customer Services Portfolio Holder agreed to ask the Member Training Advisory Group to consider this budget in detail.

Cabinet **AGREED** to accept the recommendations of the Constitution Review Working Party and to accept the following delegated powers:

(a) In place of the reference to the Annual Workforce Plan:

For approval by whole Executive

To approve the service Continuous Improvement Plans (for recommendation to Council)

For decision by Portfolio Holder

Resources & Staffing PFH to determine responsibilities and grading/scales of new posts arising from Council approval of bids under Continuous Improvement Plans

(b) That Chief Officers have delegated powers to approve statutory grants up to and including Level 3;

(c) Member Training / Support and Approval of Conference Attendance:

Conferences/Appointments

For approval by whole Executive

For decision by Portfolio Holder

Portfolio holders may attend such conferences or courses as they see fit where these are funded from their own portfolio budget. The Leader may attend such conferences or courses as required, subject to budget availability.

Information and Customer Services

For approval by whole Executive

For decision by Portfolio Holder

"To approve arrangements for member training and support (including IT support), together with approval of attendance of members at conferences or external training events beyond those allowed for portfolio holders and the Leader, where funded from the Democratic Representation budget"

(d) Consequential Amendments

- Addition of loans to reference to non-statutory grants and guarantees
- Deletion of references to Local Authority Social Housing Grant
- Deletion of examples of statutory and non-statutory grants
- Relating to virement:

For approval by whole Executive

To approve virement where the affected PFHs have not agreed

For decision by Portfolio Holder

Relevant PFHs to approve virement across 2 or more portfolios (with the Finance & Resources Director) See Rule 5, Budget & Policy Framework Rules

To approve carry forward of uncommitted balances on reserve account for grants over 2 years old

To approve carry forward of uncommitted balances on reserve account for grants under 2 years old

14. AUTHORITY TO APPEAR IN COURT

Cabinet, at its meeting on 16th October 2003, granted authority to the Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder to nominate officers to appear in the County and Magistrates Court. The Constitution Review Working Party felt that it was more appropriate that the Chief Executive exercise this authority and recommended that Cabinet rescind its previous decision and transfer authority to the Chief Executive as only professional officers could appear in court for the Council.

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) to rescind its decision of 16th October 2003; and
- (b) to grant authority to the Chief Executive to nominate officers to appear in the County and Magistrates Court under the County Court Act 1984 and the Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000.

15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2004

Member authorities were invited to submit bids for subjects for debate at the Local Government Association (LGA) Annual Conference. Cabinet felt that the suggested subjects were of exceptional importance not just to South Cambridgeshire District Council, but also to many other local authorities.

Cabinet **AGREED** to put forward the following topics for debate at the LGA Annual Conference:

- (a) The powers of local authorities to enforce effectively against illegal traveller encampments on land which the travellers themselves own;
- (b) The relationship between human rights and planning legislation;
- (c) The huge lack of government resources in rural growth areas for affordable housing and the necessary infrastructure.

16. PROFESSIONAL ARTS ORGANISATION PARTNERSHIP GRANTS 2004/05

The Community Development Portfolio Holder noted that she had already agreed those grants which fell within her delegated powers, and recommended the remainder to Cabinet.

Clarification was sought and given:

- The Cambridge Film Consortium was a charity involving the Cambridge Arts Picture house, Anglia Polytechnic University and Screen East, and had worked with Sawston Village College on film and animation work as well as film projects in Cottenham, Hauxton and Gamlingay. The grant would be used to continue the programme at Sawston Village College and on-going outreach work in the District;

- The reduced grant to Kettle's Yard reflected the limited work in South Cambridgeshire in the past year. The Arts Development Officer had agreed to revisit the grant if new outreach proposals were made;
- The grant to The Junction / CDC took account of the forthcoming closure for refurbishment and would be reviewed after six months;
- The Arts Development Officer and was confident that the Cambridge Arts Theatre service level agreement was deliverable;
- Targets for all organisations would be monitored on a monthly basis rather than six-monthly as in previous years.

Cabinet **AGREED** the following Arts Partnership Grants:

- (a) a grant of £35,000 to the Cambridge Arts Theatre for the work of the Education department, paid in two instalments, subject to the signing of a service level agreement; and
- (b) a grant of £40,000 to The Junction / CDC, payable in two instalments, subject to the signing of a service level agreement.

Information Items

17. HOUSING REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

The Housing Portfolio Holder presented the update on the progress in letting the repairs and maintenance contracts and advised Cabinet of the in principle management decision to allocate a portion of housing repairs and maintenance work to the Council's DLO workforce.

The following corrections were made to the report:

- "Locally sourced labour" to be included under the Council's Sustainability Corporate Objective at paragraph 3;
- "...district wide works for unplanned large voids..." at paragraph 6;
- "...maintenance service currently underway..." at paragraph 10;
- "and using benchmarking as at paragraph 14" to be added to the final sentence of paragraph 11;
- corrected spelling of "principle" in the recommendation at paragraph 19.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director confirmed that there was a large amount of work required to integrate the DLO into the new Housing and Environmental Services Directorate, work which would be done in a transparent manner and which was essential to ensure the repairs and maintenance services to tenants remained strong.

The Head of Shire Homes clarified that the three different contracts ensured the Council would be able to include large voids in the refurbishment programme: an increasing proportion of refurbishment funding was spent on large voids, thus the first two contracts, each covering separate geographical

areas, included incidental refurbishment and large voids and, as voids were unpredictable, the third contract would provide large refurbishment jobs on a responsive and reactive basis District-wide as if such jobs were voids. The three contracts provided a value for money service which would get the work completed quickly and capital funding would be used for the third.

Cabinet **NOTED**

- (a) the progress made in tendering critical housing repairs and maintenance contracts to achieve contiguous services provision; and
- (b) the in-principle management decision made to allocate a portion of work to the Council's DLO.

18. HOUSING STOCK OPTIONS APPRAISAL UPDATE

The Housing Portfolio Holder reported that the Stock Options Appraisal (SOA) was a government requirement. The deadline was July 2005 and the Council was on target to complete the SOA by spring 2005. The Housing and Environmental Services Director confirmed that the Independent Tenant Advisor (ITA) interview process had been completed and an ITA appointed.

Clarifications were sought and given:

- Right To Buy Requests were declining; it was likely that this was due to properties being valued much higher;
- The Tenant Empowerment Strategy was a government requirement setting out how the authority worked with all its tenants, not just those involved in the Tenant Panel, and would ensure that all tenants had the opportunity to be informed of the SOA through means such as a newsletter, telephone hotline, and meetings;
- *South Cambs Magazine* and *Key Issues* could be used for a comprehensive explanation to tenants of the issues involved in the SOA;
- Appendix B set out the criteria which the government would sign off. A detailed project plan identifying responsible officers and timescales would be developed by officers;
- Authorities which have transferred their housing have negotiated assured tenancies with the receiving housing association which as far as possible reflect tenants' existing secure tenancies, for example by preserving rights to buy etc. The Law Commission was looking at plans to create one kind of tenancy for affordable rented homes to reduce current confusion between assured and secure tenancies;
- If a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) were established to manage the housing stock, the Council and its preferred provider would form a contractual arrangement, so Councillors and tenants would have the opportunity to negotiate terms of a management agreement. The Council could similarly influence the nature of a Housing Association established for management if stock were transferred under an LSVT. Housing Association Boards usually comprised independent community members, Councillors and tenants, so Council and tenant involvement and influence would be retained;

- No single option needed to be applied to the whole of the housing stock and a mix and match option was also possible.

The Housing and Environmental Services Director agreed to provide a training seminar for members following the elections and the Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder agreed to add the SOA to the general training programme.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

19. SHIRE HOMES PLANNED MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

Cabinet had historically awarded delegated authority to the Housing Portfolio Holder to accept the winning tender for large housing repairs and maintenance contracts of a value at Level 3 or above. On closer scrutiny of the Constitution and Contract Standing Orders, it was confirmed that Cabinet had given delegated powers to the Portfolio Holder to accept tenders at Level 3 or above.

Cabinet **NOTED** that the awarding of large planned maintenance contracts for 2004/05 and subsequent years would be authorised by the Portfolio Holder.

Standing Items

20. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

None.

21. RE-LOCATION OF OFFICES TO CAMBOURNE

Cabinet members had recently visited the new offices and plans for the move were proceeding according to schedule. The Risk Management Strategy had been revisited and the New Offices Working Group was satisfied that there were robust contingency plans in place for the move.

The meeting ended at 10.45

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE:
MINUTES**

Date 8 March 2004
Time 1430h – 1700h
Place South Cambridgeshire Hall, Hills Road, Cambridge
Present: County Councillors
T J Bear, J E Coston, P D Gooden, S F Johnstone and J E Reynolds

District Councillors
D Bard (Chairman), C C Barker, J D Batchelor, D S K Spink and
R Summerfield

CALC Councillors
G Everson, M Mason and D Morison

Also present
County Councillor A G Orgee
District Councillors S Kindersley and P Orme
Parish Councillors N Brew (Babraham), S Rowe (Horseheath) and
J Daunt (Little Abington)

123. MINUTES – 8TH DECEMBER 2003 & 11TH FEBRUARY 2004

The minutes of the meetings held on 8th December 2003 and 11th February 2004 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

8th December 2003

page 2, Minute 110, Petitions Update, (a) A1307 between Haverhill and A11, second paragraph, delete "between Bartlow Road and the western Horseheath junction" and add "from the A11 to the Suffolk county boundary".

page 2, Minute 110, Petitions Update, (a) A1307 between Haverhill and A11, fourth paragraph, delete "A11 particularly the Babraham crossroads" and add "section beyond the A11 up to the Babraham crossroads".

page 5, Minute 112, Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement (JFMHI) Schemes 2004/2005, last bullet point, replace "County" with "District".

page 6, Minute 112, Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement (JFMHI) Schemes 2004/2005, third bullet point, add "and the Pampisford scheme."

11th February 2004

- add CALC Councillor G Everson to the list of apologies.

Arising from the minutes of 11th February 2004, the following matters were also raised:

- Minute 121, A14 Village Traffic Calming Project – Progress Report - County Councillor Johnstone advised the Joint Committee that she was not the Local Member for Longstanton but was the Local Member for Over. The Longstanton scheme would be part of the route from Over to the A14.
- Minute 122, Safer Routes to School – Fowlmere County Primary School – Members were informed that discussions had taken place with London Road residents, the Parish Council and other residents regarding the proximity of the proposed new path to properties on the western side, and about reduced visibility arising from the reduced path width on the eastern. The new path would now be reduced to a width of one metre at the chimney breast of one house only. The course of the path along Hillside Cottages would remain unchanged.

124. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Johnstone declared a prejudicial interest under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct as a Non-Executive Director of Addenbrooke's NHS Trust in relation to Minute 127, Park and Ride Site Operational Hours, as Addenbrooke's NHS Trust had registered an objection to the proposed measures. She left the council chamber whilst this item was discussed.

125. PETITIONS

The Joint Committee received:

(a) A1307 Cambridge Road, Little Abington

A 92-signature petition, presented by Ms J Daunt, Little Abington Parish Council, requesting interactive speed signs along the A1307 Cambridge Road, Little Abington. Local Members Councillors Orgee and Orme, indicated their support for the petition. Councillor Orgee added that he also supported any other measures to reduce traffic speeds.

(b) A1307 at Babraham

A 62-signature petition, presented by Mr N Brew, Chairman of Babraham Parish Council, requesting improvements to be made to the dangerous crossing on the A1307 at Babraham. Local Members Councillors Orgee and Orme, indicated their support for the petition. Councillor Orgee added that his concern had been reflected in his request, at the last meeting, to extend the A1307 from the A11 to Suffolk County Boundary Route Study to include the section beyond the A11 up to the Babraham crossroads.

In accordance with the County Council's petitions procedure, a full response to the points raised would be sent to the petitioners following further consideration and consultation. The Area Joint Committee would also receive an update at its next meeting.

126. CAMBRIDGE INFORMATION SIGNING SYSTEM

Members were reminded that they had considered reports on a new information signing system for Cambridge, based on a series of signing rings, at their meetings on 15th September and 8th December 2003. Consultations had since been undertaken on a signing system which included an inner ring focusing on car park management and an outer ring focusing on encouraging drivers to use Park and Ride. There had also been some trial sites for the middle ring focusing on network information and incident management for traffic travelling into and out from the city centre.

The Joint Committee received a tabled summary of questionnaire returns, which were supportive of both the inner and outer rings. The need for the middle ring signing was not as clear as for the other rings. It was therefore proposed that, in the light of the consultation, the middle ring trial sites should not be pursued further at this time. This would free up resources, which could be used to provide information signs on other main routes into the city. It would achieve, subject to local consultations on the exact location of the signs, a complete ring of information signs on all the major entry points to the city.

It was noted that some residents had raised specific concerns over the location of the inner signs. Members were informed that the Cambridge Area Joint Committee would explore these issues in greater detail. They were advised that an operational protocol covering the use of the free text signs was to be prepared for approval by the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committees over the coming months. The completion of the scheme, subject to approval, was scheduled for the autumn in time for the start of the Grand Arcade development.

During discussion, the following comments were made and points noted:

- queried the possible location of the Huntingdon Road free text message sign. Members were informed that it was proposed to locate the sign on the Cambridge side of the Girton junction. Further consultations on the exact location of the signs on other main routes into the city would include Local Members.
- queried the value of the disappointing response to the consultation. Members were informed that officers had also relied on responses from stakeholder groups. They were advised that a poor response could reflect the fact the public did not feel too strongly about this issue.
- concern about the cost of maintaining the signs. It was noted that the inner ring of signs would be mainly operated automatically with parking availability being directed by the counting system at car parks. This would also apply to signs on the Park and Ride approaches. The County Council was likely to have highway network traffic management centre, in the future, to manage all technologies on the

highway network. In the meantime, the administration of the scheme would be managed within current workloads.

- requested feedback on staff involvement and the cost of administering the scheme. It was noted that the signs were radio controlled and therefore very cheap to operate. They would require attention from staff initially and this had been allowed for in the set up costs for the scheme. It was acknowledged that existing budgets might have to be modified to deal with any unexpected problems. Discussions were taking place with the Police to allow them access to the signs.
- the importance of accurate and timely information for the credibility of the scheme. It was suggested that the information displayed on the signs should be short and clear for both residents and non-residents of Cambridge. It was also suggested that the signs should not promote public transport during the introductory period.
- concern that the County Council was prioritising the needs of motorists over bus users particularly as Real Time Information (RTI) for buses was not yet available. The Joint Committee was reminded that the Council had been reluctant to release funding for RTI in the absence of a national standard. However, RTI would be operational soon as part of the Guided Bus scheme.

It was resolved unanimously to support the information signing system proposals subject to the changes detailed in Section 5 of the report.

127. PARK AND RIDE SITE OPERATIONAL HOURS

The Joint Committee was informed that the relative ease of access to Park and Ride sites, out of hours, had attracted organised gatherings of 'cruisers' to the Trumpington and Cowley Road Park and Ride sites. This had resulted in a large number of complaints from local residents about the noise and intrusion experienced during the evening and late into the night. It had also resulted in damage to both sites.

Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) had been advertised for all Park and Ride sites to prohibit motor vehicles on the sites during the night. The Police would then be able to immediately issue fixed penalty tickets to any cruisers found using any site, if they managed to secure access by some means. The TROs would also prohibit parking during the night. The barriers at the sites would be locked to physically prevent access. This would mean that drivers arriving back late to sites would not be able to retrieve their vehicles until the following morning. Members were informed that access and egress at the Trumpington site to the small parking area segregated from the main parking was required at all times to facilitate the dropping off and picking up of long distance bus service passengers. The advertised proposals prohibited parking in this area for longer than two hours to avoid it being used for long stay parking.

The Joint Committee noted details of 79 objections to the proposals relating to the adverse effect on people returning to the sites late in the evening, either after work or socialising in Cambridge, and on access to long distance bus services. The County Council was aware of the importance of protecting the needs of bona-fide site users. It was therefore proposed to introduce a permit scheme to allow Park and Ride users to apply for an overnight permit, which could be displayed in the vehicle to avoid it being ticketed after the closure of the site. Site barriers would continue to operate as at present, to allow permit holders to leave the site, out of hours. Permits for long stay parking would be subject to a maximum stay of 23 hours in any 24. It was proposed to charge a fee for a long stay parking permit to support the site running costs.

Members were advised that decisions on the implementation of the scheme would be taken by the County Council, in the light of the views of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committees.

During discussion, the following comments were made and points noted:

- queried how site co-ordinators would distinguish between those people travelling into Cambridge and those using long distance buses. It was noted that site co-ordinators would monitor the permit arrangements. Any permit holder found to be abusing permit conditions could have their permit withdrawn and no further permits issued.
- queried the administration of the permit system. It was noted that city centre permits would be free of charge as Park and Ride was primarily aimed at supporting access to the city centre. The Council did not want to discourage long distance users but it was important that they contributed towards Park and Ride. Members were informed that the details of permit holders would be recorded. Permits would be obtainable from the kiosks at the sites or via telephone. They would also be available for a period of time e.g. a month, for long distance users. Members highlighted the importance of clear information on the system for users.
- acknowledged the need to address the problem of 'cruisers'. However, Members were concerned about the impact of these proposals on bona-fide site users particularly those using long distance bus services. It was important that they were not forced to park on local streets or discouraged to use public transport. They queried whether it was cost effective to issue permits for such a small number of people. They were also concerned about the negative publicity these proposals could create. It was suggested that the TROs were sufficient and site co-ordinators should just be asked to monitor the situation. Members were advised that a permit system was needed to exempt legitimate users from enforcement action.
- the need for Park and Ride to continue after 7.30p.m. It was suggested that discussions should take place with operators about a possible trial of a late night service at one site particularly in the light of increased car parking charges in the city.

- queried the quality of the CCTV pictures on site to use as evidence to secure a prosecution. Members were informed that it would be very difficult to use this evidence in a prosecution. TROs allowed the Police and the Council to take immediate action.
- suggested that the Council could take a civil action against 'cruisers'. Members were advised that such action would be very expensive and the Council would only be able to prosecute in relation to trespass, which would be very difficult to prove as the public had right of access to the sites. The penalty was also likely to be very small and would therefore not act as a deterrent.
- the need to find other ways of addressing the problem in order to avoid penalising legitimate Park and Ride users. It was suggested that the Police should be dealing with the problem of 'cruisers'. Members were informed that the Police had provided some support in relation to the Trumpington site. However, they had not been able to respond on some occasions to noise and intrusion complaints at the site late into the night.
- the possibility of wheel clamping offenders. It was noted that the Council had no powers to wheel clamp. However, this could change in the future with the introduction of local authority parking control measures.
- the possibility of introducing pay and display at sites in place of bus tickets. It was noted that this issue had been discussed when Park and Ride had first been set up. Members were informed that there were cost implications of introducing pay and display. There was also concern that 'cruisers' could pay to use the site, which would legitimise their actions.
- suggested that the Council section off parts of the Park and Ride sites to make them less attractive to 'cruisers' and provide a small area for long stay parking. It was noted that it would be very expensive to modify all the sites. It would also be very difficult to limit long stay parking to just long stay users. Members were advised that it was more cost effective to trial a permit system first.
- requested a report on how the scheme was working in six months time.

A proposal from Councillor Barker, seconded by Councillor Spink, to support the draft TRO as advertised without a permit system but with a review in the autumn was not supported.

It was resolved by a majority to support the draft TROs as advertised, subject to a relaxation to allow permits to be issued for legitimate site users, and a review in the autumn.

(CALC Councillor Morison declared a personal interest by reason of being an objector to

the proposals)

128. A14 VILLAGE TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT – PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Committee was informed of progress in developing and implementing traffic calming schemes in selected South Cambridgeshire villages, along the A14 corridor between Cambridge and Huntingdon.

Four letters of objection had been received, following the publication of the details of the type and location of the raised areas proposed for Longstanton. Members noted the details of the objectors, their reasons for objecting and officer comments on each.

The Joint Committee queried whether the project was on target and requested information on the cost of individual schemes. It was informed that approximate costings had been identified in the Local Transport Plan. However, some Parishes had not taken up the option of environmental traffic calming measures. It was noted that an appendix detailing the cost of individual schemes would be included with future reports. Members were informed that the County Council had managed to spend £1.8m in 2003/04 from the £2.00m funding available, and secure funding for 2004/05.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Gooden, reminded Members that at the last meeting they had been informed that Histon and Impington Parish Councils would be contacted in March about the development of draft schemes for both villages. He was concerned that the Parish Councils had still not been contacted. Both Councils had provided a detailed submission six months ago but had not received any feedback. Officers agreed to contact the Parish Councils in March 2004. Speaking as a Local Member, CALC Councillor Mason, highlighted the need for officers to take into account the increase in traffic movements in Histon since the opening of Tesco's.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Reynolds, hoped that there would be proper co-ordination with the Highways Agency in relation to the widening of the A428 between Caxton Gibbet and Hardwick and the scheme for Dry Drayton. He was concerned about dualling outside the entrance to Scotland Farm. Members were also concerned about rat-running after the A428 was dualled. It was noted that discussions were taking place with the Highways Agency. He also requested a date for the safety audit and start of the scheme. In relation to the scheme for Madingley, it was noted that it would be completed within 8 weeks weather permitting.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- i) to note the progress made;
- ii) to determine the objections without holding a public inquiry;
- iii) to approve the construction of the raised areas in Longstanton, and
- iv) to inform the objectors accordingly.

129. A1307 FROM THE A11 TO SUFFOLK COUNTY BOUNDARY ROUTE STUDY

The Joint Committee received a report on the progress of the route study on the A1307 from the A11 to the Suffolk County boundary. Members were reminded that a petition had been presented to the last meeting requesting action to improve safety and access along the A1307 corridor.

Since 1997, there had been an average increase of 9% in traffic movements along the corridor. Surveys were currently being undertaken involving traffic turning and speed data. Models predicting the impact of changes on traffic movements would subsequently need to be prepared. There had been 141 injury accidents between the A11 and the County Boundary at Suffolk from January 1998 to December 2003. Officers were still preparing the figures for the section west of the A11. Members noted an accident summary based upon actual recorded injury only accidents and a casualty summary. The accident rate had remained steady despite the increase in traffic growth, which reflected minor and major works carried out. However, the severity index was significantly greater than the County norm.

There were currently three accident black sites, not including the A11 interchange, in the current 2003 Cambridgeshire Accident Cluster site list. The dual carriageway up to the entrance of Dalehead Foods east of Linton was ranked 19th, the entrance to the Granta Service Station 23rd, and the A1307 from Bartlow crossroads to Dean Road crossroads 27th. Members noted previous works conducted to address accidents occurring over this length of the A1307. They also considered programmed works, which included access arrangements for the Special Educational Needs (SEN) School at Linton Village College to be incorporated within the route study.

The Joint Committee was informed that the results of this investigation and the proposed strategy would be presented to the next full meeting in June, and it would include the villages of Little Abington and Babraham.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Batchelor, welcomed the report, which had confirmed the views of local residents that the A1307 was an extremely dangerous road. He was very supportive of a strategy to reduce casualties, and thanked officers who had already carried out a considerable amount of work to resolve issues on this stretch of road. Members requested figures for heavy commercial vehicles using the A1307, and queried whether these vehicles had been involved in accidents in the vicinity of Dalehead Foods.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Orgee, acknowledged how important this report was in reinforcing the poor safety record of the A1307. However, he stressed the need to ensure that any improvements to specific locations did not impact on safety further down the route. He asked officers to take account of the safety of children from the Abingtons travelling to Linton Village College. He also welcomed improved safety measures at the SEN school. His views were supported by Councillor Orme. Horseheath Parish Councillor S Rowe expressed local concerns about the failure of motorists to adhere to the speed limit between Horseheath Park to Mill House. This had effectively split the village in two making it very difficult for local

people to access the four entrances/exits to the village. She was also very concerned about the noise of vehicles.

It was resolved unanimously to note the report.

130. RESULTS OF HEAVY COMMERCIAL VEHICLE COUNTS (HCV), GAMLINGAY

The Joint Committee considered the results of lorry counts recently undertaken in the Gamlingay area as a result of local concerns. Members were reminded that they had received a petition from local residents regarding traffic in the area, including a request for an environmental weight limit, at their meeting in June. At this meeting, they had also noted the concerns of petitioners, and resolved to order HCV counts in the area, including the village of Gamlingay, to be discussed at a future meeting. Members noted details of HCV counts, and the County Council's HCV policy.

An analysis of HCV movements recorded at six sites had shown that the B1040 North and The Heath were the only sites to exceed 60 HCV movements. However, a breakdown of movements into flows on the individual roads had not met the Council's policy criteria of a minimum of 60 movements along a route or in the area per day. HCV flows had only exceeded the threshold on the B1040, both north and south of Gamlingay. However, the imposition of a weight limit would not be appropriate or comply with current policy as there was no suitable alternative route that would not impose an excessively long diversion. The Council was in the process of appointing an HCV Manager who would be looking at current HCV routes through the County and working with the freight industry to minimise the impact on local communities.

Some Members expressed disappointment at the outcome of the investigation. However, they welcomed the appointment of a County HCV Manager. It was important not to overlook the size of some of the vehicles on small roads and the impact on local people. They were particularly concerned about the impact on pedestrians where there were no footpaths.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Kindersley, reminded Members that the petitioners had originally petitioned for traffic calming measures in the village. There was clearly substantial vehicle movement in the area of The Heath and accidents were a regular occurrence. Therefore he reiterated his support for some form of traffic calming. He was disappointed that County policies prevented an HCV restriction, which had occurred in the neighbouring village of Hilton, and the introduction of a 40mph limit in the area. Local residents had recently conducted their own HCV count and identified a number of persistent offenders. He was concerned that a bid for a Jointly Funded Minor Highways Improvement Scheme for a planings footway had not been successful even though local residents had offered to help fund it. Residents had also been informed by the Police that it was not possible to conduct speed checks as there was nowhere for the Police to stop. He asked for the concerns of local residents to be reconsidered and for action to be taken to improve safety in the village.

Members were reminded that this report was in response to their request for HCV counts. It was noted that a request for traffic calming measures had been dealt with as part of the petitions update report considered at the June meeting. They were

reminded that officers had to work within the Council's policy framework and priorities. However, it was acknowledged that changes in policies over the years could have resulted in some anomalies. Members were reminded that the Jointly Funded Minor Highways Improvement Scheme bid for Gamlingay had not scored highly enough. They were also informed that the night-time HCV restriction in Hilton had been imposed after a public inquiry.

Given the length of time between the two reports, Members requested the opportunity to reconsider both reports together at the next meeting in order to identify any possible options. They were concerned that they might have put more emphasis on the environmental weight limit than on traffic.

It was resolved unanimously:

- i) to note the results of the lorry counts and the intention to appoint a Heavy Commercial Vehicle (HCV) Manager; and
- ii) to receive a report at the next meeting with details of general traffic counts as well as lorry counts.

131. SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL – BALSHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Joint Committee considered feedback and comments received in response to consultation on a proposed Safer Routes to School scheme that had been developed for Balsham Primary School. The scheme had received a great deal of local support; however, one objection had been received with regard to the extension of the existing footpath in School Lane. Residents were concerned that the proximity of the path would increase the level of exposure to their property. Members were advised that there was over three metres of verge between the path and the highway boundary.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Bear, supported the proposed scheme and highlighted the support of the general community.

It was resolved to approve the proposed scheme for implementation.

132. AGENDA PLAN

The Committee noted its agenda plan, up until the 2005 spring cycle, which would include an information paper on new developments in the autumn. Members also agreed dates for special meetings, to commence at 2.30p.m., to progress the A14 Village Traffic Calming Project, as follows:

- Friday, 30 April
- Friday, 10 September
- Monday, 8 November
- Friday, 28 January
-
- Chairman