

## COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN

4<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2004

### CONTENTS



**South  
Cambridgeshire**  
District Council

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Committee Meetings
2. Prejudicial Interests/Withdrawing from meetings  
(Recommended by the Standards Committee)
3. Call in

#### OFFICER DECISIONS

1. Historic Building Grants: War Memorial, **Longstanton**

#### MINUTES

1. Environmental Health Portfolio Holder Meeting minutes from 29<sup>th</sup> July 2004
2. South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Joint Area Committee minutes from 28<sup>th</sup> June 2004

#### AGENDA

1. Agenda for the meeting of the Cambridgeshire County Council held on the 27<sup>th</sup> July 2004  
(For members who do not have internet access, paper copies of reports tabled at this meeting are available on request from Democratic Services)

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM:  
9<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> August 2004**

<b>Monday 9<sup>th</sup> August 2004</b>			
<b>Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2004</b>	9 am	Licensing Training for Committee members only	Grd floor meeting room
<b>Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2004</b>	2 pm	*Housing Portfolio Holders Meeting	Housing Directors office
<b>Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2004</b>			
<b>Friday 13<sup>th</sup> August 2004</b>	9 am	Time Management Training Course (This course is fully booked)	Council Chamber

**\*Housing Portfolio Holder Meetings**

At the December 2003 meeting of the Housing Portfolio Holder, it was agreed to invite non-executive Members to the portfolio meetings. The allocation will be done on a first come, first served basis and will be restricted to two members only. The first two members to contact Democratic Services will be able to attend. Members who wish to attend must note that some items may be confidential. Contact Lucie Edginton on 01954 713026 or by email

[lucie.edginton@scams.gov.uk](mailto:lucie.edginton@scams.gov.uk)

**INFORMATION ITEM**

**PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS / WITHDRAWING FROM THE MEETING  
(RECOMMENDED BY STANDARDS COMMITTEE)**

The Standards Committee has recommended that all Councillors take note of the following issues regarding prejudicial interests and withdrawing from the meeting.

**Withdrawing from the Council Chamber (Advice from Standards Board for England)**

The Case Review is a series of publications through which The Standards Board for England can share its experience of conducting investigations, giving legal advice and developing policy in relation to the Code of Conduct. It can be downloaded from

[http://www.standardsboard.co.uk/pdfs/publications/The\\_Case\\_Review.pdf](http://www.standardsboard.co.uk/pdfs/publications/The_Case_Review.pdf). Volume 1 contains questions and answers about withdrawing from the meeting, including:

**Can a member declare a prejudicial interest, withdraw from the meeting and remain in the room where the meeting is being held?**

No. A member must withdraw from the room even if he or she has declared an interest and takes no further part in the discussion. The Code's intent here is that a member's presence alone can influence a decision or discussion. For example, it is not acceptable for a member simply to observe proceedings from the public gallery. This view is supported by the decision of the court in *R v North Yorkshire County Council ex parte Richardson* [2003] EWHC 764 (Admin) [summarised below].

Members should note that **retiring to the mezzanine level is unacceptable** as it is the public gallery and members can both see and hear proceedings, which could be intimidating to other members either before or after the debate, and could create a poor public perception of the Council's ethical standards.

**Court of Appeal ruling on Prejudicial Interests:**

A recent case for the Court of Appeal gave a very clear ruling on whether a councillor with a prejudicial interest could, nevertheless, attend a council meeting in a private or representational capacity. The case, *Richardson and Another vs. North Yorkshire County Council and The First Secretary of State*, concerned a planning application for a quarry extension.

## **Standards Committee continued...**

Councillor Richardson was both the county councillor and parish councillor covering the area of the proposed extension. His home was very close to the proposed extension of a quarry and was one of a handful of properties liable to be most affected by the development. Under the Code of Conduct, a councillor with a prejudicial interest is barred from attending a meeting where that interest is being discussed. Councillor Richardson claimed such a ban was unjust and denied his rights to represent his community and his rights as a private individual. The following issues were raised in the case.

### **What is the meaning of 'member' in paragraph 12(1) of the Code of Conduct?**

Counsel for Councillor Richardson argued that 'member', in this context, applied only to members who were part of the decision-making body. As Councillor Richardson was not on the planning committee he was not covered by the provisions of the Code of Conduct at the planning meeting, and therefore should have been able to attend the meeting.

The Appeal Court concluded that 'member' in paragraph 12(1) means all members of the council, not just a member of the relevant committee.

### **Is a member, notwithstanding paragraph 12, entitled to remain at a meeting in a representational capacity?**

The Appeal Court concluded that a member with a prejudicial interest in a matter has no right to attend a meeting by virtue of his representative role. It decided that the Secretary of State was entitled to introduce a code of conduct which had the effect of restricting a member's right to represent their constituents. It rejected the argument that a knowledgeable member of the public would reasonably have regarded Councillor Richardson as simply putting forward the views of the people he represented, or making a contribution to the debate based on his perception of the public interest, rather than being influenced by the potential impact of the development on his own home. It stated that the personal interest was a highly-material, additional consideration, however conscientious a councillor might be in his representative role and his concern to protect the public interest.

### **Is a member, notwithstanding paragraph 12, entitled to remain at a meeting in a personal capacity?**

Counsel argued that, even if Councillor Richardson did have a prejudicial interest, he did not want to attend the meeting as a councillor but wanted the right to attend as a member of the public and be able to make the same representations as an ordinary member of the public.

The Appeal Court ruled that a member of an authority attending a council meeting couldn't divest himself of his official capacity as a councillor, simply by declaring his attendance in a private capacity. He is still to be regarded as conducting the business of his office. Only by resigning can he shed that role.

### **Was Councillor Richardson affected to a greater extent than his constituents, many of whom were opposed to the development?**

The Appeal Court decided yes. There was a group of people in the village, including Councillor Richardson, who were nearest to, and most liable to be affected by, the development. They therefore had a greater and special interest in the outcome of the planning application than other residents of the parish.

### **Was Councillor Richardson properly regarded as having a prejudicial interest?**

Councillor Richardson claimed that he had been unlawfully excluded from the meeting. The Appeal Court said the initial and principal judgement on whether there is a prejudicial interest is for the individual councillor himself. But there comes a point at which it would clearly be irrational, and therefore unlawful, for the councillor to conclude that he does not have a personal interest under paragraph 8(1) and therefore, as the case may be, a prejudicial interest under paragraph 10(1).

### **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 11<sup>th</sup> August 2004 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> August July 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.

### **DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS**

Applicant	Decision
GWM/3/04 War Memorial, All Saints Churchyard, Longstanton - Parish Council -	Award a Historic Building Grant for £250 towards checking the stability, cleaning and re-pointing of the stonework and repainting the incised lettering on the war memorial

## NOTES OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PORTFOLIO HOLDER MEETING ON 29<sup>th</sup> July 2004

**Present:** Cllr S Kindersley (PFH); Stephen Hampson; Dale Robinson; Susan Walford (for items 5 & 6)

**Apologies:** Cllr Mrs D Spink; Cllr D Wherrell

Agenda Item	Agenda Item	Action
1.	<b>Notes of Previous Meeting</b> – Agreed	
2.	<b>Matters Arising &amp; Action Points</b> <i>Item 2; Footway lighting</i> – DSR explained that work had yet to begin on an exit strategy for the above service. The PFH considered the possible level of savings against the implications of withdrawal and indicated that he did not consider this to be a high priority at the present time although he accepted that the matter might have to be re-visited.	
3.	<b>Portfolio Holders Priorities for 2004/05</b> The PFH advised that his priorities for this year were; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidation of the integrated waste management &amp; recycling service.</li> <li>• Smooth introduction of the new licensing regime.</li> <li>• Preparing &amp; planning for Northstowe, Northern Fringe and other large developments (in the context of the EH Portfolio)</li> <li>• Cleaner Streets strategy. The PFH asked for this item in particular to be raised up the priority list. DSR to consider workload and re-prioritise if possible</li> </ul>	DSR et al DSR/MB DSR et al DSR
4.	<b>Update Report on Environmental Health Reactive Out of Hours Response Service.</b> On enquiry the PFH was advised on how the public accessed the service and requested that Members were informed on the process. DSR to check the accessibility of the service again now the contact centre was operational. The PFH <b>NOTED</b> the report.	IG DSR
5.	<b>Prioritisation of Potentially Contaminated Land Sites in South Cambridgeshire.</b> Susan Walford introduced this report and a number of issues were discussed; namely; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length of time for studies and determination</li> <li>• Work involved in designation of sites.</li> <li>• Types of sites and possible contamination levels</li> <li>• Open and closed cemeteries</li> <li>• Definition used in the legislation</li> <li>• Specific issues in the adopted Contaminated Land Strategy</li> <li>• Comparisons with other surrounding authorities</li> <li>• Future Governmental intentions &amp; BVPI's</li> </ul> <p>The PFH was advised that the current estimated length of time to complete the determination of contaminated land did not include the time required to define liabilities or secure remediation (where necessary). The PFH felt that 10 – 15 years to complete the task was on balance too long a period to be sustainable but given the financial position of the Council and other priorities new resources were limited. Accordingly DSR was asked to consider additional resource in this area within his Environmental Health restructuring proposals.</p>	DSR

6.	<p><b>Air Quality Progress Report 2004</b>  The PFH was advised of the process involved in meeting the objectives for air quality. Last year had been assessed as a poor year for air quality due to the good weather experienced and that this had been classed as a one in ten year event. This explained the trends seen in the graphs. The predictions had been made from extrapolating the first 3 to 4 months monitoring data. The PFH noted that South Cambridgeshire was required to progress to a detailed assessment of air quality for Nitrogen Dioxide along the A14 corridor and hotspots identified in High St, Histon and High St, Sawston and that there was insufficient in-house staff resource to carry out the assessment. Accordingly the PFH <b>AGREED</b> to engage consultants for this work and vire the appropriate sums to cover the costs of their appointment.</p>	SW
7.	<p><b>Environmental Health Portfolio Formal Reporting – 12 month forward look.</b>  The content of the forward look was <b>NOTED</b>.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Deadlines for the adoption of the Council’s Licensing Policy</b>  The reporting and consultation deadlines were tabled and the PFH was advised of the process involved in meeting the legislative requirements. It was noted that the timetable the Council needs to follow to enable it to comply with it’s statutory duties under the licensing Act did not allow for call-in after the decision of the 6<sup>th</sup> September. The PFH agreed to approach both the Chairmen of Council and of Scrutiny to agree that the decision to consult on the draft policy was both reasonable and urgent under section 12.16 of the Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules as such should not be subject to the call in arrangements. Susan May to be informed of the outcome of the approach so that the decision could be published in accordance with the Constitution.</p>	Cllr Kindersley
9.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><b>Health Fair</b> - The PFH requested that the Health Fair be rescheduled and that further thought be given to the publicising of the event.</p> <p><b>Promotion of the Work of Environmental Health</b> – The PFH felt that many Members were unaware of the important work undertaken by Environmental Health and what they should do when faced with a particular issue or problem. It was agreed that a monthly ‘news sheet’ should be produced on different but topical subjects including frequently asked questions.</p> <p><b>2004/05 First Quarter Recycling Figures</b> – The first quarter recycling figures for Local Authorities in Cambridgeshire were presented. The PFH noted that recycling in South Cambridgeshire was 51%, the best in the County.</p>	IG/DSR/SH  IG
10.	<p><b>Confidential Item – Raves Trigger Plan</b>  The PFH was updated on the latest discussions with the police concerning raves and that the plan remained a restricted document.</p>	

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

**Date** 28th June 2004

**Time** 1430h – 1705h

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

**Present:** County Councillors  
T J Bear, M Farrar (substituting for J E Coston), P D Gooden,  
S F Johnstone and J E Reynolds

### **District Councillors**

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

### CALC Councillors

G Everson and M Mason

### **Also present**

County Councillors A G Orgee and P L Stroude

District Councillor P Orme

Parish Councillors E Cornell (Linton), J Daunt & J Hirsh (Little Abington), M Halliday  
(Gamlingay) and S Rowe (Horseheath)

## **137. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor S F Johnstone was elected Chairman for the current year.

## **138. MINUTES – (a) 8 MARCH 2004 & (b) 30 APRIL 2004**

The minutes of the meetings held on 8 March and 30 April 2004 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

### **30th April 2004**

- add Councillor J D Batchelor to the list of apologies.
- amend the venue from South Cambridgeshire Hall to Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge.
- page 5, minute 136, third paragraph, second sentence change “at” to “opposite”.

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

Councillor Dr D Bard was appointed Vice-Chairman for the current year.

## **140. PETITIONS**

The Committee was informed that no petitions had been received.

## **141. PETITIONS UPDATE – A1307 CAMBRIDGE ROAD, LITTLE ABINGTON; A1307 BABRAHAM; AND B1050 STATION ROAD, LONGSTANTON AND WILLINGHAM**

The Committee received an update report on petitions received requesting interactive speed signs on the A1307 through Little Abington, safety improvements on the A1307 at Babraham and safety measures on the B1050 in Longstanton and Willingham.

### A1307, Little Abington

It was proposed that the Parish Council should be invited to submit a Jointly Funded Minor Highways Improvement (JFMHI) bid for four interactive speed limit signs.

### A1307, Babraham

Some remedial measures had already been implemented, including signing and surface treatments. A bid would be submitted to the Medium Sized Traffic and Safety Scheme programme for other improvements. It was noted that the section of the A1307, from the A11 to Babraham, had been included in the Route Strategy undertaken by the County Council's Accident Investigation section.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Orgee, reported that the recently published Little Abington Parish Plan had highlighted the degree of local concern about the volume of traffic on Cambridge Road, Little Abington. He asked for the whole of the A1307 to be considered as part of the Route Strategy. District Councillor Orme and Parish Councillor J Daunt expressed their support for Councillor Orgee. Councillor Orgee reported that Babraham Parish Council had already been informed that street lighting would be installed at the Babraham junction. Members were advised that the estimated cost of installing street lighting exceeded the Minor Works Budget and would require a Medium Sized Traffic and Safety Scheme bid.

### B1050, Station Road, Longstanton and Willingham

Longstanton Parish Council had indicated its support for the provision of a footway linking the two villages. Speaking as the Local Member for Willingham, Councillor Johnstone, who had indicated her support for the petition, queried why the Parish Council had not included provision for a footway in its A14 Traffic Calming Scheme. She explained that the request for the 850 metres of footway related only to Longstanton parish. Also speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Stroude, expressed his strong support for a footway and cycleway from the golf course.

It was noted that the provision of a footway would exceed the cost threshold of a JFMHI scheme. However, it could be considered as part of the Medium Sized Traffic and Safety Scheme programme. It was possible that the provision of a footway could be considered in conjunction with future developments at Northstowe, the Longstanton bypass and Guided Bus. It was noted that any reduction in the speed limit was unlikely to have the support of the Police and would require significant traffic calming features to be effective.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- i) note the concerns of petitioners regarding the A1307 through Little Abington and Babraham, and the B1050 through Longstanton and Willingham;
- ii) note the suggestion that the provision of interactive signs in Little Abington would be appropriate as a Jointly Funded Minor Highways Improvement bid from Little Abington Parish Council;
- iii) note that the A1307 Route Strategy had been extended to include the junction in Babraham and was considered in a separate report to the meeting;
- iv) note that the existing national speed limit between Longstanton and Willingham complied with current speed limit policies;
- v) note the suggestion that the provision of a footway between Longstanton and Willingham would be appropriate for submission as a medium sized scheme (October list); and
- vi) inform the petitioners accordingly.



## **142. A14 VILLAGE TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT – PROGRESS REPORT**

The 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. Members asked if information regarding the support of villages for schemes could be reported consistently.

### Cottenham

Members received notice of an additional recommendation for Cottenham and details of the recently completed consultation, which indicated a very positive response to the proposed scheme. It was hoped to start work in the middle of August. As the next meeting of the Committee was not scheduled until September, it was proposed that the measures in the proposed scheme for Rampton Road, Cottenham should be approved, subject to the agreement of the Parish Council and local County and District Members.

Members queried why the new interactive sign on Rampton Road was not supported fully. It was noted that there was already one sign. However, evidence had shown that the signs were more effective in pairs. Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Stroude, expressed his support for the scheme.

### Elsworth

A local resident had appealed against the decision made by the Committee at its last meeting to install speed cushions on Boxworth Road, Elsworth, at a point approximately 52 metres north east of its junction with Duncock Lane. This was based on the fact that the officer comments on the objection were now incorrect due to the felling of a mature tree. Members considered photographs of the site and were informed that the mature tree had been felled. It was still considered unlikely that the cushions would cause a significant increase in noise levels at the site and that the garage alone would provide an adequate noise attenuation screen. The provision of these cushions was supported by the local County and District Members and the Parish Council.

Members queried the design of the speed cushions and were informed that they were 1.65m wide, which allowed larger public service vehicles and heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) to span the cushions therefore creating little noise. It was not anticipated that there would be a drainage problem.

### Girton

A meeting had taken place with the Parish Council and modifications had been made to the scheme. A further meeting would take place on 2 July. It was noted that the scheme would take approximately 12 weeks to complete.

### Histon and Impington

An exhibition was taking place on the proposed scheme on 28 and 30 June. Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Gooden, reported that the scheme proposed by both Parish Councils had attracted controversy locally. He queried whether two exhibitions to discuss the draft proposals would be sufficient. He asked whether officers would be available to attend the village feast on 10 July, where the plans would be on display, to discuss any technical issues. Also speaking as a Local Member, District Councillor Mason, explained that the proposed one-way entry to Station Road was likely to be controversial for traders.

### Madingley

It was noted that residents in Madingley had complained that motorists were not obeying the speed limit when leaving the village. Members were informed that the aim of the project was to slow

down traffic entering the village. The Committee would receive the results of a survey of local residents on the effectiveness of the measures at a future meeting.

### Swavesey

A scheme for the village had been agreed, which had the support of the Parish Council and both the local County and District Members. Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Johnstone, queried whether the widening of the footway between Taylor's Lane and Swan Pond would be dual use. It was noted that the Parish Council had only agreed to its use as a footway initially. She welcomed the additional cyclist direction signing from the Station Road/Taylors Lane junction along Blackhorse Lane, Chantry Close and Moat Way.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) note the progress made;
- (ii) approve the construction of the traffic calming scheme in Swavesey;
- (iii) determine the appeal without holding a public inquiry;
- (iv) ratify the decision made at the previous meeting, to install speed cushions on Boxworth Road, Elsworth, at a point approximately 52 metres north east of its junction with Duncock Lane,
- (v) inform the appellant accordingly; and
- (vi) approve the provision of all measures in the proposed scheme for Rampton Road, Cottenham, subject to the agreement of the Parish Council and local County and District Members.

### **143. RESULTS OF VEHICLE COUNTS – THE HEATH, GAMLINGAY**

The Committee considered together the two previous reports on traffic conditions in the The Heath area of Gamlingay as a result of local concerns. Members noted that the Annual Network Monitoring Report 2003 identified the 16-hour average annual weekday flow on the B1040 through Gamlingay as 4000 vehicles. This was in the lower end of the range compared to other rural "B" class roads across South Cambridgeshire.

Any reduction in speed limit would not comply with the current speed limit policy because The Heath area was outside the village envelope. The area did not suffer from a poor injury accident record. It was not possible to justify wild animal warning signs as The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions advised that in a rural area animals of all types should be expected as part of the rural road environment. An environmental weight limit for HCVs would also not comply with Council policy. It was therefore proposed that the provision of a footway be submitted as a JFMHI bid from the Parish Council. Horse warning signs mentioned in the original petition had already been provided.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Kindersley, expressed his disappointment that no further action had been proposed since the last meeting. He reported that he had asked for a full traffic count for The Heath. Members were informed that there had been a fatality on the road recently, which had caused considerable disquiet locally. He was concerned about the equity of service across South Cambridgeshire where some villages with similar traffic flows had received improvement measures. These measures were supported by 100% of the population in The Heath. Residents had recognised the financial difficulties facing the County Council and had offered to pay for a planings footpath but had been informed this was not possible. The Police supported traffic calming measures and had recognised the iron crossroads as an accident cluster

site. He also queried why a wild animal warning sign could be erected in Croydon but not at The Heath.

The Committee was informed that the County Council was not seeking to ignore the views of local residents but had to work within policies agreed by Councillors. Members were aware that the countywide Medium Sized Traffic and Safety Scheme programme involved a scoring system based on personal injury accidents. It was noted that The Heath was unlikely to attract a high score. Traffic flows were available in the Annual Network Monitoring Report 2003, which had been circulated to all Members of the Committee. Officers were under the impression that the Committee had only asked for an HCV count.

The Parish Council was invited to discuss with the local Divisional Traffic Engineer a JFMHI bid. Members were concerned that a bid could raise expectations locally particularly as success could not be guaranteed. Officers also agreed to discuss the possibility of local residents paying for a planings footpath. Members highlighted the problem of 'rat-running' through The Heath to access the A1, which was likely to get worse with the expansion of Cambourne. It was noted that increasing traffic levels were commonplace across the County.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) note the two earlier reports and the decisions made at that time;
- (ii) reiterate the recommendation that the Parish Council submit a JFMHI bid for improvements in the area; and
- (iii) propose that officers have further discussions with the Parish Council.

#### **144. ACCIDENT REMEDIAL SCHEME: JUNCTION OF HIGH GREEN AND HIGH STREET, GREAT SHELFORD**

The Committee received a report detailing a proposal to consult on the proposed casualty reduction measures in Great Shelford. Members noted the background to the scheme for High Green, Great Shelford, which was granted funding by the County Council's Cabinet in November 2003. The detail of the proposals was highlighted on Plan 1 attached to the report. There had been positive discussions with the Parish Council and the District Council's Conservation Officer. Therefore it was proposed that a public consultation should be carried out and the details of the scheme developed with feedback from local residents, local businesses, the Parish Council, the Conservation Officer and emergency services. The Committee would receive a further report on 13 December.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Farrar, welcomed the scheme particularly the proposal for a pedestrian crossing to help pedestrians accessing the Post Office, Bank and the local school. Members asked officers to investigate the possibility of providing a protected car parking space outside the Post Office.

It was resolved unanimously to approve consultation for the proposals as set out in Plan 1 attached to the report.

#### **145. A1307 FROM THE A11 TO SUFFOLK COUNTY BOUNDARY ROUTE STUDY**

The 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 the study had been extended to include the section of road between the A11 and Gog Magog roundabout. The Committee noted the background to the report. Unfortunately, the 2003 traffic flow data for the eastern side of Linton was not yet available. Various traffic data models were being produced to show existing traffic movements and to forecast the likely traffic movements should various measures be introduced. Unfortunately, the results were not yet available. It was a very complex process, which had been

affected by some unplanned delays in survey work. Members would receive the results at a future meeting.

Members considered the road traffic accident data for this stretch of road. The accident rate for the A1307 was no worse than that which would be expected on a road of this type and traffic flow was marginally less than the national average. There were three accident cluster sites not including the A11. Members noted details of work carried out at some of these sites. They also noted details of work proposed and carried out along the length of the carriageway between the A11 and the Gog Magog roundabout. The Committee was reminded of previously identified proposals.

Members noted recommendations for interactive road signing at 15 locations, proposals for the Bartlow Road and Dean Road crossroads, central reserve safety fencing on the lengths of dual carriageway, street lighting at Babraham Crossroads, and the vicinity of Dale Head Foods factory entrance. Three of the recommendations would be included as separate bids within the Medium Sized Traffic and Safety Schemes programme. The construction of a roundabout at Bartlow Road Crossroads was already programmed. The study into central reserve safety fencing should be initiated using revenue funding in 2004/05.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Bear, was concerned that the study had not included access onto the A1307 at peak times including pedestrian access, which had been raised by the petitioners in December 2003. He was particularly concerned that the local bus operator might withdraw services as it was finding it difficult to rejoin the A1307 from the villages. He explained that there was little public support to reduce the dual carriageway to a single lane from the start of the dual carriageway to the Dale Head Foods factory entrance. He urged officers to take a holistic view and integrate the proposals for the factory within the proposals for the whole route. Councillor Bear was disappointed that the results of the modelling were not yet available. There needed to be some consideration of the effect of the accident remedial measures on access. Members were informed that an order for the interactive sign at the Village College was scheduled to be placed. Officers had discussed the location of this sign and others with the Parish Council.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Batchelor, supported the issues raised by Councillor Bear. He welcomed the report as another step in the right direction. He requested that Bartlow Road and Dean Road be dealt with together. He appreciated the danger of raising local expectations as funding could not be guaranteed. However, it was important to highlight the severity of the accident problem on the route.

Councillor Orgee, also speaking as a Local Member, welcomed the attention to safety along the whole route. He reported that Babraham Parish Council had requested the possibility of reducing speed limits at some crossroads as well as providing interactive signs. He expressed his support for proposals for the Babraham Road crossroads. He highlighted the need for the safety measures not to impact other parts of the road and local access roads. Horseheath Parish Councillor, S Rowe, highlighted the high level of injury accidents from the Horseheath to Bartlow Road crossroads and the problem of noise. She requested that officers investigate the possibility of double white lines on Park Hill.

The Committee was reminded that consultation on all the proposed measures would take place with Parish Councils and the Linton Steering Group. It was acknowledged that proposals for the Dale Head Foods factory would need to be considered carefully as any proposal to remove the dual carriageway would make it very difficult for cars to overtake slow moving vehicles. The phasing of the traffic signals at the Village College would need to be considered in the modelling exercise as there was concern about traffic queuing through the village at peak times.

It was unlikely that speed limit signs would be installed at crossroads as they would require other traffic calming measures to be effective. Members were informed that the majority of funding mechanisms available were targeted at reducing accidents. However, officers would be able to work with the Police to address speed related accidents. It was noted that the Police would be

conducting speed checks on Pampisford Road. It was also proposed to take speed recordings in Cardinals Green, Horseheath.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- 1) note the details of the route study; and
- 2) support the proposal to conduct a feasibility study to install central reserve safety fence.
- 3) support the inclusion of the following measures within the Traffic Management Programme for Medium Sized Schemes:
  - i) Carriageway and access modifications in the vicinity of Dale Head Food factory
  - ii) Interactive road signing
  - iii) Installation of street lighting at Babraham junction
- 4) support the closure of the central reserve gaps on the dual carriageway at Dean Road crossroads and the prohibition of the right turn into and out of Horseheath Road, Linton integrated with the existing proposal to construct a roundabout at Bartlow Road crossroads already on the Programme for Major Safety Schemes.

#### **146. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE**

The Committee was informed of the emerging transport projects associated with the Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) and the programme for consultation and implementation. It was noted that a number of different organisations were working closely together to help deliver the project. The transport projects for the CNFE had been broken into two phases; those that could be delivered by April 2006, and those requiring longer preparation time. Members noted that the Office for the Deputy Prime Minister had set a tight timescale for the projects. The County Council's Cabinet would consider the design options for each of the projects on 26 October 2004. The Joint Committee would be able to discuss the different designs for each project on 8 November before the public consultation.

Members were informed that the County Council was working very closely with the Highways Agency who were part of an officer steering group. The Committee highlighted the need to involve the Infrastructure Partnership in the project.

It was resolved unanimously to note the progress made.

#### **147. REVIEW OF THE ARRANGEMENTS WITH CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL TO DELIVER HIGHWAY SERVICES**

The Committee considered changes to the arrangements for delivering highway services within the Cambridge agency area. Members were informed that the area covered by the Cambridge agency agreement included neighbouring parts of South Cambridgeshire. The recent Best Value Review of Highway Maintenance and Network Management had concluded that there was a case to reconsider agency arrangements in Cambridgeshire with the prime aim of improving service delivery by having a single service provider to deliver highway services across Cambridgeshire. The County Council had served the City Council twelve months notification of the termination of the agreement. A partnership arrangement was being negotiated with the City Council to deliver its environmental enhancement programme.

Members queried the proposal for a single service provider when it was proposed that the City Council should still be responsible for grass cutting and tree maintenance as part of its wider grounds maintenance responsibility. The staff of Park and Ride sites would also continue to be the responsibility of the City Council under the partnership arrangement. It was noted that the City Council was best placed to deliver these services. Members therefore highlighted the need for clarity to enable the public to identify who was responsible. It was noted that contact details would be published after the transfer of staff. Members queried whether the County Council could take

over the maintenance of street nameplates from other Districts. They were informed that it was more cost effective for the County Council to take over this duty in the City. Other District Councils would need to consider their own arrangements.

It was resolved unanimously to note the progress in changing the arrangements for delivering highway services within the Cambridge agency area.

#### **148. CAMBRIDGE INFORMATION SIGNING SYSTEM**

Members were advised of the operational arrangements for the information signing system for Cambridge. They were reminded that the Committee had given its support for the provision of a new scheme of information signs for Cambridge subject to further consultations on the location of some signs at the meeting on 8 March. There were three types of signs, which included car park management signs (inner ring), Park and Ride information signs (outer ring) and information signs. The car park management signs would be supported by new vehicle counting systems at the multi-storey car park entrances and exits, which would provide real time information on the availability of spaces. It was noted that a series of planned events had been programmed into the signs for Park and Ride.

The signs would be operated during the day through a central computer housed at Shire Hall. The Police had indicated an interest in operating the signs 24-hours a day to manage any major incidents that could affect access or public safety. The City Council's car park staff were also likely to have secure dial-in access to operate signs. The County Council was very aware of the need for accurate and up to date information and for the signs not to be overused. It was proposed to undertake a review of text messages after 12 months.

Members queried the arrangements for motorists if Lion Yard car park was full after they had passed the outer ring signs. The new system would gradually build up an historic database, which would help predict when to display the full signs in advance of car parks reaching full capacity. The signing system would advertise where spaces were available. Members highlighted the need for a similar system to be introduced for Huntingdon. Officers agreed to raise the need for more interactive signs with the Highways Agency at its liaison group meeting.

It was resolved unanimously to support:

- (i) the operational arrangements in section 2 of the report; and
- (ii) the review in section 4 of the report.

#### **149. NETWORK MONITORING REPORT 2003, NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2004, ADDITIONS TO THE MEDIUM SIZE TRAFFIC AND SAFETY SCHEMES AND BRIDGES PROGRAMME**

The Committee was informed of the Network Monitoring Report 2003 and the Network Service Plan 2004. Members' attention was drawn to the 30% increase in traffic over the last ten years. In the same period there had also been a 30% reduction in the number of death and serious injuries in the County.

##### Network Monitoring Report 2003 – Part 1

Members asked if traffic flow information could be recorded on the same hourly basis rather than over 16 and 12 hours. Officers were asked to investigate the 12 hour flows for A1307 Babraham Road and A1307 A11- Linton on page 51. Members queried the rural traffic growth figures for A1198 Wimpole Lodge as the traffic had increased on this route as a result of Cambourne. It was noted that the figures included traffic leaving Cambourne. The Chairman acknowledged the importance of monitoring the increase in the future.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Mason, was concerned about the volume of the traffic on the B1049, which carried more traffic north bound than the A10 from Milton to Waterbeach, and bisected the parishes of Histon and Impington. He highlighted the need for action to be taken to arrest the volume of traffic on minor roads north of the A14.

#### Network Service Plan 2004

Members queried the prioritisation for resurfacing and reconstruction. The Local Member for Milton, Councillor Summerfield, was particularly concerned about the state of Cambridge Road and High Street, Milton where the speed bumps and cycleway had disintegrated. Members were informed that there was a scoring system based on the structural integrity of the road including edge deterioration and traffic flows.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) note the Network Service Plan 2004, the inclusion of three additional schemes in the Medium Size Traffic and Safety schemes programme, and the replacement span for Cutter Ferry Bridge, Cambridge.
- (ii) note the Network Monitoring Report 2003 including Part 1 Traffic Monitoring, Part 2 Road Safety Monitoring, and Part 3 Joint Road Casualty Data Report.

#### **150. JOINTLY FUNDED MINOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS – REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**

The Committee considered improvements to the operational procedure for JFMHI schemes. It was proposed that a Councillor from each authority be invited to join the assessment panel. Dates would be circulated to all Members in July and the appointment of representatives based on availability. Representatives should be available for two inspection days in October/November.

Members discussed proposals to improve billing arrangements, which were currently based upon scheme completion or year-end. There was concern about Parish Councils being billed before a scheme had been completed to a satisfactory standard. It was noted that there had only been limited complaints about the standard of schemes in the past and that these were addressed.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) increase the community contribution from 60p per elector to £1;
- (ii) approve the billing for contributions with effective commencement of the works;
- (iii) elect two Councillors, from the County and District Councils, as the Member representatives on the assessment panel; and
- (iv) allow two schemes to be included where they occur within separate villages within Parishes, providing they rank highly enough.

#### **151. PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF WAITING – STATION ROAD, WATERBEACH**

The Committee considered objections to a draft Order that would introduce lengths of prohibited waiting on Station Road, Waterbeach. One objection had been received concerning the increase in vehicle speeds as a result of removing parked cars.

Members were informed that Station Road was a busy road and parking regularly caused local congestion. It was also a narrow road on a slight bend with limited forward visibility. It was noted that the proposal had the support of the local County and District Councillors. On balance, the Committee felt that the Order should be introduced as advertised as it would improve road safety.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) determine the objections without holding a public inquiry, and
- (ii) inform the objectors accordingly.

**152. AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee noted its agenda plan, up until the 2005 spring cycle,

Chairman



**A meeting of the County Council was held at Shire Hall, on Tuesday 27th July 2004 at 10.30**

**AGENDA**

	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>
1.	Minutes - 25th May 2004
2.	Announcements
3.	Declarations of Interest
4.	Petitions
5.	Reports of the Cabinet
	(a) <a href="#">Report of the meeting on 15th June 2004</a>
	<i>This report contains the following items for determination by Council:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Premature Retirement in the Interests of the Efficient Exercise of the Authority's Functions (PRIEEAF)</i></li> <li>· <i>Prospects for Learning - A Single Education Plan for Cambridgeshire</i></li> </ul>
	(b) <a href="#">Report of the meeting on 13th July 2004</a>
	<i>This report contains the following items for determination by Council:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>Local Transport Plan (LTP) Annual Progress Report 2003/04</i></li> <li>· <i>Section 31 Partnership Agreement - Integrated Community Equipment Services (ICES)</i></li> <li>· <i>Financial Outturn and Statement of Accounts 2003/04</i></li> </ul> <i>Copies of the above documents have been circulated separately to all members and are available on the Council's website.</i>
6.	<a href="#">Council Constitution - Scrutiny Procedure Rules</a>
7.	<a href="#">Council Constitution - Review of Political Proportionality</a>
8.	Written Questions under Council Procedure Rule 9
	<i>Replies to written questions will be placed around the Council Chamber prior to the start of the meeting.</i>
9.	Oral Questions under Council Procedure Rule 9
	<i>Oral Question Time will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines set out in Annex A to the Council Procedure Rules</i>
10.	Motions submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10
	(a) <a href="#">Motion submitted by Councillor G Harper</a>
	<i>This Council views with concern the proposed extension of compulsory postal voting at elections, believing that a secret ballot is the heart of the democratic process and that all-postal elections seriously compromises the security and confidentiality of the vote.          (The Chairman of Council advises that the subject of the motion is a matter for the Council to determine within existing policy frameworks and therefore that the motion is in order as drafted).</i>
11.	Membership of Committees and Appointments to Outside Organisations. <i>To approve:</i> <i>(i) that Councillors J Broadway, M Farrar, and H J L Fitch replace Councillors B S Bhalla, C M Carter, J L Gluza, P D Gooden and J D Jones on the pool of members from which the Staff Appeals Committee is drawn;</i> <i>(ii) that Councillor J L Gluza be appointed as Labour substitute member on the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee</i> <i>(iii) that Councillor I C Kidman replace Councillor J D Jones as one of the Council's representatives on the Local Government Association and on the County Councils' Network Council</i>
	<a href="#">Council Constitution - Responsibility for Council Functions: Functions of the Appointments Committee [additional item]</a>