

## **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> July 2020

Time: 10:00am – 12.33pm

Present: Councillors I Bates (Chairman), D Connor, L Dupre (substituting for H Batchelor) R Fuller, J French, Lynda Harford, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), N Kavanagh, S King, I Manning and A Taylor.

Apologies: Councillor H Batchelor Substitute L Dupre.

### **10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With reference to agenda Item 5 'Kings Dyke level crossing closure – award of construction management Consultancy Contract- and the reference in it to ESPO both Councillor Howell and Councillor Bates declared personal interests as respectively being the Chairman and being a representative on ESPO.

### **11. MINUTES 16TH JUNE 2020**

That subject to the following changes:

#### **Minute 4 Petitions and Public Questions**

Last paragraph with reference to Haydenfield retirement complex change to read: **Havenfield** retirement complex

#### **Minute 7 Covid 19 Temporary Cycling proposals**

- Page 6 paragraph 3 fifth line changing Ms Minsull-Beech to read Ms Minshull-Beech
- page 9 last paragraph before resolution insertion of Councillor Manning as the Member who had requested that recommendation c) be amended to include Lead Members as part of the delegation,

It was resolved:

That the Minutes be approved a correct record.

### **12. MINUTES ACTION LOG**

On item 160 Highways and Infrastructure Committee Action Log - cross referenced to Minute 146c) review of the Local Highways Initiatives (LHI) Process and the original query raised by Councillor King for notes containing more information to be circulated, this was still outstanding. Officers undertook to implement. **Action Graham Hughes (Post meeting Note: This has now been resolved. Cllr King has been provided with a copy of the notes).**

It was resolved:

To note the action log.

### **13. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

There had been 5 requests to speak on Item 9, South Cambridge Cycling Improvement Plan that the Chairman accepted which were taken later in the agenda when considering the item.

### **14. KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE – AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT CONSULTANCY CONTRACT**

A contract to construct the Kings Dyke crossing scheme was signed with Jones Bros on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2020 with the work due to commence shortly on site. As the Council required ongoing support and specialist skills to operate the NEC contract, a mini competition was undertaken under the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) framework to provide construction contract management professional services. In the subsequent tender competition White Young Green had submitted the most competitive tender for both price and quality and would under the terms of the contract if approved, provide three staff for the duration of the scheme. This report sought Committee approval of the award of the contract.

During the course of discussion:

- One Member while supporting the report recommendation drew attention that White Young Green (WYG) had been appointed by the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) Pro5 Consultancy Framework to assist with the preparation of contract documents and were now also the successful tenderer being recommended for approval. He therefore questioned whether WYG had received an unfair advantage and what 'Value Engineering' had been achieved. It was explained that WYG had been asked to help with the preparation of the documentation as they had long standing knowledge of the scheme and were therefore ideally qualified. Their proposed appointment followed a separate competitive tendering exercise and so 'Value Engineering' had been achieved. It was also highlighted that their skills would also aid Value Engineering on the mainline construction.
- The local Member on the Committee Councillor, Connor confirmed that he fully supported the recommendation.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Award the contract to WYG Consultants following a competitive process under

the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) Pro 5 consultancy framework

## **15. WISBECH ACCESS STRATEGY PHASE 1 DELIVERY**

The Chairman had agreed to take this item as a late report under the discretionary powers given to him under the Local Government Act 1972 on the following grounds

Reasons for lateness: – the need to amend the terms of reference following further consultation with local Members.

Reasons for Urgency: the requirement for the report to be considered before this month's meeting of the Combined Authority Business Board.

The Fenland Local Plan (adopted May 2014) includes proposals for 3,000 new homes in Wisbech and 30 hectares of new employment land to deliver around 2,500 new jobs up to 2031. The Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan includes up to 550 new homes to 2026 on the eastern side of Wisbech. The Wisbech Access Strategy jointly developed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council, with input from the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk and Norfolk County Council, is a package of highway schemes to meet these requirements.

The project involved five sites but for the reasons set out in the report only three were being taken forward at the current time. The total funding required compared to the original budget estimate was now £11.082M, including the growth deal funding of £1.182m as outlined in paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8 of the report.

Government, through the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), provided £10.5m to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) for delivery of Phase 1 of the Wisbech Access Strategy, on condition that scheme development work resulted in an acceptable and deliverable package of transport measures and would be spent by the end of March 2021. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) recognising the funding challenge proposed to allocate £6.0m from the Local Growth Funding (LGF) grant and a further £3m from within its Medium Term Financial Plan and £900k from the Capital Gain Share, subject to Business Board and CPCA Board approval. This would allow completion of the three schemes beyond March 2021, thereby removing any uncertainty associated with the LGF funding.

Across the 3 sites were a total of 33 separate parcels of land to acquire for the construction of the schemes and negotiations were underway with the landowners targeted to finish by the end of August 2020 with a report to come back to the October Committee. Negotiation for the land required was still the preferred methodology, however, the project risk register had identified that the negotiation process did not restrict the timeframe that the negotiations could occur in, nor the

price of the land being negotiated over. The negotiations for land purchase was already underway. If, however, a negotiated settlement for all of the necessary land within the necessary timeframe became unlikely, it was being proposed that a Compulsory Purchase Order process should be undertaken.

The report also highlighted a need to change the Governance framework to be consistent with other projects in the capital programme to consist of an officer Project Board to report to this Committee and a Steering Group, which would receive information from, and gives recommendations to, both the Committee and the Project Board. The new project governance and Terms of Reference were set out in Appendix 3, detailing the nature of the Project Board's responsibilities and its general relationship with the Steering Group.

During the course of discussion included:

- One member expressed the view that like many other large capital projects undertaken by the Council, there always seemed to be endless delays and also drew attention to what appeared to be a loss of part of the LGF Grant, asking whether this had been the result of not meeting the required timescales. Regarding the challenges of spending the £10.5m by March 2021, this had reduced to £6m due to the reduced number of schemes being taken forward as a result of the two deferred sites. The £4.5 million would be returned to the Combined Authority who would reallocate the money to other schemes.
- The Council's Cycling Champion on the Committee referencing paragraph 4.7 Public health Implications reading

*“..... Although the short term packages are highway focused and provision for walking and cycling will not be included until the detailed design stage, all efforts should be made to ensure improvements support the development of a coherent walking and cycling infrastructure across Wisbech.*

asked for assurances that necessary walking and cycling infrastructure would be taken seriously and actioned early on asking also whether the County Council Cycling team had been involved and whether Wisbech had its own lobbying cycling group? It was reported that the project did take into account cycling considerations highlighting that there were good cycling routes nearby and that the County Cycling Team had been involved in the review of capacity and it was considered that the provision available was suitable for the demand envisaged and for additional capacity for future demand for cycling in Wisbech. In confirming that whilst there was no direct cycle lobbying group in Wisbech, it was explained that there had been heavy involvement of the local members.

- One Member reiterated that funding money had been lost but thanked the officers for obtaining replacement funding. In terms of the membership of the Steering Group he highlighted that with three local members on the Steering group he was the only local member not on the group stating that the other Members would be happy for him to join. He highlighted that there was 700

additional houses being constructed in his district and so he formally requested that the Chairman and officers find a way to make him a member of the Steering Group. **Action: the Chairman undertook to take away and discuss further with the report author and Andy Preston and would come back to the Member.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the project development to date and changes to the programme and budget required and forecast expenditure by March 2021
- b) Agree to request the approval of changes to the Local Growth Fund grant funding agreement from the CPCA Business Board
- c) Authorise commencement of Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) procedures to secure the necessary land and delegate to the Executive Director – Place and Economy, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee, the authority to trigger the CPO procedures if that is necessary to deliver the project efficiently and effectively.

## **16. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY**

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership is a partnership between Cambridgeshire County Council, Peterborough City Council, Police, Fire and Rescue Service, Highways England, East of England Major Trauma Centre (Addenbrooke's), Public Health and the Road Victims' Trust. The previous Strategy covered the period 2015-2020, with this report presenting the proposed Road Safety Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to 2030 set out in Appendix A of the officer report, following extensive background work and consultation by the Road Safety Partnership.

The Road Safety Strategy provides the context for the Council's road safety activity to be reported to the Committee reflecting the road safety elements of the new 'Local Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough', setting targets and performance indicators for the period 2020-2030 and beyond. The main change is adopting a 'Vision Zero' approach using the internationally recommended 'Safe System' approach and renaming the 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership' as the 'Vision Zero Partnership'. The vision partners would work toward a target of zero people killed on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's roads by 2040, as zero was the only acceptable number of road deaths. Accompanying this would be a target to reduce reported killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties by at least 50% to 234 in 2030 compared to an average of 469 between 2014 and 2018. In addition, the Strategy was committed to trialling the use of the 'Think Communities' approach to support local communities in tackling local road safety issues.

In discussion many members praised the report and the officers' commitment to road safety in bringing the ambitious Strategy forward,

Issues raised included:

- One Member highlighting the need to ensure there was the appropriate synergy with the 2050 zero carbon target objective and the need to change behaviours and have appropriate measures in place, while also needing to overcome the suspicion of some communities / Parish Councils that the County Council was trying to pass responsibility to them without providing the necessary funding. The intention would be to work with communities and to address the particular issues in their area, recognising that there was not a one size fits all solution.
- Some scepticism of whether the targets proposed were realistic. One Member highlighting that the previous Strategy had a target of reducing the number killed or seriously injured by 40% when only half that was achieved. The report did not address or investigate why the previous Strategy had failed in achieving its target and did not highlight what had not worked, which would have been a more transparent starting point. With regard to the Parish Councils, referencing the previous reply, a Member indicated her experience from those who had contacted her was that they often approached the County Council to help with road safety issues only to be told there were technical issues. She cited the A142 road junction issues as an example. On the same point she highlighted the resourcing issues which in relation to the safety study on the Ely to Chatteris stretch of the A142 required £5 million of safety measures with implementation of all the recommendations years away. While wanting to support the recommendations she highlighted that unless the County Council addressed known structural issues, the success of the Strategy would be seriously hindered. In reply on funding, it was accepted that the Integrated Transport Block Funding programme was small, there were opportunities for additional Department for Transport DfT funding with works on the A303 being provided as an example.
- Whether the officers were confident numbers quoted for KSI's were accurate? The research undertaken to set the new targets had been based on the corrected figures.
- Had such a Strategy been implemented anywhere else in the world and was there data to measure its success? The same approach had been adopted in Australia, Sweden, Netherlands and New Zealand. Both Sweden and the Netherlands had seen massive reductions in KSI figures and Australia and New Zealand who had the Strategy in place for the last 10 years had also seen substantial benefits from the approach adopted.
- Had any thought been given to changing the definition of what constituted a serious injury with the particular member suggesting it should change to being a life changing injury? The definition had been formulated after consultation with Addenbrooke's Hospital. There was to be a member seminar on the subject in the autumn.
- With reference to Addenbrooke's Casualty statistics a Member highlighted that their accident and Emergency department did not record separately accidents involving cyclists.
- Surprise was expressed that there was no reference to insurance companies in

the report. It was explained that they would be invited to contribute to the appropriate work streams where it was considered they could add value.

- A query was raised on how the pilot areas would be selected? It was indicated that a couple of areas were already engaged and the trial approach would be undertaken first with willing participants using the links already established.
- There was no reference to a Modal Shift away from cars in the Strategy.
- With reference to alcohol and drugs on page 56, one Member indicated that there would always be accidents until there was a national zero tolerance to alcohol in the blood / alcohol was prohibited for those driving.
- One Member highlighted his frustration at the lack of enforcement of the 20 MPH speed limits in Cambridge City with the Police saying that they did not have the necessary resources. He asked whether there was anything officers could do to make the Police take the issue seriously. In terms of enforcement of the Strategy, this needed to be a partnership approach with all stakeholders, so that there was a collective approach rather than leaving it to one partner, e.g. providing publicity of the benefits of respecting the speed limits.
- The need to address issues with heavy goods vehicles suggesting that the Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association needed to be added as stakeholder partners. Like the answer to insurance Companies participation, they would be engaged in terms of what benefit they could make to any of the specific work streams.
- In terms of the Leadership role, the Chairman indicated that he would undertake this, as before retirement, he was in charge of a department at Addenbrooke's Hospital. He also asked that the officer convey the Committee's thanks to all those involved in producing the Strategy and also asked that the Strategy should be circulated to all District, Town and Parish Councils and other identified interested parties. **Action: Matt Staton**
- Referencing that Addenbrooke's Hospital was a major trauma centre the Chairman asked where Peterborough and Hinchingsbrooke Hospitals fitted in and asked the officer to provide a response in writing outside of the meeting. **Action: Matt Staton**

In turning to the recommendations a number of members indicated that they would wish to have a separate vote on recommendation b)

As a result two votes were undertaken with recommendations a) c) and d) agreed unanimously and with recommendation b) agreed by 7 votes with three abstentions. (Councillors Dupre, Manning and Taylor)

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve unanimously to confirm the Council's continued commitment to the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Road Safety Partnership;
- b) Approve by a majority the adoption of the Vision Zero Strategy, including its vision and targets, by the Council;
- c) Approve unanimously to note the leadership role for the Council on the Safe

Roads and Safe Road Users work streams which future road safety reports to this Committee will reflect; and

- d) Approve unanimously to delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Highways, in conjunction with the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee, to make decisions in relation to the Vision Zero partnership.

## **17. HIGHWAYS VERGE MAINTENANCE**

The Chairman announced that he had taken the decision to withdraw this report as further consultation was to be undertaken and a revised version would be presented to a future meeting.

## **18. SOUTH CAMBRIDGE CYCLING IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

As requested at a previous meeting this report provided an update on the South Cambridge programme of improvements originally agreed in March 2014 funded through s106 funds in respect of the following schemes;

- Queen Edith's Way cycle improvements
- Cherry Hinton cycle improvements
- Robin Hood junction signal improvements

It aimed to provide an understanding of the issues that had caused the delays, their impact and to request approval of the reallocation of the necessary funding from within the programme budget to complete the Fendon Road scheme. It also sought approval to commence delivery of the Robin Hood junction improvements which if agreed, could be started in January 2021.

A total of £2,317,842 s106 funding was allocated to the programme of improvements, although at that stage it was recognised that a sum in excess of £3m would be required. The report detailed the consultation that had taken place which had not only revealed overwhelming support (69%) for improvements, it also highlighted major safety concerns at the Fendon Road and Mowbray Road roundabout. Further consultation undertaken in 2016 showed an overwhelmingly positive response to the proposal to deliver a 'Dutch Style' roundabout, giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Fendon Road and Mowbray Road, which was to be the first of its kind in the UK. Committee approval was granted in November 2016 for the implementation of the Dutch roundabout, based on a budget available at that time of £1.425m. The funding details were set out in paragraphs 1.6 - 1.8 of the current report showing funding available of £1.4m for the South Cambridge Cycle Improvement programme

The report highlighted that while construction of the Fendon Road Roundabout had commenced in 2019, issues with utilities cabling re-routing works which had not been identified beforehand by the companies and the Covid 19 lockdown had resulted in the site having to close down for a six week period impacting on both the

budget as detailed in the table in paragraph 2.5 of the report and the programme timescale. The total forecast required budget for Fendon Road had now been revised to £2.359m with the total available funding for Queen Edith's Way (including Fendon Rd) within the South Cambridge Cycle Improvement Programme standing at £2,055,599. The report therefore was requesting a reallocation of £304k to the Fendon Rd scheme from the overall £4m programme. The report highlighted that this reallocation would result in insufficient funding being available to complete the full Cherry Hinton Road project. With no available budget for further work to Queen Edith's Way and a shortfall expected for the Cherry Hinton Road scheme, officers were looking to establish potential sources of further funding to allow the schemes to progress to construction, including from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership and from the small amount of s106 monies still available. The intention would be to report back on these further negotiations later in the year.

Following the Officer introduction the Chairman invited contributions from the public and Local Councillors who had given advance notice of their request to address the Committee.

**a) Dr Barnali Ghosh question regarding Fendon Road Roundabout.**

As both a Civil and Geotechnical Engineer herself, she had a particular interest in the project and her question was as follows:

“The budget to complete the Fendon Road Roundabout has risen from £800k is now £2 359 733. Since this is significantly over budget and has delayed programme what are the lessons learned by the committee? How will this learning be embedded in assessing future bids and programmes? What are the selected parameters for accessing the success and effectiveness of this scheme?”

In replying to a question later in the debate regarding the level of local support Doctor Ghosh suggested that the level of local support was debatable as a third of cyclists surveyed believed the question was ambiguous as the question asked was “would you prefer safety” with the real issue for her being whether it was the right choice in terms of value for money which required looking at the risk register and how the risks would be mitigated.

**b) Councillor Colin McGerty regarding Fendon Road Roundabout.**

In thanking the officers for producing the report and Councillor Taylor for requesting it and accepting that the safety of Council officers must come first, he went on to express his enormous sympathy for those trying to deliver the complex and pioneering project. In his presentation he explained that earlier in

the year, when it became clear the project would deliver late, he had spent a great deal of time with the project manager looking at the available plans to understand the complex web of water, gas, electrical and data cables underground, stating that they were just the ones actually marked on the map. He highlighted that even while he was at the site, a gas pipe was discovered three metres from where it was supposed to be, which had caused several hours to be lost that day. He was therefore familiar with the frustration of managing a project which slipped due to third party suppliers over which the Council had little or no control. However his greatest sympathy lay with the public and while on the whole, people had been fantastically tolerant he highlighted that the delay explanation given was very similar to that given for the delays in delivering cycle lanes on Hills Road, He therefore asked that the Committee begin a process by which the experience could be used in a positive way to improve future estimates of project timescale and costs and if possible, avoid such over-runs in future.

Having heard from two residents critical of the scheme, a Member asked as a question of clarity regarding the amount of consultation undertaken and the local support the scheme had received. In reply he confirmed that local residents replying to the initial general travel survey had been overwhelmingly in favour of the scheme with more than a 1000 replies with the Fendon Road roundabout being their top priority. A second survey in 2016 also showed strong support for the design. Even though the consultations a couple of years ago he was able to confirm that there was still very strong local support.

**c) Councillor Rosy Moore - Upgrade of Cycling and walking infrastructure on Cherry Hinton Road**

Councillor Moore spoke in opposition to the plan to remove £300k from the project to upgrade the cycling and walking infrastructure on Cherry Hinton Road asking that the additional funding to complete the Fendon Road Roundabout should not be at the expense of this project, requesting that officers should look for such compensatory funding from other sources. She highlighted what a busy road Cherry Hinton Road was, and that residents really wanted the improvements as soon as possible having responded positively to the consultation on the design and plans. The improvements were desperately needed to improve the safety for cyclists, highlighting that many young people and children used was a very busy main road and that the area potentially had the densest number of schools, colleges and nurseries in Cambridge. She also highlighted that the new restrictions in Mill Road would cause more traffic to come onto Cherry Hinton Road. In reply officers gave assurances that they were looking at all opportunities to fully fund the project on the basis that it was a strategic link. On a question of clarity one member asked whether the scheme would still go ahead as the funding was being taken away. The Chairman

replied that he was committed to delivering the Project along with the Robin Hood roundabout but the issue was where the money would come from. The Member suggested that the Member raising the issue should also look at what funding the City Council could contribute towards it.

For clarification late on in the debate Councillor Moore stated that she was not suggesting that the Fendon Road roundabout should remain unfinished but was speaking to present the views of residents on priority safety works - she fully supported the scheme going ahead. She was pleased that both officers and the Chairman had stated that they were committed to its delivery, but reiterated that she was asking that the money to finish Fendon Road Roundabout was not taken from this particular project.

**d) Mark Lawrence-Jones As a local resident who enjoyed cycling and lived near the roundabout**

In introducing himself as a local resident who enjoyed cycling and who lived near the roundabout as he had a background in engineering he had taken a keen interest in the project having over the years taken steps to understand the project but had consistently found it difficult to gain what he believed was the correct data to justify its building having for a long time sought details of the cost benefits of the project. He referenced a presentation he had made in late 2018 at Shire Hall at which he suggested along with other concerned residents that the business case should be better defined.

In drawing attention to the large increase in costs of the Fendon Road roundabout project he questioned the safety reasons to justify the project, stating that they should be supported by appropriate cost benefit data and referenced a letter he had very recently received from a major Infrastructure officer replying to his request for the said data who he said confirmed that the project impetus had been the consultation responses in respect of safety concerns but that no records could be found for a cost benefit exercise having been carried out and suggested that there was still no data for projected accidents going forward. He also questioned what other projects had been approved without such an exercise being carried out.

His question was to ask whether members were aware that there had not been a defined costs and benefits exercise to justify the project when they approved the scheme.

A Member asked for clarity of whether he was aware of the significant international and especially European research that was available to support the safety of Dutch roundabouts. He responded that yes he had looked at the body of evidence and highlighted that there were two main types of Dutch roundabout

with cycle paths and suggested that the one chosen for the project had seven times more accidents according to one report and therefore the evidence was not there regarding the safety benefits of the current roundabout project. A City Councillor who had spoken earlier highlighted that when the research paper that Mr Lawrence–Jones had cited in earlier debates had been looked into, it was found to be by an ex British national living in Holland whose argument was that he knew better than the Dutch on how to design such a roundabout.

In responding to the issues raised, officers highlighted that the Economy and Environment Committee approval in 2016 outlined the basis of funding the project and the aspirations to improve safety from the new roundabout design which was in response to the high level of concerns expressed by local residents responding to the consultation regarding the safety of cyclists on the existing roundabout and the fact that many people had stated that they were put off cycling due to the dangers they believed the existing roundabout posed. This had been reviewed at a strategic level which was beyond the economic benefits that a cost-benefit exercise would be able to measure, as it took into account encouraging as many people as possible to feel safe enough to switch to using bikes. Measures that could be looked at once implemented, would be to compare any collisions to the number of collisions that had taken place on the previous roundabout design as the target set out in the previous report was to reduce accidents to zero.

The challenges had been the infrastructure risks as set out in the report. How they had been identified in the programme would be looked at as learning lessons going forward, but it was highlighted that in terms of utility issues, these were risks encountered on all projects as the utility companies themselves did not have accurate records of where all their apparatus under the road network was. The estimated costs of a project at design stage often increased as more detail became available and costs could then be better refined. Officers were looking at the management of risk and how they were considered within a budget at an early stage and also what improvements could be made to keep the public better informed.

In further discussion:

- One Member in supporting the Fendon Road roundabout did not want to see any further delay in its implementation due to any budget shortfalls. He highlighted the success of the redesigned Radegund Road roundabout which had previously had an abysmal number of accidents and since its redesign he believed that the accident rate was now down to zero. *(Post Meeting Officer Note: the actual recorded injury collisions at the Radegund Rd roundabout were not available at Committee, having checked the records officers can clarify that there has been 2 recorded 'slight' injuries since it opened in 2015, with 27 injuries recorded in the 9 years prior to its completion).*

- He did not support switching funding from the Cherry Hinton Road Project as all three projects were interlinked and did not wish to see the whole project put in jeopardy. On that basis he could not support recommendation b)
- The Local Member for Queen Edith reminded the Committee that the project was not just concerned with cycling measures but pedestrian safety measures, including installing pedestrian crossing schemes. Referencing the time delays and the very large increase by a million pounds in costs on the Fendon Road roundabout she suggested that it was another example of a capital project whose costs had spiralled out of control putting in danger both the Cherry Hinton Road and Robin Hood schemes. She also highlighted that having spoken to other Councillor colleagues, the knock on effects extended to schemes earmarked for Fulbourn. She also cited the issues which had occurred with the construction of the Hills Road cycling scheme which was also as a result of utility issues, suggesting that there was a lack of knowledge of the risks when proceeding with projects and that there needed to be a better understanding of the cost and time risk for projects going forward. The Chairman in response assured the Committee that he had expressed similar concerns and that he had asked the Executive Director to bring forward a report to a future Committee on what improvements could be made in project management, as he agreed that the issues that had been raised in the discussion and the continued cost overspends on other capital projects were not acceptable.
- One Member asked whether the Council should be looking at compensatory costs being sought from utility companies when such delays and cost increases resulted from their inadequate records as seemed to happen on a regular basis with another example cited being Huntingdon Road. She considered this unacceptable and highlighted the need to make them more accountable. This was supported by another councillor as an issue that required further investigation as the utility companies were meant to be partners but were instead having a detrimental effect on Council projects.

From the concerns expressed in the debate around project management failures Councillor Manning proposed the following additional recommendation seconded by Councillor Taylor:

*d) noting that officers are doing work on better time/cost estimates in future projects, ask that a report on that work is brought back to a future meeting of this committee as soon as possible.*

In discussion on the amendment one Member while supporting it in principle, questioned whether it was being proposed on the right agenda item as the Chairman had already indicated that he had asked the officers to come back with a report along similar lines. The Chairman made clear that his discussion with the Executive Director was a request for a wider, comprehensive review of capital project management schemes undertaken throughout the County and this would be

brought back at an appropriate time on its completion and could not support an amendment asking for the report to come back as soon as possible.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost by 6 votes against (Councillors Connor, Fuller, Harford, Howell, King and Bates) to three in favour (Councillors Dupre, Manning and Taylor) with one abstention (Councillor Kavanagh)

Following this a vote was taken on the substantive recommendations as set out in the offices' report these were approved by nine votes in favour with one abstention (Councillor Kavanagh)

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) note the issues that have been experienced on the Fendon Road project and their impact.
- b) approve the £304k reallocation of budget from within the overall programme to complete the construction of the Fendon Road roundabout, and
- c) approve construction of the Robin Hood junction improvements.

## **19. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – TO END OF MAY 2020**

The Chairman: agreed to take this report under the same Chairman discretionary powers as for the earlier Wisbech Access Report on the urgency grounds that it contained recommendations to be agreed by the Committee which then needed to be passed on to the General Purposes Committee. The reason for lateness being that it could not be finalised at the time of the original agenda publication.

The report was presented to provide the Committee with an opportunity to note and comment on the financial position as at the end of May, and agree the revised 2020/2021 capital budgets.

The main highlights were that:

- Place and Economy as a whole is forecasting a bottom line revenue overspend of £3.6m.
- £5.2m of forecast pressures was attributable to the impacts of Covid-19, the majority of the pressures being from the loss of income which was used to fund existing services. The pressures and the assumptions on the recovery profile of income were being closely monitored and regularly reviewed.

Offsetting the Covid-19 pressures was a £1m underspend on street lighting from a one off negotiated contract settlement relating to penalties during the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract implementation period, and an underspend on waste.

- The capital budgets had been approved as part of the Business Plan but since then the budgets had been updated to reflect the carry-forwards from previous financial year, re-profiling of budget to reflect expected expenditure patterns, and funding changes. Appendix 8 of the Report provided a breakdown of all the changes, with the Committee asked to confirm their support and refer them to General Purposes Committee for approval.

Issues raised included:

- A member asking for more details regarding the one off negotiated contract settlement relating to penalties on the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract Street Lighting and whether it achieved what officers had hoped for in terms of the settlement amount being reasonable. It was explained that it was a historic issue and reflected the early part of the Street Lighting Contract and the fact that the contractor had not carried out sign and bollard cleaning and electrical testing as stipulated in the contract. The settlement had been considered very favourable achieving 90% of the maximum amount that could be claimed and it is likely this is more than would have been secured if it had been pursued through a dispute resolution process where the size of any settlement would have been considerably reduced by the legal fees that would have been incurred.
- As it had been put on pause during the Covid19 crisis a Member asked whether there was as yet any identified end date for applications to be made to the Local Highways Initiatives Schemes (LHI). No date had yet been set as officers were currently looking at the resource implications, taking into account Covid and the current focus on the Active Travel Fund, as the project would be using the same staff resources with the Chairman reminding Members that staff were only starting to come back from redeployment. It was hoped to finalise the position in the next two weeks with officers agreeing a date was required as soon as possible. The Member agreed, highlighting that Parishes needed a reasonable time to submit schemes if they had not yet done so already, and therefore it was essential to communicate the date to them as soon as possible.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) confirm support for the capital budget changes as detailed in Appendix 8 and refer them to General Purposes Committee for approval and,

b) Review note and comment upon the report.

## 20. COVID-19 UPDATE REPORT

Given the rapidly changing situation and the need to provide the Committee and public with the most up to date information possible the Chairman has agreed to accept this as a late report on the following grounds:

1. Reason for lateness: To allow the report to contain the most up to date information possible.
2. Reason for urgency: To enable the committee to be briefed on the current situation in relation to the Council's response to Covid-19 for those service for which it is responsible.

The Committee received the most recent iteration of the Council's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In discussion Committee Members raised a number of issues relating to the key highlights set out in section 3 including the following:

- Referencing paragraph 3.1 and the provision of Active Travel measures to provide temporary cycle and pedestrian infrastructure one member raised concerns that so far local Members had received more consultation on Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) schemes rather than the County Council schemes and it looked as if the County Council was lagging behind in implementing them. It was explained that GCP had less schemes to be implemented with County Council officers having spent the previous week prioritising schemes and that consultation would be beginning in the week, while highlighting that due to the need to deliver the schemes within 8 weeks, the consultation would necessarily have to be very limited.
- The same Member raised the issue regarding a desire that blue badge holders should be permitted to go through the bus gates on the Mill Road closure and while he understood that there were technical details, was concerned at the continued delay as he believed they should have been sorted by now. In response it was explained that the issue was not specific to the Mill Road closure but the reason why they were not given an exemption currently was that the blue badge was issued to an individual not a vehicle which made it difficult in term of using registration number recognition cameras and was therefore an enforcement concern. More work needed to be undertaken to make it practicable which would also require a change of policy necessitating a report to come back to Committee.
- One Member highlighted with extreme concern the second from last bullet on page 3 reading '*Traffic levels continue to increase further following the opening of all non-essential retail and are now close to 70% of pre Covid levels*' making the point that many had hoped the reduction in traffic would have been for longer as many people were still furloughed. She asked what action was being taken to discourage people from going back to cars. Officers agreed it was disappointing and officers would be looking to redouble action on measures such as Active Travel and undertaking a communications

campaign to reassure the public that using public transport was safe. Central Government's message had been that public transport was not safe which was why some people had taken up travelling by car again and therefore explanation was required to counter this and explain how it was safe to travel on public transport. The Officer recognised that if traffic levels rose to their previous levels it would be difficult to get people out of their cars.

- Another Member also referencing the update paragraphs under 3.1 in thanking officers for the Mill Road closure highlighted that one aspect that had not happened had been the installation of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras which tended to discourage people from entering as so much was down to individual behaviour and some cars were still crossing the bridge putting pedestrians and cyclists at risk even with signs on both sides of the road. He therefore asked officers to provide an exact date when the camera would be installed backed up by robust signage. In response 9<sup>th</sup> July was the date given for the cameras and 13<sup>th</sup> July for the signs. The latter unfortunately while already ordered, would not be available at exactly the same time.
- Another member on 3.1 raised the issue of safety zones around schools highlighting that the report referred to 15 expressions of interest to date having been received within Cambridgeshire seeking clarification of what this meant and also asking if officers were disappointed as the number, as it was for the whole County seemed low. All schools had been contacted via the Education department. It was not considered disappointing as currently different schools had different pressures but over next few weeks there was an expectation that there would be an increased level of interest as schools caught up with all their paperwork.

It was resolved to:

Note the progress made to date in responding to the impact of the Coronavirus

## **21. HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN**

During discussion of the item the Chairman reminded Councillors Taylor and Kavanagh that concerning the new Cambridge City Local Highways Initiative (LHI) Panel as highlighted at the last meeting, officers were waiting to receive the names of the Councillors to sit on. It (*Note: Four Labour and three Liberal Democrat councillors were required*)

The Committee received the Committee's forward agenda plan.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the agenda plan with the following additions:

September 15<sup>th</sup>

- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

- Coldham's Lane Roundabout
  - A141 Study
  - Cambridgeshire County Council CC Future Transport Priorities
  - March Study
- December 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Lancaster Way Consultation outcome.
- b) To ask officers in consultation with the Chairman to programme into the Plan the following additional reports:
- the results of the review lessons to be learnt from recent over run time / money Projects in respect of future project management best practice.
  - Progress Update Report on Wisbech Access Project.
- c) To note that the August meeting had been cancelled but would be replaced by a short virtual seminar on Winter Gritting specifically aimed at new members to the service area starting at 10 a.m.

Chairman  
September 2020