

A605 KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING REPLACEMENT

To: **Economy and Environment Committee**

Meeting Date: **16th September 2014**

From: **Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment**

Electoral division(s): **Whittlesey North, Whittlesey South**

Forward Plan ref: **Not applicable** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To note scheme progress and the findings of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report.**

Recommendation: **The Committee is asked to;**

- a. note the findings of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report;**
- b. support public consultation on the deliverable options, Option 3 Part on-line, Option 4 off-line alignment to the north and Option 5 off-line alignment to the South;**
- c. Approve the appointment of a Committee member to sit on the Project Board.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Bob Menzies
Post:	Director, Strategy and Development
Email:	Bob.menzies@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 728368

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 To update members on the development of proposals to relieve congestion on the A605 at King's Dyke level crossing, seek approval for consultation on deliverable options and request the appointment of a Committee Member to the Project Board.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The A605 between Whittlesey and Peterborough carries over 12,000 vehicles per day and there are some 120 daily train movements across the level crossing. The resulting closure of the crossing barrier causes significant delay to traffic. Future plans by the rail industry to increase the number of trains along the route would further increase delays.
- 2.2 The situation is exacerbated in wetter periods, when local flooding closes North Bank, an alternative route to Peterborough, for long periods of time. The additional 5,000 vehicles a day using the level crossing doubles the average delay per vehicle.
- 2.3 A high level investigation identifying the issues and possible benefits of a scheme to close the level crossing was undertaken. It concluded that a bridge is technically feasible and is likely to require the acquisition of third party land. Taking into account an estimated scheme cost of £15m and the benefits to the transport network, the report showed that a scheme would offer a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of between 2.01 and 4.24 depending upon assumptions of the time that North Bank is likely to be closed. The Department for Transport advice on value for money assessments places the scheme in the high to very high value for money categories. On this basis further scheme development work is being undertaken.

3. PROCESS FOR DELIVERY

- 3.1 The project is being developed in line with national standards for major transport projects and Government's 'Five Cases Model'. Each option is assessed against criteria relating to Strategic, Value for Money, Financial, Delivery and Commercial themes. Included in this assessment is the impact of each option upon the local environment.
- 3.2 Following the initial high level investigation, an engineering evaluation has been undertaken. This evaluation considered seven possible options:
 1. on line, within existing highway boundary, with a full road closure.
 2. on line, within existing highway boundary, allowing for temporary working or traffic management on land outside the highway during construction.
 3. part on line, contiguous to the existing highway keeping one or more main line traffic lane flowing under traffic management control during construction.
 4. off line alignment to the north
 5. off line alignment to the south
 6. a tunnel solution
 7. wider area bypass solution

- 3.3 The evaluation identifies three options (3,4 &5) which are considered deliverable in engineering terms. It is proposed, subject to the approval of the Committee, to hold a public consultation on these options in the autumn.
- 3.4 Appendix A shows the preliminary general arrangement plans for the three options which are deliverable in engineering terms. The full report setting out the advantages, dis-advantages and construction methodology is available on the County Council web site at:
http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20051/transport_projects/520/kings_dyke_crossing
- 3.5 Option 1 an on-line solution, is not considered deliverable as it will not fit within the available highway land, and would require a full road closure with traffic diverted onto alternative routes for the duration of the work. Option 2 is not considered deliverable due to an unreasonable level of disruption to traffic during construction and local access issues. A tunnelling solution was investigated, however, preliminary ground investigations do not support a tunnel solution in the area due to the high level of groundwater.
- 3.6 A wider area bypass, option 7, is considered to be technically deliverable. However, the longer route would result in a greater local impact and a significantly higher cost. As such and in light of other options being considered deliverable this option is not recommended for further consideration.
- 3.7 The finding of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report and the broader 'five case model' assessment will be brought together in a single Options Assessment Report (OAR) fully assessing each option. Appendix B sets out the format for the OAR. The OAR will also take into account the views of residents and network users.
- 3.8 The full OAR, including the responses to the public consultation, and updates on continuing evaluation, such as ecology, will be reported to Committee early in 2015, when the Committee will be asked to agree a single option to be taken forward for delivery.

4. COSTS AND FUNDING

- 4.1 Following the engineering evaluation, the estimated project cost is £13m which includes construction, design, land acquisition and, diversion of statutory plant. Construction costs estimates for the deliverable options have been prepared and range from £6m to £8m. The County Council Business Plan includes an allocation of £13.5m between 2014/15 and 17/18. Currently the project has secured funding of £11.5m made up of £3.5m County Council residual capital, £5m Growth Deal and £3m Local Transport Body funding. A further contribution from Network Rail will be sought to off-set operational savings made from closing the crossing.

5 PLANNING PROCESS AND DRAFT ORDERS

- 5.1 At this stage of the project it is too early to identify the specific statutory requirements for delivery. However, three key areas are expected to need approval.

- i. Planning requirements;
 - ii. Acquisition of land and rights for construction; and
 - iii. Highway orders and traffic regulation orders.
- 5.2 The on-going work will identify the planning requirements for the various options and it is anticipated that the scheme will require a planning application to be submitted.
- 5.3 The findings of the Engineering Options Feasibility Report confirm that the project will require the acquisition of land and rights for construction. Land take will be kept to a minimum and all efforts will be made to negotiate the acquisition. The land required will be identified as the preferred option emerges. Approval to use Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers, should they be necessary, will be sought in the report seeking approval for the preferred option early in 2015.
- 5.4 It is anticipated that orders will be required to change the network to accommodate private accesses affected by the scheme and to remove the legal right to use the level crossing following closure. All order processes will be coordinated so far as possible to ensure the most efficient determination processes are followed.

6 PROJECT GOVERNANCE

- 6.1 To oversee the continued development and delivery of the scheme and provide a forum for key issues to be considered, a Project Board has been established. The board comprises stakeholders, local County and District members and the former Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning. Following the recent change to committee structure the committee is asked to appoint a member of the committee to sit on the Project Board to replace the former cabinet member.

7 PROGRAMME

- 7.1 Below are the key dates in the outline programme, assuming a straightforward planning and procurement process.

- *Public consultation* *Nov 2014*
- *Selection of preferred option* *Jan 2015*
- *Planning application and approval* *Jan-June 2015*
- *Detailed design and procurement* *July -Jan 2016*
- *Construction* *Jan to Sept 2016*

- 7.2 The programme will be dependent on the detail of processes required for planning consent, land acquisition and arranging consent from Network Rail to work over the railway. These issues will be clarified as a single option is identified and the programme will be refined.

8. NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 Should the committee be minded to support the project as laid out in this paper a full public consultation will follow this autumn.
- 8.2 The aim of the consultation will be twofold, firstly to update the public on the finding to the engineering feasibility and options assessment work and secondly to gain feedback as to which, if any, option they prefer.
- 8.3 The finding of this consultation along with the update on implication for delivery will be brought to this committee in the new year for consideration and, if applicable, approval for a single option.

9. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

9.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The new crossing would benefit both road and rail users by improving journey time and reliability, helping provide a firm basis from which to grow existing local businesses and support the introduction of new enterprise.

9.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

It is anticipated that local levels of pollution resulting from stationary and slow moving vehicles which result from the closure of the crossing will be significantly reduced.

9.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

10 SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Resource Implications

The funding for these works is being provided from a range of contributions. These include; Growth Deal Funding - £5m, Local Transport Board - £3m County Council residual capital - £2m. Additional funding sources are being investigated such as Network Rail.

10.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

10.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

10.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

The new crossing will be subject to extensive public consultation and community engagement.

10.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The existing local liaison forum (Fletton brickwork) will be invited to act as an informal consultative meeting for stakeholders and local residents to discuss the project during the development of the scheme.

10.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Source Documents	Location
<i>Kings Dyke Level Crossing Replacement - Initial Investigation</i> Engineering Options Feasibility Report	Castle Court 2 floor B wing