

## **MEETING OF HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018

Time: 10:00am -11.55am

Present: Councillors H Batchelor, I Gardener, M Howell, B Hunt (Vice-Chairman), S King, P Raynes, T Sanderson, J Scutt, M Shuter (Chairman) and A Taylor

In attendance: Councillors P Downes, J Williams and T Wotherspoon

### **57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **58. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2018 were confirmed as a correct record with the following changes:

p4 amended to reflect that Councillor Scutt did not support charging for internet services in libraries.

p1 attendance list should not include Cllr Howell.

Councillor Scutt commented that the Press Release issued after the 13<sup>th</sup> February Committee stated that the “Committee had agreed” the library service transformation recommendations, but it would have been more accurate to state that the changes were “agreed by a majority of Committee Members”. The Chairman acknowledged this point and advised that the Press Release had been withdrawn within a few hours, and he added that he had made it clear in his radio interview that this had not been a unanimous decision by the Committee.

With regard to minute numbered 21 on the Action Log (Performance report), the Executive Director, Place and Economy, confirmed that this was being progressed, and Performance Indicators were being reviewed.

The Action Log was noted.

### **59. PETITIONS**

There were no petitions.

### **60. ROAD SAFETY ACROSS CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

Members received a report updating them on the current trends in road casualties, and challenges related to road casualty reduction in the county. The report also detailed proposals for future delivery of road safety in Cambridgeshire to address these challenges and for the digitalisation of safety cameras.

The Committee noted:

- the significant increases in the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) on Cambridgeshire roads since 2015;
- the factors that contribute to increases in KSI figures, including economy, funding, enforcement/fear of being caught, changes to the way collisions are reported by the Police and driver behaviour – the latter being the biggest factor in road traffic collisions;
- the substantial financial impact of collisions, including costs to the emergency services, NHS, other public services, loss of earnings and societal value;
- the Road Safety Hub approach that was proposed, which was a delivery structure based around core expertise/functions, in order to deliver an efficient and effective road safety service for Cambridgeshire, working with partners including the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the Combined Authority and Peterborough City Council. This would enable communities to access a universal level of service for common road safety issues, maintaining a level of consistency across the network;
- the proposed new methodology for identifying high risk routes and sites, which involved a risk-based analysis of all A and B roads, ranking sections in order of risk.

Arising from the report, Members:

- expressed concerns regarding the trends for increasing KSI on Cambridgeshire roads, identified in the report;
- noted that the figures included trunk routes e.g. the numbers killed and seriously injured on the Cambridgeshire stretches of the A14 and M11. Whilst the Council does not have direct influence on trunk routes, Cambridgeshire residents use those roads, so it was appropriate that they were included. It was suggested that it would be helpful if the statistics could provide a breakdown by trunk routes and other routes. **Action required.** It was confirmed that a proportion of collisions involve people living outside Cambridgeshire and this number was higher than the number of Cambridgeshire residents having collisions elsewhere in the country. Officers explained that the main issue to be considered was driver behaviour, which was the key factor to be tackled in reducing collisions – investment only in the roads themselves would not necessarily have a significant impact on the KSI figures. The Council was working with the Police and Highways England to address these issues;

- a Member thanked officers for their excellent and comprehensive report. Whilst noting that driver behaviour was the main cause of collisions, and that young men were more likely to be involved in collisions, asked how work to address this would be resourced, and how much partnership working e.g. with the emergency services would work within the Hub structure. Officers confirmed that their main focus was on driver behaviour, and one of the main drivers for the Hub structure was so that partner organisations can access the Hub and its expertise;
- queried why current policies made it difficult for volunteers to perform School Crossing Patrol (SCP) duties, when resources were so limited. Officers advised that whilst they were striving to be more flexible with volunteers, the Council has statutory duties related to SCPs, so this needed to be carefully managed;
- observing that 60% of collisions within Cambridge involved cyclists, it was noted that the contributory factor categories set out in Figure 2 of the report were the categories that the Police used, although this list was being reviewed nationally. When pedestrians were involved, a specific set of categories were used. Factors relating to cyclists were included under vehicles and can be filtered by vehicle type. It was further noted that following a collision, the analysis provided by the Police represented the subjective opinion from the Police Officer investigating the incident at the time, so that data had to be approached with some caution, and was not just accepted on face value. All cluster sites were investigated by one of the Council's engineers, and this was a statutory duty. Those engineers had access to the Police's collision reports, and they would pick up any patterns so that solutions could be identified;
- asked how driver education was being managed. Officers advised that they do direct the target audiences through secondary education and colleges, and since September had been running a programme called "Drive IQ", aimed at helping young people understand their role as road user: this was currently being evaluated by both Cranfield University and the DfT. The DfT was also targeting social media such as LadBible and other websites which young men use;
- asked if it was possible to identify clusters of accident sites and whether they were on the county's rural roads, e.g. the report identifies 6 fatalities in Huntingdonshire, but does not identify the roads i.e. whether these were on a trunk road or rural road. Officers explained that this was picked up in the proposals: it was currently very complicated to identify cluster sites, but the proposed methodology would simplify this process. A and B roads would be assessed in terms of risk, and a coloured map produced identifying cluster sites where there were six injury collisions or three fatalities within a 100 metre section of a road;
- noted that whilst there were a range of capital programmes which mitigated risk, the specific Road Safety capital programme of £594K (for 2017/18) was a relatively small budget targeted on the main cluster sites throughout the county;

- a Member commented that it would be helpful to separate out county roads from trunk roads, and observed that on completion, the A14 improvements should mean there was less traffic on adjacent routes such as the A1123, at which stage it would become even more important to separate out the data;
- queried the apparent focus on speed, given that most accidents in Cambridge city involved cyclists or pedestrians, and whether the funding and mitigation measures were weighted towards speed related incidents, and therefore did not provide as much funding for Cambridge. Officers advised that pedestrians and cyclists were regarded as more vulnerable than other road users, and there was no bias in the capital programme that put Cambridge City at a disadvantage. The Council was working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership to identify other ways of addressing road safety in the city;
- noted that the low number of fatalities in Fenland did not have any statistical significance;
- asked if officers had considered providing incentives for those drivers under 35 e.g. measures which could reduce their insurance premiums, such as attendance at Speed Awareness courses. It was noted that the latter option was currently only for those drivers who would otherwise face prosecution for speeding. The Member suggested that this type of course could be offered to address driver behaviour;
- asked if increasing traffic volumes had been factored in to the increase in KSIs. Officers advised that a recent study of the A142 showed that there had been an average 33% increase in traffic volume since 2010, but overall there had been no specific exercise mapping increases in traffic flows to collisions;
- whilst acknowledging the 2020 target set by the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Road Safety Partnership, a Member asked if there were any interim milestones that the Committee could monitor. Officers advised that one issue was identifying the impact of the change to the Police reporting system: only one full year's data was currently available, so there was not yet a full understanding of the baseline;
- discussed the need to update safety cameras to digital, observing that these had a positive impact on driver behaviour. A Member noted that the Council received no revenue from safety cameras, and asked if this had been explored? Officers advised that the revenue from all Fixed Penalty Notices goes to the Treasury. The Police recovered the cost of those attending Speed Awareness Courses, and does have a surplus from that, which the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) was able to reallocate. The Chairman advised that he had met recently with the PCC and discussed this: the cameras really needed updating, but the cost of that replacement would fall on the Council, which had no associated revenue to pay for them;
- a Member suggested that funding might be available from government, or even one of the major insurance companies, for programmes targeting driver

behaviour in young men, and suggested this be explored. It was noted that some insurance companies already used telematic boxes to monitor driver behaviour. Officers explained that one of the key drivers for the Hub approach was to give the team capacity to seek that type of funding, and ensuring that the appropriate expertise was available to put together appropriate bids;

- It was agreed that an Action Plan would be brought back to Committee in six months. **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) adopt a new delivery model for road safety as outlined in Section 2.3 of the report;
- b) approve the new methodology for assessing collision hotspots and high risk routes outlined in Section 2.4.11 of the report;
- c) approve the commencement of negotiations with the Police regarding the future costs associated with the safety camera programme, in partnership with Peterborough City Council;
- d) approve the capital programme for safety schemes outlined in Appendix 5 of the report.

## **61. HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSET MANAGEMENT**

The Committee considered a report on the revised Highway Asset Management Policy and Strategy, and the new Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP), which would be renamed the Highways Operational Standards.

Members noted that the most recent Government guidance favoured a less prescriptive but more risk based approach i.e. to the on-site risk assessment of potentially dangerous defects in the highway. The Council needed to implement the new Code of Practice by October 2018. The amount of funding that the Council received from the Department for Transport (DfT) via the Incentive Fund would depend upon the extent that the Council implemented and maintained highway asset management strategies and policies.

The compendium of all transport capital works, previously presented as the Council's Transport Delivery Plan, was now included in the Highways Operational Standards as Appendix M.

The Chairman advised that he was proposing an additional recommendation for the Committee's consideration:

*(d.) agree that the Executive Director, Place & Economy, in liaison with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, can make amendments to Appendix M of the Highways Operational Standards, in accordance with the approved asset management principles.*

This would provide additional flexibility in the proposed programme, whilst not jeopardising the approach required to maximise government funding.

Arising from the report:

- a Member welcomed the detailed report, and said it good to have all practices and procedures in one place. She raised concerns about decision making processes for prioritising and minor highways work, as it was not clear how Members could engage in the decision making process. The Committee was advised that the Local Highways Officer should always be the first port of call. A balanced approach between local requests and asset management had to be taken: the proposed additional recommendation would allow a degree of flexibility in accordance with the Asset Management principles. It was important to have an asset management structure, whereby officers have to inspect to confirm state of road and prioritise works accordingly. The overall condition of the network (A and B roads) was assessed annually, but monitored continuously;
- a Member asked how any changes to Appendix M, covered in the proposed additional recommendation, would be reported back to Members. It was confirmed that there would be an audit trail, and the Highway Operational Standards document would be republished annually and published on the website;
- Members discussed how HCVs were a major factor in the deterioration of carriageways, but it was noted HCVs were entitled to use highways unless there were specific weight restrictions. It was confirmed that traffic implications were taken into consideration when responding to Planning applications, but that there needed to be a balance between developing the local economy whilst being mindful of any negative effect that any additional traffic may create;
- noting response times, a Member commented that sometimes the Council sold itself short by quoting the maximum timescale, when in practice repairs were undertaken much more quickly;
- in response to a Member question, it was confirmed that 20% of Unclassified Roads, which accounted for over half of the network, were checked annually via visual inspection. The Member pointed out that many Parishes would be interested in an option to buy in to an enhanced service, and that should be explored;
- a Member commented that automatic statements on the website were sometimes misleading. The Assistant Director (Highways) acknowledged this point and advised that this was currently being reviewed, so that responses were much more reflective of the work actually being carried out. Work was also taking place on some easy to understand factsheets, which would be shared with all Members at the seminar on 11<sup>th</sup> May: the Chairman asked Members to strongly encourage their colleagues to attend that seminar. The Assistant Director (Highways) also confirmed that Local Members would be advised when the Dragon Patcher was going to their division, and a log of works done by it, and before and after photos would be shared with the Local Member, so that Local Members could share these with their constituents.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a. approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Policy (Appendix 1 to the report);
- b. approve the latest version of the Highway Asset Management Strategy (Appendix 2 to the report);
- c. approve the Highway Operational Standards (HOS) (Appendix 3 to the report);
- d. agree that the Executive Director, Place & Economy, in liaison with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, can make amendments to Appendix M of the Highways Operational Standards, in accordance with the approved asset management principles.

## **62. LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT (LHI) SCHEMES 2018-19**

The Committee considered a report on the outcome of the prioritisation of 2018/19 LHI applications by the Member panels in each District area. Members were reminded that some minor changes to the LHI scheme was agreed last year, the main change being that feasibility was undertaken by officers to help shape the bids coming forward, and also that the cost of officer time was factored in to scheme costs.

Members noted the breakdown of the budget by District areas, and were reminded that if a project on the prioritised list is found to be undeliverable, the next scheme 'below the line' would be taken forward, without the need to go through any further approval process.

Members also noted that the Council was working with Highways England, who were allocating up to £10,000 for highways schemes in those communities adjacent to the A14. It was expected that these proposals would be finalised shortly, and that those communities in Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire would benefit accordingly.

Arising from the report, Members:

- noting the significant public interest in LHI schemes, especially in Cambridge city, and two Members observed that the Member panels were held in private, and they suggested that members of the public should be able to attend, and papers made available publically. Officers advised that the process worked slightly different in Cambridge City, as it was the City Council (as opposed to Parish or Town Councils in the Districts) which provides all the match-funding. Whilst the dates and times of the City Member panels were advertised, these were not public meetings, although the public could contact officers and request to sit in as observers. Officers agreed to initiate discussions with City Council colleagues on how the earlier stages e.g. proposals for LHI bids at the City's Area Committees could be made transparent, and engage the community more. **Action required.**

Another Member commented that whilst he would have no problem with the public attending, his experience of being on the Scoring Panel was that they would probably be less interesting to a member of the public than other types of meeting;

- in response to a question on what would happen if a scheme overspent, i.e. whether those schemes at the bottom of the list be deferred, Members were reassured that the new process meant that officers had more involvement from an earlier stage, and the risk of the budgets for particular schemes significantly overspending was very low: any overspend would need to be paid by the other party i.e. Parish/Town/City Council;
- noted that officers do feedback to unsuccessful applicants, and also highlight the possibility of privately funding schemes;
- one Member suggested that the feasibility filter should be even tighter, as some schemes were still coming forward which were clearly not going to be successful e.g. exceeding the District budget or not supported by the Parish Council;
- officers confirmed that given the new process, i.e. feasibility assessments and greater officer involvement, there were very few schemes which were not realised. The amount of unspent budget was insignificant, and would be rolled forward to the next financial year and divided proportionately between Districts and the City. It was agreed that future reports would identify any schemes which were not completed. **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) approve the prioritised list of schemes for each District area, included in Appendix A to the report.

## **63. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – JANUARY 2018**

The Committee received a report presenting financial and performance information for Place and Economy for January 2018.

The forecast overspend on Winter Maintenance had increased, but this was offset by the increased forecast underspent on 'Highways Other'. The forecast bottom line position across Place & Economy services was a £112K underspend.

There had been some additional slippage on capital for services covered by both Highways & Community Infrastructure and Economy & Environment Committees.

Arising from the report:

- a Member was pleased to note how many children were involved in the Summer Reading Challenge, and asked for thanks to be passed on to all the library staff involved;
- a Member expressed concern regarding the delay to the new Archives Centre. It was confirmed that this related to Planning issues which had



delayed the actual start on site. It was agreed that an update would be provided. **Action required;**

- a Member was pleased to note that the issues relating to the Streetlighting contract had been addressed. It was noted that a programme of LED updates had recently been published;
- Members congratulated the gritting teams for their hard work during recent bad weather;
- Members noted that discussions continued with Amey regarding the Waste PFI contract;
- Members noted that there would be a review of all the Place & Economy Performance Indicators, to assess whether they were still the most appropriate Performance Indicators for the respective Committees to monitor, and to ensure that they were outcome focused.

It was resolved unanimously to:

review, note and comment on the report.

#### **64. HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Committee considered its agenda plan and training plan.

The following item was added to the Agenda Plan:

- Road Safety Action Plan – September 2018

It was noted that the provisional April meeting was not required, and that slot would be used for the Community and Cultural Services 'package tour', visiting Coroners, Registration, Libraries and Archives services in Huntingdon. This event was open to all Councillors.

It was resolved to:

1. note the agenda plan and training plan, including the updates provided orally at the meeting.

**Chairman**